
Independent Completion Report of the Basic Education Sector Program in Sri Lanka

FINAL REPORT

12 Jan 2013

Amendment History

| Version No. | Date | Brief Description of Change | Author |
|-------------|------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| V1 | 09/11/2012 | First Draft | Angela Little |
| V1.1 | 12/11/2012 | Quality Assurance | MyraHarrison |
| V2 | 19/11/2012 | Revised draft to incorporate quality assurance. | Angela Little |
| V3 | 19/12/2012 | Revised after comments from AusAID, UNICEF, NIE | Angela Little |
| V4 | 12/01/2013 | Final revision after comments from AusAID | Angela Little |

This report was commissioned through the Education Resource Facility - an Australian Government, AusAID, funded initiative. The views in the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of AusAID or of any other organisation or person.

Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... | 1 |
| 1. Introduction..... | 8 |
| 1.1 Activity Background..... | 8 |
| 1.2 Country Context | 8 |
| 2. Evaluation Objectives, Scope and Methods..... | 9 |
| 2.1. Evaluation Method..... | 9 |
| 3. Program Design and Implementation History | 10 |
| 4. Relevance..... | 12 |
| 5. Effectiveness | 14 |
| 5.1. BESP achievements in relation to targets | 15 |
| 5.2. Unravelling the CFA criteria..... | 20 |
| 6. Efficiency | 24 |
| 7. Sustainability..... | 26 |
| 8. Gender Equality | 29 |
| 9. Monitoring and Evaluation | 31 |
| 10. Analysis and Learning..... | 33 |
| 11. Conclusions, Evaluation Ratings and Recommendations..... | 34 |
| 11.1. Conclusions and Evaluation Ratings..... | 34 |
| 11.2. Recommendations | 37 |
| 12. Final Note | 39 |
| 13. References | 40 |
| 14. Annexes..... | 45 |
| Annex 1: Terms of Reference..... | 46 |
| Annex 2: The Evaluation Team | 59 |
| Annex 3: Cross Cutting Issues | 60 |
| Annex 4: School visit field report | 62 |
| Annex 5: Program of Meetings..... | 76 |
| Annex 6: List of Persons Met..... | 80 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Annex 7: Checklists and Questions..... | 88 |
| Annex 8: Child Friendly Dimensions and Criteria in the BESP | 99 |
| Annex 9: Full Set of Child Friendly Dimensions and Associated Criteria..... | 102 |
| Annex 10: BESP schools by district and year of inclusion..... | 104 |
| Annex 11: SSA and SDP in CFA and PSI | 105 |
| Annex 12: Key Project Components..... | 112 |
| Annex 13: Summary of BESP Achievements with Analyses | 116 |
| Annex 14: Notes on Indicators | 122 |
| Annex 15: National Strategic plan ESDFP-Relevance of Primary Education ... | 125 |
| Annex 16: AusAID Gender Equity Criteria..... | 128 |

AID Activity Summary

| | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aid Activity Name | Basic Education Support Program (BESP) | | |
| AidWorks initiative number | INH574 | | |
| Commencement date | February 2009 | Completion date | December 2012 |
| Total Australian \$ | AUD 7.4 million | | |
| Total other \$ | | | |
| Delivery Organisation(s) | UNICEF | | |
| Implementing Partner(s) | MOE Sri Lanka | | |
| Country/Region | Sri Lanka/ South Asia | | |
| Primary Sector | Education | | |

Acknowledgements

The Consultants would like to thank all those listed in Annex 6 of this report, who freely gave their time to meet with us and to support the undertaking of the Review. We express our gratitude to staff of the Ministry of Education staff in Colombo, in the provinces and in the schools, of the National Institute of Education and of UNICEF, in Colombo and in the provinces. All participated positively in the exercise and responded patiently to our many and varied questions. We also thank Edward Archibald, Janelle Denton and Dunstan Fernando of AusAID for their effective management and support to the review and great help with the fieldwork.

Author details

Prof Angela W Little (International Consultant and Team Leader)

Dr Wilfred Perera (National Consultant)

Muthu Sivagnanam (National Consultant)

Dr James Jennings (AusAID South Asia Regional Education Adviser)

Acronyms

| | |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| ADB | Asian Development Bank |
| ADE | Assistant Director of Education |
| ALP | Accelerated Learning Program |
| APDE | Additional Provincial Director of Education |
| AusAID | Australian Agency for International Development |
| BESP | Basic Education Support Program |
| BL | Basic Literacy |
| BLC | Basic Literacy Class |
| CCA | Child Centred Approach |
| CCM | Child Centred Methodology |
| CELD | Centre for Education Leadership Development |
| CER | Compulsory Education Regulations |
| CFA | Child-Friendly Approach |
| CFS | Child Friendly Schools |
| CP | Central Province |
| CRC | Convention on the Rights of the Child |
| CRPD | Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities |
| CUE | Catch-up Education |
| DCD | Development Co-operation Directorate |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee |
| DDE | Deputy Director of Education |
| DEO | Divisional Education Officer |
| DRR | Disaster Risk Reduction |
| ELC | Essential Learning Competencies |
| EMIS | Education Management Information System |
| EP | Eastern Province |
| ESDFP | Education Sector Development Framework Program |
| GA | Government Agent |
| GCE AL | General Certificate of Education Advanced Level |
| GCE OL | General Certificate of Education Ordinary Level |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| GN | Grama Niladari |
| GoSL | Government of Sri Lanka |
| ICT | Information Communication Technology |
| ICR | Independent Completion Report |
| IE | Inclusive Education |

| | |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------|
| INGO | International Non-Governmental Organization |
| IR | Intermediate Result |
| IRDP | Integrated Rural Development Program |
| ISA | In-Service Advisor |
| KS1 | Key Stage 1 |
| MDG | Millennium Development Goal |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MOE | Ministry of Education |
| MoF | Ministry of Finance |
| MoFA | Ministry of Foreign Affairs |
| MTR | Mid-Term Review |
| MTSP | Mid-Term Strategic Plan |
| NCoE | National College of Education |
| NEREC | National Education, Research and Evaluation Centre |
| NFE | Non Formal Education |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| NIE | National Institute of Education |
| NP | Northern Province |
| OOSC | Out of school children |
| PAD | Project Appraisal Document |
| PAF | Program Assessment Framework |
| PBA | Program Budget Allotment |
| PCR | Program Component Result |
| PDE | Provincial Director of Education |
| PELP | Primary English Language Project |
| PEPP | Primary Education Planning Project |
| PMP | Primary Mathematics Project |
| PSDP | Primary School Development Program |
| PSEDP | Plantation School Education Development Program |
| PHI | Public Health Officer |
| PSI | Program for School Improvement |
| SAARC | South Asia Association for Regional Cooperation |
| SAC | School Attendance Committee |
| SBA | School Based Assessment |
| SBM | School Based Management |
| SDC | School Development Committee |
| SDP | School Development Plan |
| SDS | School Development Society |

| | |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| SLEAS | Sri Lanka Education Administrative Service |
| SMI | School Medical Inspection |
| SPM | Sector Planning Mission |
| SSA | School Self-Assessment |
| TIMS | Teacher Instruction Manuals |
| ToT | Training of Trainers |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children’s Fund |
| UP | Uva Province |
| WASH | Water and Sanitation and Hygiene |
| WFP | World Food Program |
| WB | World Bank |
| ZDE | Zonal Director of Education |
| OECD | Organization for economic Cooperation and Development |

Executive Summary

1. The Basic Education Support Program (hereafter BESP) commenced in 2009 and was the Australian Government's first major budget measure initiative in the education sector of Sri Lanka. BESP is due to be completed by the end of December 2012. The program is managed by UNICEF and implemented by the Ministry of Education (MOE). The overall value of the program is AUD 7.4 million, of which AUD 7.2 million was provided to UNICEF under a Partnership Contribution Agreement, and AUD 0.2 million for project development and reviews. The overall objective of BESP is 'to support universal completion of primary education and improve learning achievement by building a child-friendly learning environment'. The Child Friendly Approach (hereafter CFA) is central to the work of BESP schools. The objectives of this evaluation were four-fold: (i) assess BESP performance against program objectives in accordance with AusAID evaluation criteria (ii) assess accountability for expenditure of Australian public funds on BESP activities (iii) assess how BESP has contributed to the objective of Education Sector Development Framework Plan (ESDFP) and (iv) taking into consideration AusAID's current investment in the education sector, advise and recommend on AusAID's future support to education in Sri Lanka.

2. Overall we judge that BESP has been very relevant to the Sri Lankan context and has been aligned with the priorities of the Sri Lankan government. It has been responsive to the needs of children in disadvantaged areas and to the particular needs of children in conflict affected areas. It has met a number of its targets but has been more effective in meeting its targets for access than for quality. While commendable progress has been made in a number of schools that joined BESP only in 2011 more work needs to be done to consolidate achievements to date. As BESP approaches its end date and the prospect of 'roll out' across the country beckons there is a need to take stock of achievements to date, to analyse further the challenges posed by some elements and to reflect critically on the causal nexus that is assumed by project designers between school and classroom activities and the end results.

3. Relevance: With its foci on improved access to and improvement in the quality of education BESP is aligned with Sri Lankan and AusAID priorities. It is consistent with the objectives of Sri Lanka's national plans for education, embodied in ESDFP1, 2006-2011 and ESDFP2, 2012-2017 (Ministry of Education, 2012). Its overall objective is consistent with AusAID's 2008 *Education Sector Strategy for Sri Lanka*, its more recent 2011 Education Thematic Strategy and its 2012 Gender Equality Strategy. The overall goal of BESP was consistent with UNICEF's strategy in Sri Lanka at BESP inception and throughout its implementation.

4. Effectiveness: We have based much of our analysis on UNICEF progress and completion reports (UNICEF 2010a, 2011a, 2012 a, b) and have also undertaken a number of re-analyses based on raw data. Much of the data in the ACR was collected in early 2012 and is based on 2011 MOE school census data. Were the most up to date data available at the time of our analysis or had this evaluation been conducted after the project completion date based on 2012 data then assessments of progress may have been different. The BESP monitoring and evaluation framework employs two results, six outcomes, sixteen indicators and sixteen targets linked with the indicators. Five of the eight access targets have been 'met'. Survival rates have increased, the percentage of out of school children who been re-enrolled in school has increased, all children

identified as requiring alternative education have been enrolled in Basic Literacy Classes (BLCs) or accelerated learning programs (ALPs), and more than 50% of these students have subsequently re-enrolled in school. One access target has been 'almost met'. This is the target that requires all schools to have a student attendance committee in place. Two access targets have been met only 'partially'. While there have been commendable increases in attendance rates in three districts, improvements in eight others have been more modest. In those districts in the Northern Province, which rejoined BESP only in 2011, attendance rose from an average of 87.4% to 91.0% among girls and from 86.2% to 90% among boys between 2010 and 2011. And the retention after one year of children who were enrolled in BLCs and have re-enrolled in school is 55% as against the target of 80%.

On the basis of evidence available to us in October 2012 targets for improving the quality of education have been more difficult to achieve. Only three of eight targets have been 'met' or 'almost met'. The requirement that provincial resource teams be established in all nine provinces has been met fully, though it should be noted that team was established in the Northern Province only very recently in June 2012. Ninety one per cent of schools have conducted School Self Assessments (SSAs), designed to create a school plan. And all schools have at least one teacher trained in CFA. Four 'quality' targets have either been only 'partially met' or 'not met'. Implementation guidelines in the form of the CFA manual appear to have been distributed to most schools but the guidelines for education officials have not yet been finalised. A tool kit on inclusive education has been developed but has not yet been distributed. To date the collection by schools of CFA information has commenced only in BESP schools in Uva province and is therefore met only partially. The overall target for Strategic Result 2 –a reduction of ten percentage points in the percentage of students who achieved 70+ on the Grade 5 scholarship examination between the district and the national level - has not been met. It was an ambitious target, its measurement was challenging and heavily constrained by available data and the extent to which the national figure would increase unanticipated. Evidence is not yet available on the extent to which CFA practices have been adopted at school level. This is the most ambitious and comprehensive indicator of all. It requires assessments by multiple stakeholders of the implementation of the six dimensions and 29 criteria that, taken together, comprise the Child Friendly Approach. Some tools are still being finalised.

5. Efficiency and accountability: In the last two years of the project there has been noteworthy improvement in implementation of activities and fund utilisation which has resulted in considerable gains in terms of efficiency. Recommendations made by the Mid Term Review (MTR) conducted in 2010 have been implemented and the consequent improvements to the program documented. The expansion to the North was implemented within a short timeframe. Risks have been identified, addressed and managed with minimum disruption to the program. Australian funding of BESP activities has been efficiently utilised in accordance with the original program design and the extension agreement. The project has implemented the inputs and outputs as planned. All funds were subject to the GOSL rules and regulations for expenditure and accounting and to UNICEF's global rules and regulations as well as to the audits of both GOSL and UNICEF.

6. Sustainability: There are a number of positive indications of sustainability. A commitment to the adoption of the general principles of CFA was expressed in the 2010 national plan *Mahinda Chintana: vision for the future*. CFA is a central plank of the

Ministry of Education's National Strategic Plan for Education 2012-2017. A CFA guidance manual on CFA has already been distributed to around 2,800 primary schools/sections beyond the BESP schools. The incorporation of CFA content into the primary curriculum began in 2007 and is intensifying. The inclusion of a CFA module within the College of Education teacher education curriculum bodes well for the sustainability of the approach for many years to come. As well as widespread awareness of CFA principles and practices provinces at the school level, there is growing awareness among provincial, zonal and divisional level officers.

7. Gender equality: 'Gender responsiveness' is a core element of CFA. Girls perform slightly better on indicators of survival and attendance. Classroom seating practices and extra-curricular activities encourage boys and girls to learn and play side by side. The majority of teachers and of in-service advisors who support primary teachers are female. There is some evidence that school attendance committees are responsive to the needs of boys who are more likely to be out of school and attending school less.

8. Monitoring and Evaluation: The authors of the Mid Term Review identified Monitoring and Evaluation (hereafter M&E) as an area needing further improvement. Indicators were fine-tuned and targets set. The quality of UNICEF progress reporting is very good. Progress is apparent and those who generate M&E information at school level have begun to use the information in their possession to reflect upon their current level and formulate locally appropriate strategies to improve their status. Results-oriented M&E practices are being institutionalized in the Education Divisions, Zones and Provinces with monitoring tools developed by the respective provinces. The development of monitoring tools at the Ministry level for use in the provinces has continued apace but has been subject to delays. The institutionalisation of the results-based M&E system within the MOE's ESDFP M&E system requires further work in the coming year.

9. Analysis and Learning: Because CFA has been a global UNICEF flagship program BESP has been able to learn from international experience. However some of the challenges and recommendations identified in a UNICEF consultant's report in 2008 at the time of BESP inception were not adequately followed through and remain relevant. The analysis of the MTR was penetrating and recommendations made have been followed. Now that BESP is coming to an end, and as CFA is mainstreamed, there is an urgent need for key project implementers to undertake careful analyses of implementation experience and make modifications, where necessary, to the CFA model.

10. Recommendations: In conclusion we judge that BESP has been very relevant to the Sri Lankan context and is well aligned with the priorities of the Sri Lankan government. It has been responsive to the needs of children in disadvantaged areas and to the particular needs of children in conflict affected areas. It has been reasonably effective in meeting its targets, and has been most effective in meeting the targets set for access. Fund utilization has been efficient and accountability strong. The prospects for sustaining many of the BESP activities into the future are good, though this will depend to some extent on a renewal of staff with expertise in primary education and a clearer division of responsibilities between MOE, NIE and the provinces. While BESP can claim some success in promoting gender equality across the curriculum and co-curricular activities, it has been able to draw on a more general environment that encourages gender equality in education. While there has been considerable progress in the development and application of a monitoring and evaluation system many challenges

remain - in the development and use of quality monitoring tools, in their use of evidence generated by them for improved practice and in the their integration into a national system of monitoring progress towards the goals of the national education plan (ESDFP 2012-2017). As BESP approaches its end date and the prospect of 'roll out' across the country beckons there is a need to take stock of achievements to date, to analyse further the challenges faced in the implementation of particular elements and to reflect critically on the causal nexus that is assumed between BESP activities in schools and classrooms and the end results.

10.1 CFA should continue as a high priority within the ESDFP plan, the ESDFP budget and UNICEF Country Program budget respectively.

10.2 UNICEF and the MOE should complete the following before the end of December 2012

- (i) Distribute the education toolkit
- (ii) Develop the CFA guideline for education officials
- (iii) Advance plans for the survey necessary to provide evidence for Indicator 12
- (iv) Complete the out of school survey report
- (v) Complete and distribute the CFA training manual
- (vi) Complete teacher training manuals for key stages 1 and 2
- (vii) Complete the Basic Literacy Centre training manual

10.3 Based on its priorities and fund availability, AusAID may consider an extension of support to the MOE and the NIE and the Provinces through UNICEF to

- (i) Consolidate its work in selected schools, including the activities noted above in 10.2
- (ii) Conduct a critical review of the CFA causal model that links school and classroom activities with results
- (iii) Strengthen the analysis of school-based results and activities and lessons to be learned as CFA is integrated into ESDFP
- (iv) Support a process of quality assurance of all technical outputs (e.g. Child Friendly guidance manual, implementation guidelines, monitoring tools, curriculum guidelines)
- (v) Integrate a revised results-based M&E system into ESDFP.

10.4 AusAID should continue to support the implementation of CFA through the mandated responsibilities of the MOE, NIE and the provinces through its ongoing

support to ESDFP via the World Bank. Through its ongoing support to ESDFP it should continue to advocate for

(i) Intensive support to primary education

(ii) The implementation of CFA

(iii) The implementation of the inclusive education policy

(iv) The creation of a cadre for primary education

(v) Separate budgets and accountability for expenditure on for primary education

(vi) Improved systems for assessing and promoting learning in primary education.

10.5 AusAID funds should also be used to promote analysis and learning by the community of educators and promote evidence-based planning through research and integrated monitoring systems. This report could be used as the basis of one such exercise in analysis and learning.

10.6 With careful consideration of best practices and government ownership, MOE, NIE, UNICEF and other development partners should

(i) Merge CFA and PSI approaches to school level planning and management within ESDFP to capitalise on their respective practices, using Annex 11 as a guideline.

(ii) Establish and ensure a timely flow of funds to schools to assist the development of school plans and their implementation

10.7 MOE, the NIE and DPs should increase opportunities for professional learning from analyses of specific activities (e.g. school level planning and management, processes, teaching and learning processes and outcomes, children's participation inschool planning and management, disparity analysis)

11.0 Summary of evaluation ratings

The evaluation ratings awarded follow the AusAID rating scale, as follows.

Satisfactory

Less than satisfactory

6 Very high quality

3 Less than adequate quality

5 Good quality

2 Poor quality

4 Adequate quality

1 Very poor quality

| Evaluation Criteria | Rank | Explanation |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Relevance</i> | 5 | The project objectives are relevant to the goals of both AusAID and the GoSL. The key access and school-development strategies being implemented are relevant to the needs of disadvantaged children and schools and to Sri Lanka's priority of reducing educational disparity. Our award of 5 rather than 6 derives from our concern that the roll out of the Program of School Improvement (PSI) was overlooked by those who designed BESP. CFA and PSI approaches to school-based planning and management are in urgent need of harmonisation. A proposal for how this might be done is set out in Annex 11. |
| <i>Effectiveness</i> | 4 | Based on evidence presented to us in October 2012 we judge that of the sixteen targets nine have been 'met' or 'almost met'. Five have been partially met. One has not been met and evidence is currently unavailable on the extent of implementation of CFA at school level. Note that the project is due to end at the end of December 2012 with project closure scheduled for March 2013. |
| <i>Efficiency</i> | 5 | Finances have been focused on the school level and used accountably. UNICEF staff have shown strong commitment to the project. Project implementation and fund utilisation increased in the last eighteen months. |
| <i>Sustainability</i> | 4 | The concept of CFA is frequently mentioned in the education discourse. National level adoption is apparent in National Development Plans and the current five year plan for education (ESDFP 2012-2016). Implementation guidelines are being disseminated. CFA is gradually being integrated in primary education curricula and in teacher education programs. However, the M&E system for CFA is not yet integrated within the MOE M&E system. |
| <i>Gender Equality</i> | 5 | 'Gender responsiveness' is a core element of Child Friendly Schools. Performance on key indicators is similar for boys and girls, with slight advantages apparent in favour of girls. Classroom seating practices and co-curricular activities encourage boys and girls to learn side by side. The majority of teachers and of in-service advisors who support primary teachers are female. There is some evidence that school attendance committees are responsive to the needs of boys who are more likely to be out of school and attending school less. |
| <i>Monitoring and</i> | 4 | At project inception and again at the MTR the need for an implementable monitoring framework was recorded. There |

Evaluation

has been significant progress since 2010 but many challenges remain. While the quality of progress reporting has improved and the quality of UNICEF annual progress reports and the current completion report is very high, much work needs to be done to integrate CFA monitoring tools into the MOE M&E system. Because CFS is a school-based program, future M&E analysis should use the zone, the district and the school as units of analysis. Targets should be stated in terms of numbers and %s of schools expected to attain them. Aggregations at division and zone should focus on mean levels of achievement across schools and disparities between schools.

Analysis and Learning 4

It appears that the UNICEF CFS framework was adopted wholesale rather than adapted selectively. Some of the challenges and recommendations identified in a UNICEF consultant's report in 2008 at the time of BESP inception were not adequately followed through. However the response to the analysis offered by the MTR and its recommendations was positive. Now that BESP is coming to an end and as CFA is mainstreamed there is an urgent need for a careful analysis of implementation experience and the modifications to the CFA model (e.g. in relation to school based planning and management and to teacher practices in the classroom). More conceptual work is needed on working through the assumed causal connections between CFS activities and ESDFP objectives. The documents that set out CFS purposes, practices and lessons for the future, that will need to be reprinted in the future, require a review of content and presentation. Some documents are of only moderate quality.

Final Note

BESP was not designed initially as a program for emergency education. However, project designers and reviewers always intended that BESP should be extended to districts impoverished by war as soon as this became possible. Communities which were multiply and severely displaced during and after the war have benefitted greatly from their inclusion in BESP from 2011. The BESP whole school, child-friendly approach and the development of strong school-community relations have helped women, girls, men and boys to rebuild their lives, their families and their schools.

Independent Completion Report of the Basic Education Program in Sri Lanka

1. Introduction

1.1. Activity Background

The Basic Education Support Program (hereafter BSEP) commenced in 2009 and was the Australian Government's first major budget measure initiative in the education sector of Sri Lanka. It is due to be completed by the end of December 2012. The program is executed by UNICEF and implemented by the Ministry of Education (MOE). The overall value of the program is AUD 7.4 million, of which AUD 7.2 was provided to UNICEF under a Partnership Contribution Agreement, and 0.2 million for project development and reviews. The overall objective of BSEP is

- To support universal completion of primary education and improve learning achievement by building a child-friendly learning environment.

Universal completion is regarded as a measure of Access, and an improvement in learning achievement as a measure of Quality. The overall objective is measured through one strategic result and three outcomes for each of access and quality. The outcomes for access and quality are measured through sixteen targets linked with sixteen indicators.

The program was designed during the period 2007 to 2008. At that time AusAID's objective for the education sector in the Asia-Pacific region was to assist developing countries to reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development by giving more girls and boys a better education. Consistent with the principles set out in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (OECD-DAC, 2005), AusAID was committed to improving harmonisation with other development partners, and to increasing alignment with partner governments, by continuing the shift towards sectoral programs. An inaugural Education Sector Planning Mission (SPM) in November 2007 was followed by a *Concept Paper*, *peer review*, recommendation and endorsement that a program be developed in partnership with UNICEF. The detail of the program and the nature of the partnership with UNICEF were finalised in October 2008 and the program commenced in February 2009.

1.2. Country Context

The program was designed during a period of intense ethnic conflict in the North and the East of the country. Commencing in the late 1970s and intensifying through the late 1980s and 1990s, hostilities ceased in 2002 and recommenced in 2005. The war ended in May 2009. Thereafter many of the communities who were to benefit from BSEP spent around a year in the Manik Farm camp awaiting resettlement. The longstanding conflict coincided with a period of sustained economic growth, averaging 4% per annum, following the introduction of economic liberalisation policies in 1978. Despite increased economic growth expenditures on education have remained modest at less than 2% of GDP.

Sri Lanka's historical educational record compares very favourably with countries in the Asia Pacific region. On access she has performed better than neighbouring countries in the South Asia region consistently over time. She has also performed well in comparison

with the so-called Asian Tigers. Already by 1950, just two years after independence, 80% of Sri Lanka's children were enrolled in primary education, compared with 88% in Korea and Taiwan, 77% in Singapore and 50% in Hong Kong. Twenty per cent of children were enrolled in secondary education compared with 16% in Korea, 11% in Taiwan, 7% in Singapore and 13% in Hong Kong). In other words in 1950 Sri Lanka's primary and secondary enrolments were very similar or better than those in East Asia. Today, primary and secondary education enrolments are also comparably high and equity so strong that girls outnumber boys in Grades 1-13. However, the education systems in these East Asian countries have expanded greatly, especially at the upper secondary and higher education levels and their respective curriculum emphasis on Maths, science, IT and English has been more pronounced. Moreover, education has been employed as a tool of social and cultural integration and national cohesion. Comparable evidence on learning achievement is not available. The economic performance of these East Asian countries has far surpassed the performance of the Sri Lankan economy (Little, 2007).

Despite commendable overall performance on enrolment, considerable disparities are apparent in educational access and quality. Access disparities remain in rates of dropout, grade 5 completions and school attendance. Quality disparities remain in terms of learning achievements at Grades 4 and 5. These disparities are marked by region, urban/rural residence, medium of instruction, school type and student gender.

2. Evaluation Objectives, Scope and Methods

The objectives of this Independent Completion Report (ICR) are to:

1. Assess the performance of BESP against the stated program objectives, including the objectives of the expansion to the North following the MTR, in accordance with the evaluation criteria and questions specified in this Terms of Reference (TOR).
2. Assess accountability for expenditure of Australian public funds on BESP activities.
3. Assess how BESP has contributed to the objective of ESDFP.
4. Based on the findings of the evaluation and an assessment of the current situation, and taking into consideration AusAID's current investment in the education sector and broader program objectives and policies, provide advice and recommendations on its future support to education in Sri Lanka.

The TOR, including the evaluation questions¹, is set out in Annex 1. The composition of the team and their expertise is attached at Annex 2.

The main body of findings in this report is devoted to the first objective of the ICR: to assess the performance of BESP against the stated program objectives, including the objectives of the expansion to the North following the MTR, in accordance with the evaluation criteria and questions specified in this TOR. This is presented in Section 5 on Effectiveness. ICR objective 2, the assessment of accountability for expenditure of Australian public funds on BESP activities, is addressed in Section 6 on Efficiency. ICR objective 3 is addressed within the Section 7 on Sustainability. We are also invited to comment on a series of 'cross cutting' issues. These are set out in Annex 3.

¹ It was agreed between AusAID and the review team that the criterion of Impact would not be addressed in a separate section. A brief note on one unintended outcome of BESP on conflict-affected communities is presented at the end of the report.

2.1. Evaluation Method

The evaluation team worked individually, in pairs and as a team. They met stakeholders as individuals, and in small and large groups. They conducted their evaluation through documentary analysis, interviews and group discussions and observations. Documentary analysis was undertaken of c. 70 documents. These ranged in type from project plans and progress reports, to child friendly guidance manuals, monitoring materials and school plans to AusAid strategy papers and related evaluation studies. A key document was the *BESP Activity Completion Report* 24 February 2009 - 31 December 2012, submitted to the team in October 2012, three months ahead of project completion and six months ahead of project closure.

The team met BESP project designers, implementers, monitors and beneficiaries at national, provincial, zonal, divisional and school levels. At the national level discussions were held with officers of the Ministry of Education, the National Institute of Education, with UNICEF and with the World Bank. Between October 21 and 26th the team worked intensively in the four provinces where BESP is implemented. One group worked in the North and the East (Trincomalee and Batticaloa districts); the other in Uva, Central and the East (Ampara district). They were accompanied throughout by UNICEF officers and two members of AusAID, Colombo. Presentations of project progress were made by three provincial directors and four zonal directors with follow-up discussions with 3 Additional Provincial Directors of Education, 32 Zonal Directors of Education, 32 Deputy Directors of Education, 20 Divisional Education Officers, 31 Assistant Directors Education (Primary) and 25 In Service Advisors (Primary).

Interviews, discussions and observations were undertaken in 17 schools with 17 principals, over 100 teachers and 64 parents. Teaching and learning was observed in 16 classes and school facilities were observed in 17 schools. The field visits to schools and provincial offices were very intensive and well organised. The team visited schools pre-selected by the UNICEF officers. In all cases the school was prepared for our visit but not for the questions we would pose. In the case of classroom observations, with the exception of one school, the teachers were unaware in advance which class would be selected for observation. Immediately following the field visits report was compiled (Annex 4) and used as an input to the analysis contained in the final report. The program of meetings and visits and lists of persons consulted are presented in Annexes 5 and 6 respectively. A checklist of questions, derived from CFS criteria and existing monitoring tools, and used by the team in their work is presented in Annex 7.

3. Program Design and Implementation History

Central to BESP's program design and implementation history has been the concept of a 'Child Friendly School'. The concept of a 'child friendly school' supports the notion that schools should be (i) rights-based and proactively inclusive; (ii) gender responsive; (iii) promoting of quality learning outcomes; (iv) healthy, safe and protective; (v) actively engaged with students, families and community; and (vi) supported by child-friendly systems, policies and regulations.

The origins of the Child Friendly schools program in Sri Lanka and BESP's involvement in it can be traced to the 1980s and 1990s when a number of primary education projects were supported by the Ministry of Education, the National Institute of Education and the bi-lateral agencies (Ranaweera, 2000). During a conference held in March 2001, hosted by the Ministry of Education and the UK government's Department for International

Development (DFID), a number of 'lessons' were drawn from these projects, including the importance of community involvement in school-based planning was underlined. Subsequently, at a SAARC conference held in Colombo in 2002 it was resolved that innovative strategies should be designed to sustain and improve the small Type 3 schools serving predominantly in disadvantaged communities (Sivagnanam, 2002, 2008). In Sri Lanka, schools are of four Types. The small schools are of Type 3 and offer schooling from Grade 1 to 5. Type 2 schools offer schooling from Grade 1 to 11. Type 1C schools offer schooling from Grade 1 to Grade 13, with an Arts and Commerce stream in Grades 12-13. Type 1AB schools offer schooling from Grade 1 to 13 with the addition of a Science stream in Grades 12-13. In 2001, there were 1747 Type 3 schools with student enrolments of less than 75, 85.6% of which of the Type 3 were in rural locations and 12.2 % in the estate sector (Ministry of Education, School Census, 2000).

In 2002 the Primary Education Branch at the MOE proposed to UNICEF for support for a program of intervention in 1500 Type 3 small schools. UNICEF launched a pilot intervention namely Child Friendly schools in all 124 schools in the three disadvantaged divisions in the Puttalam district in the North Western Province. The main goal for the project was 'a child friendly classroom environment that was promoting of learning achievement, physical and psychological well-being provided a proper basis for knowledge gathering and establish certain behavioural patterns on life skills with the active participation of children within the overall framework of child rights' (Wijemanne, 2003).

Following two broadly positive evaluations the CFS initiative was extended to divisions in sixteen more districts. By 2007 1400 schools were included in the CFS project. At this point UNICEF identified a number of challenges that need to be addressed to strengthen the approach. In the meantime, AusAID fielded an inaugural Education Sector Planning Mission (SPM) in November 2007 that resulted in a Concept Paper, followed by an AusAID peer review in February 2008. An AusAID Education Sector Strategy Paper for Sri Lanka and an initial BESP draft of the BESP were prepared in collaboration with UNICEF and MOE. UNICEF's Education Program for 2008-2012 focused on issues of access and quality especially among the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children, including those disadvantaged by virtue of social or economic circumstances or disability, and those affected by conflict (BESP 2008). It focused on eleven of the former seventeen districts, described as 'UN designated districts'. BESP aligned with these purposes and geographical focus (BESP, 2008).

A results framework was developed. Two main results - on access and quality - were assumed to flow causally from the implementation of the 'child friendly' approach - a complex and comprehensive framework of six dimensions and 29 criteria that implicate a wide range of activities. The Child Friendly concept as understood at the time of BESP is set out in Annex 8. The current list of Child Friendly dimensions and criteria are presented in Annex 9.

It is significant that neither the 2008 UNICEF results framework nor the 2008 BESP results framework analysed the assumed causal connections between the activities implicated by the Child Friendly Approach and, outcomes and results. Instead, the results framework includes just one indicator that addresses the entire approach in all its complexity i.e. 'All primary schools in focal districts are participating in the CFS initiative and 25% of all primary schools have reached an achievement rate of 80% towards CFS criteria in all CFS dimensions'. The BESP design document suggested that schools will measure the achievement of each of the criteria 'on a monthly basis and these will also

be measured biannually by zonal support staff, with verification checks by provincial staff' (BESP 2008, Annex D, set out in this report as Annex 8). We return to this point under the sections on effectiveness and M&E.

BESP commenced work in 2008 in six districts in three provinces and in 839 schools. After the cessation of hostilities in 2009 and the resettlement of communities during 2010 and 2011 BESP was extended to the Northern Province (Annex 10). By October 2012 BESP was being implemented in 1,359 in eleven districts in four provinces. Following standard MOE classifications 21% of the BESP schools are Type 1 AB or 1 C, 44% are Type 2 and 35% are Type 3 schools. This distribution contrasts markedly with the types of schools included in the original CFS program which had focused exclusively on small Type 3 schools. Moreover, 18% of the schools are classified as being located in very congenial or congenial locations, 15% are in locations which are neither congenial nor non-congenial locations, 21% are in difficult locations and 35% are in very difficult locations (Ministry of Education, School Census, 2011).

4. Relevance

With its foci on improved access to and improvement in the quality of education BESP is very relevant to the Sri Lankan context and to AusAID priorities. It is consistent with the objectives of Sri Lanka's national plans for education, embodied in ESDFP1, 2006-2011 and ESDFP2, 2012-2017 (MOE, 2012). Its overall objective is consistent with AusAID's 2008 Education Sector Strategy for Sri Lanka, the purpose of which was 'to assist GoSL in achieving universal completion of primary education and improving learning achievement for children in accordance with the goals of GoSL's sector program in education' (AusAID 2008). It is also consistent with AusAID's most recent strategy for its support to education worldwide (AusAID, 2011). Pillars 1 and 2 of AusAID's 2011 global strategy stress improving access to basic education opportunities for all and improving learning outcomes so that children and youth achieve the basic skills necessary for productive lives (AusAID, 2011). The overall goal of BESP was consistent with UNICEF's strategy in Sri Lanka at BESP inception and throughout its implementation. UNICEF's Education Program for 2008-2012 was developed in collaboration with MOE and was approved by the Ministry of Finance and Planning.

When BESP was developed in 2007/2008, the Ministry of Education had already launched an approach to school-based management, known as the program for school improvement (PSI), within ESDFP1.

The relevance of this for the design of the school planning and managements activities within CFA was overlooked at the time. An analysis of the ESDFP and BESP documentation suggests that this may have arisen for the following reasons. ESDFP1 was premised on four pillars – access, quality, efficiency and equity and governance. UNICEF strategy was premised on three themes – access, quality and emergencies. Common to ESDFP1 and UNICEF strategy were access and quality. The 'program for school improvement' (PSI) is essentially a tool for school-level planning and school-based management and was an element of ESDFP pillar 4. Because of its location under Pillar 4 its significance for the schools destined to become part of the Child Friendly program in the coming years may have been overlooked by the project designers during the process of alignment. Nonetheless, of the six CFA dimensions, the fifth addresses processes of school planning, management and implementation, albeit with different terminology. Dimension 5 is described as 'active engagement of students, families and communities' and requires school principals and teachers, together with a

range of community stakeholders and students to undertake a process of school self awareness (SSA), to develop a plan, identify resources required for the plan and to implement the school development plan (SDP).

Currently the PSI and CFA approaches to school planning operate in parallel. Figure 1 offers our analysis of the similarities and differences between the two approaches

Figure 1 PSI and CFA modalities in school level planning: similarities and differences

| | PSI | CFA |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Origin | Embodied in National Education Commission proposals of 1997 as School Based Management (SBM) Secretary MoE appoints a committee to develop the concept and mode of implementation. The committee have island-wide consultation and the Sri Lankan SBM version evolves as PSI | Proposed and launched by UNICEF Primary Branch MoE with UNICEF collaboration develops CFA after a series of workshops |
| Central Responsibility | School Activities Branch, MoE | Primary Education Branch, MoE |
| Zonal Responsibility | PSI Coordinator | CFA Coordinator (in some zones the same person coordinates both CFA and PSI) |
| Date of Implementation | 2006, implemented in phases | 2002, implemented in phases |
| Coverage | Implemented in the whole country by 2011 | Implemented in 1359 schools in eleven UN designated districts by 2011 |
| Purpose | Create and implement a five year strategic plan and an annual operational plan, <i>oriented to school improvement in general</i> . Improve transparency and accountability in school management and school expenditure and improve curriculum implementation | Create and implement a one year and five year school development plan, <i>oriented to child friendly approach</i> . Improve transparency in school management and expenditure and improve curriculum implementation |
| Stakeholder consultation in formulating the plan. | Stakeholder groups clearly stated and include in-school staff, parents, past pupils, and representative of zonal office | Stakeholder groups include in-school staff, parents current students, well-wishers and the wider community |
| Legal force | Directions embodied in a circular | Limited guidance provided in a manual |
| Implementation, | School development | Implementation committee |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| monitoring and evaluation/ committee Meetings | Committee (SDC) required to meet monthly. Composition of SDC is prescribed. | not prescribed. The responsible group should represent all the categories Included in SSA. |
| Submission of plans | Submitted to Deputy/ Assistant Zonal Director Planning | Submitted to Deputy/ Assistant Zonal Director Education Development with a copy to Divisional Director |
| Funding linked with plans | Plan links with some funding through ESDFP. | BESP project funds are made available to implement some prioritized activities in the plans. In addition, schools have identified potential donors. Value addition is made by unpaid work done by parents and community members. |

In 2012 the implementation of PSI in all schools in the country appears as an ESDFP 2 World Bank Disbursement Linked Indicator. And CFA has been adopted within ESDFP 2 as the preferred approach to the development of primary education. The approaches have gathered momentum and support from different groups of stakeholders. Some stakeholders are aware of both approaches at a superficial level but unaware of the disjunctions them, while others are aware of both approaches but do not feel empowered to bring the disjunctions to the notice of higher authorities to seek their resolution. We recommend a merger of the approaches that capitalizes of the strengths of each. Annex 11 provides more information about the disjunctions between the two approaches and outlines recommendations.

5. Effectiveness

Has BESP achieved its objectives? As noted earlier the overall objective of BESP is 'to support universal completion of primary education and improve learning achievement by building a child-friendly learning environment'. This objective is supported by two strategic results, six outcomes, 16 indicators and 16 targets, 8 for access and 8 for quality. While these represent the intended 'results', myriad activities and project components have been put in place to reach them. For schools it is the creation of a child-friendly learning environment that constitutes the heart of BESP.

This complexity has posed a number of measurement challenges for UNICEF and the MOE. The assessment of the extent to which child-friendly environments have been implemented Indicator 12 is extremely complex. Its measurement relies, inter alia, on the development of agreed meanings and measures of each of the 29 criteria and the incorporation of these within separate monitoring tools for use by principals and teachers and by myriad support staff in the divisions, zones and provinces.

The Child Friendly Learning Environment

The Child Friendly Learning Environment has, over the course of the project been termed the Child Friendly School (CFS), the Child Friendly Approach (CFA) and, most recently, the Child Friendly Framework (CFF). CFS, CFA and CFF are very comprehensive sets of prescriptions about the school and classroom environment and about expected behaviours of principals, teachers, parents and education officials

(Annex 9). The prescriptions are organised along six dimensions and 29 criteria, each of which implicates many other activities that need to be put in place.

The achievement of these criteria involves a very wide range of activity, some of which are more intensive than others. The achievement of some these criteria require relatively straightforward actions e.g. the formation of committees, awareness sessions to be held, the distribution of guidelines. Others involve more complex actions e.g. the development of learning materials, the production of high quality manuals and the development of a school plan through a wide scale consultation. Some of the key project components are described in more detail in Annex 12.

5.1 BESP achievements in relation to targets

It should be noted at the outset that BESP ends on Dec 31st 2012 and that this evaluation was undertaken from early October to Nov 9th 2012. A number of project activities have yet to be completed. Data on one major indicator (Indicator 12) has yet to be produced.

Figures 2 and 3 set out summaries of BESP achievements in relation to targets for access and quality respectively. We have based our analysis on the most recent UNICEF Activity Completion Report (ACR), dated October 2012 and have also undertaken a number of re-analyses based on raw data. Much of the data in the ACR was collected in early 2012 and is based on 2011 MOE school census data. Were the most up to date data available at the time of our analysis or had this evaluation been conducted in January 2013 based on 2012 data then assessments of progress may have been different. A more detailed summary of achievements, showing some of our analyses is set out in Annex 13.

Access Targets

Figure 2 Access (Strategic Result 1) Achievement of Targets against Outcomes and Indicators

| <p>Strategic Result 1: A reduction of 1 % per annum in the current level of children not completing primary education in target schools in focus districts(<i>Indicator 1</i>)</p> <p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 50% decrease in the number of girls and boys in all five grades not enrolled in schools 2. 85% of girls and boys regularly attend school reaching a minimum of 80% attendance 3. Out-of-school children are accessing Catch-Up or Alternative Education Programs | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Indicators | Target | Comment on Achievement | Achievement Status ² |
| Indicator 1 Survival Rate (By sex and by district) | All the BESP supported districts show progress in survival rates | Data for 2009 and 2001 are available for only six of the eleven districts. The five districts in the North entered BESP mid 2011. Four of the six original districts show a percentage point increase of more | MET |

² Oct 2012, three months before project completion and six months before project closure

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| | | than 3 %, with Moneragala shows a remarkable increase of 17.2%. | |
| Indicator 2 Number of identified out of school girls and boys | Number of identified out of school girls and boys.(No target numbers are specified in advance, so strictly this is not a target) | 4,338 boys and 3,709 girls identified in the BESP supported schools' catchment areas between 2009 and 2011. | MET |
| Indicator 3 Number and % of identified out of school girls and boys enrolled into school. | At least 50 % of identified out of school children enrolled into school. | 2170 out of 4338 out school boys (50.23 %) and 1979 out 3709 girls (53.57 %) were reintegrated into schools. Six out of eleven districts show a re-integration rate over 50 per cent. The three conflict affected Northern Province districts (Mannar, Mullaitivu and Vavuniya) show the lowest re-integration rates of 37, 38 and 38% respectively, but this has been achieved over a short period of time. | MET |
| Indicator 4 Number and % of schools which have mechanisms in place to successfully identify and support children out of school and at risk of dropping out. | All BESP supported schools have functioning School Attendance Committees (SACs) | As in September 2012, 1196 (96%) BESP supported schools had functioning SACs | ALMOST MET |
| Indicator 5 % of girls and boys who attend at least 80% of school days. | 85 per cent of girls and boys regularly attend school reaching a minimum of 80 per cent attendance 85 per cent of girls and boys regularly attend school reaching a minimum of 80 per cent attendance | UNICEF (ACR 2012) reports that 87% of girls and 86% of boys attend more than 80% of school days. Five of the 11 districts have not reached the target. These five districts have been in the BESP since 2009. Four of the five districts in the Northern province that joined late in 2010 already had attendance rates c 85% or higher and will have inflated the cross district average in 2011. | PARTIALLY MET |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Indicator 6 Number and % of identified out of school children completed BL (Basic Literacy) Classes and Accelerated Learning Program (ALP). | Enrolling all identified children lagging behind in Basic Literacy (BL) skills into BL classes; and incorporating all identified children who need ALP into ALP classes | Catch-up education was dropped in 2009 following a poor evaluation. 672 (357 girls and 315 boys) out-of-school Children, i.e. 100% of identified children lagging behind in BL skills were enrolled in BL classes in three districts included from 2009 (Nuwara Eliya, Badulla, Moneragala). The Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) has reached 260 schools in the Northern province and supports approximately 20,000 displaced students in the northern province and 9,000 marginalized children in the Eastern province. | MET |
| Indicator 7 Number and % of children reintegrated into school | At least 50 per cent of the enrolled students in BL classes reintegrated into schools | 446 i.e. 66 percent of children in BL classes in Nuwara Eliya, Badulla and Moneragala districts, reintegrated into schools in 2012 (241 out of 357 girls and 205 out of 315 boys). Indicator does not apply to the other 8 districts. | MET |
| Indicator 8 Number and % of children who have been retained after reintegrating into school. | 80 per cent of reintegrated children will be retained at the end of first year | 246 (167 girls and 79 boys) out of 446 reintegrated students (55%) in Nuwara Eliya, Badulla and Moneragala districts are retained in schools by 30 th July 2012. This indicator does not apply to the other 8 districts. | PARTIALLY MET |

Comment on Access Targets

Based on data available to us in October 2012, we judge that five of the eight access targets for outcomes that lead to improvements in access have been 'met'. Survival rates have increased, the percentage of out of school children who have been re-enrolled in school has increased, all children identified as requiring alternative education have been enrolled in Basic Literacy Classes (BLCs) or accelerated learning programs (ALP), and more than 50% of these students have subsequently re-enrolled in school. One access target has been 'almost met'. This is the target that requires all schools to have a student attendance committee in place. Two access targets have been met only partially. While there have been commendable increases in attendance rates in three districts, improvements in eight others have been more modest. And the retention after one year of children who were enrolled in BLCs and have re-enrolled in school is 55% as against the target of 80%.

Quality Targets

Figure 3 sets out the achievement of targets against Quality outcomes and indicators.

Figure 3 Quality (Strategic Result 2) Achievement of Targets against Outcomes and Indicators

| <p>Strategic Result 2: By 2011, disparities for students in passing Grade 5 Scholarship Exam reduced by 10% from 2008 level between the national and targeted districts</p> <p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Child Friendly Approach is institutionalized within the national education system in the focus districts 2. All primary schools in BESP focus districts are participating in the CFA initiative and 25% of these schools have reached an achievement rate of 80% towards CFA criteria in all CFA dimensions 3. Effective monitoring systems support the achievement of CFA | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Indicators | Target | Comment on Achievement | Achievement Status ³ |
| Indicator 9 The absolute difference in the percentage of students who achieved 70+ marks on the Grade 5 Scholarship Exam between the national rate and the district rate. | By 2011 disparities for students in passing the Grade 5 scholarship Exam reduced by 10 percentage points from 2008 level between the national and targeted districts. | The indicator is based on all schools in a district and not simply the project schools. It is a poor indicator of BESP school performance. In terms of the agreed indicator the gap between national and district levels has diminished in 5/6 districts between 2009 and 2011. In the 5 districts in the North three show a reduction between 2010 and 2011. However, the national % has increased dramatically from 57.6% in 2009 to 65.09% in 2011, compromising 'catch up'. Note that 70 marks out of 200 would not indicate close to mastery or half way to mastery. | NOT MET |
| Indicator 10 Implementation guidelines approved and disseminated to all districts | Implementation guidelines approved & disseminated to all districts. | CFA guidance manual was developed, approved and launched at a national CFA symposium with the Minister of Education and has been distributed to all the government schools in the country. 23,000 copies of CFA Guidance Manual (15,000 in Sinhala and 8,000 in Tamil have printed and distributed in June 2012. | PARTIALLY MET |
| Indicator 11 Provincial resource teams established in all provinces | Provincial resource teams established in all provinces | Provincial resource teams established in 9 out of 9 provinces. | MET |
| Indicator 12 Number and % of schools with 80% CFA criteria achieved | At least 25 per cent of BESP supported schools with 80 per cent of CFA criteria achieved | CFA Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and collection tool finalized. Data from schools will be collected in 2012 | NOT AVAILABLE |

³ Oct 2012, three months before project completion and six months before project closure

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Indicator 13 Number and % of schools with SSAs. | All BESP supported schools with SSAs | 1,230 of 1359 (91%) BESP supported schools have completed the SSA and developed and implemented a SDP in their schools. BESP funds directly supported 230 and 973 schools to implement their SDPs in 2011 and 2012. Many SDP activities do not need external funding. Some schools receive a school grant up to 220,000 rupees for improvement of physical facilities and teaching learning materials. | ALMOST MET |
| Indicator 14 Number and % of schools with teachers trained on CFA. | All BESP supported schools have teachers trained on CFA | Of the 8,829 teachers in the project schools, More than 75% teachers trained in the project schools in the original 6 focus districts and the Jaffna district. The percentage trained in the project schools in the districts of Kilinochchi, Mannar, Mullaitivu and Vavuniya is 55%, 50%, 55% and 48% respectively. | ALMOST MET |
| Indicator 15 Number and % of schools trained in monitoring criteria of CFA | All BESP supported schools have been trained on CFA monitoring criteria | All (289) BESP supported schools in 2 districts in Uva province have been trained. CFA Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and collection tool finalized. Data from schools are being collected and information on achievement of target will be available by the end of 2012. Nine focus districts have not yet been covered. | PARTIALLY MET |
| Indicator 16 Number and % of schools generating information by CFA criteria. | All BESP supported schools are generating information by CFA criteria | All (289) BESP supported in schools in Uva province have been trained in collection of information using the CFA monitoring tool. Over 500 schools, including 289 directly supported by BESP started collecting information using the CFA criteria. | PARTIALLY MET |

Comment on Quality Targets

Targets for Theme 2 and Strategic Result 2 – improving the quality of education – have been more difficult to achieve than the Access targets.

Based on evidence available to us in October 2012, only three of eight targets have been ‘met’ or ‘almost met’. The requirement that provincial resource teams be established in all nine provinces has been met fully, though it should be noted that team was established in the Northern Province only very recently in June 2012.

It should be noted that these teams have not been established *de novo*. From the late 1990s all provinces established provincial primary education teams headed up by a primary education coordinator who was usually a Provincial Deputy Director of Education. BESP has drawn from some of the same membership and re-invigorated the work of these teams. Ninety one per cent of schools have conducted School Self Assessments (SSAs), designed to create a school plan. Target 11 requires that all BESP supported schools have teachers trained in the Child Friendly Approach. The BESP M&E framework did not define in advance what percentage of teachers should have been trained on CFA. Since all schools have at least one teacher trained in CFA we generously judge that this target as having been ‘almost met’.

Four 'quality' targets have either been only 'partially met' or 'not met'. Implementation guidelines in the form of the CFA manual appear to have been distributed to most schools but the guidelines for education officials have not yet been finalised. A tool kit on inclusive education has been developed but has not yet been distributed. Thus we judge the dissemination of implementation guidelines to have been met only partially. To date the collection by schools of CFA information has commenced only in BESP schools in Uva province and is therefore met only partially. The overall target for Strategic Result 2 –a reduction of ten percentage points in the percentage of students who achieved 70+ on the Grade 5 scholarship examination between the district and the national level - has not been met. It was an ambitious target, its measurement was challenging and heavily constrained by available data and the extent to which the national figure would increase unanticipated. We offer further commentary on this indicator in some detail in Annex 14.

Finally, indicator 12, the extent to which CFA practices have been adopted at school level, cannot be assessed at this stage because the tools and survey design have not yet been finalised. This is the most ambitious and comprehensive indicator of all. It requires assessments by multiple stakeholders of the implementation of the six dimensions and 29 criteria that, taken together, comprise the Child Friendly Approach. Tools are still being finalised. A brief review of the content of some of these monitoring tools (for use by principals, teachers and ISAs) suggests that while a number of items are technically strong others are technically weak or are so general in their focus that responses to them are likely to be very subjective and unreliable. To give just one example: Criterion 3.6. The principal is asked to assess as 'excellent', 'satisfactory' or 'should be improved' the teacher's use of child-centred learning and teaching approaches in the classroom. The problem does not reside only in general nature of the task itself. It also resides in the CFA Manual for teachers where very little guidance is provided for the teacher in helping him or her to understand the practices of a child-centred learning and teaching approach. In the manual a few short homilies about the benefits of a child friendly approach is followed by a list of 14 'methodologies', ranging from 'biographical studies and related activities' to 'peer learning situations' to 'situations for observation, investigation and experimentation'. Even if these were sound methodologies, none is described beyond its label and none is listed in the principal's monitoring tool as practices he/she might look out for in the classroom.

5.2 Unravelling the CFA criteria

Despite the absence, currently, of monitoring information on the adoption by the school of CFA practices we witnessed many good practices during our field trip to 17 schools. The purpose of these visits was to explore the institutionalisation of CFA at school level. Armed with long checklists of indicators derived from draft monitoring tools and our own reading of the CFA criteria we undertook very rapid appraisals. Our 15 page field trip report (Annex 4) describes some of what we observed. Box 1 provides a handful of illustrations of the CFA dimensions at work. These and more recorded in the field report provide only fleeting glimpses of CFA on the ground and should not be read as reflecting trends across all schools.

Box 1: Field Observations of CFA dimensions ‘at work’ in schools and classrooms

CFA Dimension 1: Rights based and proactively inclusive

At least one person in each parent group was a member of the School Attendance Committee (SAC). The committee works with teachers to track school attendance and work with other parts of the community (GN, PHI, *samurdhi* officer) to reintegrate children into school. Most schools did not need to find and reintegrate children as they said attendance was high since the implementation of CFS. One example was given of four boys in Kilinochchi who had gone to work as fisherman but with the help of the community, had been reintegrated and remain in school.

CFA Dimension 2: Gender responsive

All schools had some toilets and running water facilities. Some may not have been sufficient according to MOE norms e.g. not enough toilets per student, not adequate drinking water (once per day in the dry season) or no sink. All schools had separate girls and boys toilets. Efforts are being made by school communities to keep toilets clean.

In all classes observed children sat in mixed gender groups. In most cases the group size was four, and in larger classes six. With the exception of four children in one class who sat at oversize desks, all children sat on and worked at age-appropriate, brightly painted, chairs and desks.

CFA Dimension 3: Promoting quality learning outcomes

In all classes the vast majority of pupils were attentive throughout and very keen to engage in activities, individually and in groups. In no case was a teacher observed punishing a child physically or verbally and overall the interaction was cordial and positive. The quality of teaching methods employed was good, but not exceptional.

In the classes observed the use of time in the class was teacher-directed. The balance and rhythm of teacher talk, teacher questions to students and student desk work varied. In some classes teacher talk was punctuated infrequently with a question posed to the whole class, inviting a chorus response in unison. In others teacher talk was punctuated more frequently with questions to the whole group, questions to individual students and desk work activities of short duration. On no occasion was a student observed posing a question to the teacher or to another student. In no case was differentiated (or multi-level) teaching observed. All children were ‘taught’ the same lesson and their desk work activities were undifferentiated. However in some of the classrooms learning materials for different levels were available as well as teaching aides made by the teacher and parents. The teachers reported that they used these to help weaker pupils and to stretch the more advanced. In future project implementers may wish to reflect further on the teacher and student behaviours they would expect to observe under this dimension.

Box 1: Continued

CFA Dimension 4: Child Friendly Schools are Healthy, Safe and Protective

Clean and pleasant school environments were noted in all schools visited. Some schools close to towns have taken extra efforts to maintain cleanliness by banning non-biodegradable rubbish (e.g. polythene) on school premises. Most schools have compost bins and compost pits to collect garbage. Vegetable and fruit trees are being cultivated using compost fertilizer produced within schools. Most schools have well-arranged vegetable gardens and flower gardens. Some schools sell their vegetable and fruits and use the profits to support poor school children. Others use the produce to contribute to the children's breakfast/midday meal to help improve nutrition levels.

CFA Dimension 5: Child Friendly Schools are actively engaged with students, families and community

School Self Assessment was found to be a very strong feature in all the seventeen project schools. The in-school staff explained the process of SSA with enthusiasm. We heard how the principal, teachers, parents, old pupils, well-wishers and students (Grade 5 students in type 3 schools, Grade 10/11 students in type 2 schools and Grade 12/13 students in Type 1AB/ C schools) come together to discuss issues and gaps that need to be addressed. These discussions are reported to be very open and productive. The methodologies varied from school to school. In some schools officers from the zone/division guided discussions. In others principals and teachers had an initial meeting in order to prepare for the main meeting. The numbers participating in the SSAs varied from 24 to 50 persons. In some schools the whole group worked together. They had common meetings and pooled the ideas of different groups. They did not conduct separate group meetings for each of the group. In others they met in separate stakeholder groups (i.e. parents met among themselves and students separately)

Parents/community members were able to describe the Child Friendly Approach and articulate changes which have been seen around the school. These included: improvement in learning achievement, improvement in children's attitude to teachers, a more motivated principal, no corporal punishment, better parent/teacher interaction, children happy at school and wanting to come to school, children and adults understand child rights, equal access among boys and girls, increased attendance by students and teachers, good hygiene practices and a protective, friendly school environment. Some parents mentioned that they have made some efforts to maintain child friendly environment at their homes as well.

CFA Dimension 6: Child Friendly Schools are supported by child-friendly systems, policies and regulations

BESP used the school development plan... to plan and implement strategies for achieving the six CFA dimensions. Based on the SSA schools were to identify and prioritize the needs of the school. Under BESP schools have received a school grant to support improvements such as primary classroom renovation, classroom separation, school fence and gate; repairs to teachers' quarters, furniture repairs; hiring resource persons for teaching in the classrooms, and teaching and learning material preparation. After SSA the project schools developed a one year School Development Plan. The school staff and community demonstrated an ownership to this plan. The principal and staff were committed to the implementation of the SDP with parents and well-wishers. Initially the grant received helped the schools to meet urgent requirements and, motivated by this, additional contributions began to flow from parents. In most schools, parents provided voluntary labour to repair classrooms and furniture.

Source: BESP ICR Evaluation Team School Visits Field Report, Oct 26 2012

6. Efficiency

Compared with the assessment at the time the MTR in the last quarter of 2009, in the last two years there has been noteworthy improvement in implementation of activities and fund utilisation which has resulted in considerable gains in terms of efficiency. The MTR recommendations have been implemented and the consequent improvements to the program documented. The expansion to the North was implemented within a short timeframe. Risks have been identified, addressed and managed with minimum disruption to the program. Following the MTR an additional AUD 1.5 million was added to the original AUD 5.7 million for a total of AUD 7.2 million for the three years and ten months program period. The agreement for the additional funding was signed in February 2011 and the first tranche of new funds was received by UNICEF 11 May 2011. This left less than 18 months for expenditure of not only the additional funding but also the funds that remained from the original agreement. Expenditure was greatly accelerated with more than three quarters of funds utilised in the last two years of the program. About AUD 600,000 was remaining at the end of August 2012 but funds should be fully spent within Dec 2012 based on UNICEF's projections and recent record.

Following the MTR implementation of activities was accelerated with consolidation in the original 6 program districts and expansion to 5 districts in the North. In the North there was rapid implementation of activities, including implementation of CFA in 500 schools with approximately 130,000 students (53% of schools in the North), training on CFA of nearly 2,000 teachers, intensive support to 100 schools selected to be model Child-friendly schools in conflict affected areas, supply and repair of essential school furniture, strengthening of DEOs for monitoring and supervision of schools and provision of ALP in 260 schools benefiting approximately 20,000 conflict affected students. In other provinces and nationally the activities which had not been implemented in the first two years were completed in addition to the other activities originally planned or added as a result of additional funding following the MTR. In the East an additional 9,000 conflicted affected students benefited from ALP. On the field visits the mission team members could see the evidence that activities had been implemented often with great enthusiasm.

At the time of the MTR there were concerns that the provision of WASH varied greatly across schools and that there were cases of duplication of activities and provision by different agencies, departments and projects. The AusAID funded WASH project of UNICEF has subsequently started implementation with the inclusion of BESP schools in need of WASH facilities, as recommended by the MTR mission. There has been close coordination between BESP and the WASH project both by UNICEF and the Government to ensure complementarities and to avoid duplication. It is planned by the end of the WASH project all BESP schools will have received support to improve WASH facilities through one or the other of the projects.

Management

Overall UNICEF's management and coordination appear to have improved quite remarkably after the MTR. There had been problems with provinces and schools not receiving funds in a timely way following a change to procedures which required all funds to be channeled through the Ministry of Finance. Also the MTR noted that in some cases the BESP plans were not aligned with the provinces' ESDFP plans because of differences in UNICEF's planning processes. Both these problems have been resolved resulting in a smoother and timelier flow of funds based on project plans aligned with

each province's overall plans for education. This improvement has been facilitated by UNICEF's introduction of a multi-year planning system. An increase and redeployment of staff as recommended by the MTR have improved support to zones, districts and schools. A dedicated officer for monitoring and evaluation based in Colombo has provided support at the national and provincial levels not only to process and analyse data but more importantly to assist MOE and the provinces in developing tools and setting up systems. The position has now been made permanent and is being replicated in other sections of UNICEF. Deliverables which are crucial for establishing and maintaining CFA within the system, including a Guidance Manual on CFA, modules for school based training, manuals for training and monitoring and evaluation tools and formats, have been or will be produced and delivered to schools before the end of the project, but there remains little time to ensure that they are fully utilised. A consultative process has been employed for the development of most of the materials. This has been important for the embedding of CFA throughout the system.

Management of the program by the Government has been shared by a number of key players. At the national level the Primary Branch of the MOE has provided leadership and a degree of coordination. For each province and zone focal points for BESP, officers with other duties as well, have been active in ensuring that activities were planned, implemented and monitored. NIE has had some involvement with CFA but their involvement needs to be strengthened.

Risk management

Risks have been efficiently managed throughout the program period. Of the risks identified at the beginning of the program those related to increased conflict have not materialised. Risks related to direct implementation, e.g. staff changes within the Government, ensuring a sufficient budget allocation and facilitating smooth fund flows, have been managed effectively. Risks which have emerged during program implementation have been identified and addressed pro-actively. This includes risks posed by the displacement and reopening of schools in resettlement areas. This necessitated additional training of teachers to ensure at least one teacher was trained on CFA in each school. Short term orientation on CFA for principals and teachers has helped minimise the possible disruption caused by the transfer of principals and teachers from BESP schools. As new principals take over they are provided with an orientation on CFA to ensure that activities in the school continue without a loss of momentum.

Accountability

Australian funding of BESP activities has been efficiently utilised in accordance with the original program design and the extension agreement. The project has implemented the inputs and outputs as planned. AusAID has participated in a review of the program conducted by MOE on an annual basis. UNICEF has reported annually on program activities and the extent to which the project was meeting stated objectives. All reports included an indicative account of expenditure and an annual statement of expenditure was submitted by UNICEF to AusAID.

Funds were transferred from UNICEF to the Ministry of Finance based on clearly agreed workplans. The MOF transferred funds to MOE (for national level activities) and to the provinces from which funds were transferred to schools. All funds were subject to the GOSL rules and regulations for expenditure and accounting and to UNICEF's global rules and regulations as well as to the audits of both GOSL and UNICEF. After funds

were released to MOE and the provinces UNICEF monitored the utilisation of funds at every level and accounts of expenditure were submitted to UNICEF.

There was full accountability and transparency in the utilisation of funds throughout the program period, and a final statement of expenditure will be submitted by UNICEF to AusAID within six months of the closing of the program.

7. Sustainability

Sustainability has several meanings. In this section we describe how the ‘child friendly’ approach is being mainstreamed across the country through official development and education plans, through the dissemination of implementation guidelines, and through the incorporation of child friendly content and process within teacher education and school education curricula. We also note a number of areas which require attention if sustainability is not to be compromised.

In 2010 the MTR recommended that the Ministry and UNICEF envision how project learning and strategies could be taken forward in 2012 when project funding ceases. In other words are project strategies likely to be sustained in the longer term? There are many positive indications of sustainability. The general principles of child friendly schools have already been mainstreamed. In the first country development strategy issued in the wake of the ending of the civil war, referred to as *Mahinda Chintana*, the government commits to the introduction of the child friendly approach in primary schools across the country.

Significantly CFA has been incorporated into the Ministry of Education’s National Strategic Plan for Education 2012-2017 (referred to hereafter as ESDFP2). ESDFP2 has three main themes – access, quality and governance. ESDFP2 contains a section setting out the objectives for primary education. The most recent version of ESDFP 2012-2017 places CFS as the fifth main objective for primary education and a second key strategy (Annex 15). The objective is expressed as

- Ensure an inclusive, enabling learning environment promoting child-friendly approach to learning and teaching.

The strategy introduces the term Child Friendly Framework (CFF) and is expressed as

- Improve the quality of primary education through the adoption of a ‘child friendly’ framework (CFF) along six dimensions, the introduction of school self-assessment (SSA) and the preparation, implementation and monitoring of school development plan with effective participation of school community, the development of a multi-level methodology of learning and teaching, the development of co-curricular activities, the development of a monitoring and evaluation system linked with CFF, professional development in CFF.

Asked how the core activities of CFA contribute to ESDP2 objectives the MOE’s Director of Primary Education indicated that the ESDFP objective on access would be met mainly by activities undertaken in relation to CFS criteria 1, 2 and 4, on quality by criteria 3 and 6 and on the preparation of schools plans by criterion 5. Annex 15 describes how this CFS objective and strategy relate to other objectives and strategies for primary education and the conceptual links between CFS criteria and activities and ESDFP objectives.

There is a growing awareness of the principles and practices of CFA among SLEAS officers working at the central ministry of education and in the provinces at provincial, zonal and divisional level. Awareness of the principles and practices of CFA among in service advisors working with and teachers working in BESP schools is extensive.

Manuals

A guidance manual on the Child Friendly approach and subtitled 'Towards a quality primary school' has been prepared in Sinhala and Tamil and distributed to around 2,800 primary schools and schools with a primary section across the country as well as to education officers, ISAs, colleges of education. Originally the copies were intended for the BESP schools but the decision to develop 1680 feeder primary schools under the Mahindodaya 1000/5000 schools program (of which c 300 are BESP schools) and 1500 very small schools under a program led by the Presidential Secretariat has meant that the existing copies have been distributed to all these schools as well. However, schools do not receive one copy per teacher. Some BESP teachers have never seen the manual; some have seen it but not read it while an unknown number has read and used the manual. In the coming years the MOE plans to roll out CFA to all teachers in all primary grades, a total of c 70,000 teachers. Given the importance of the manual, it is recommended that the manual be revised during 2013/4 and printed in sufficient quantities for each teacher to have a personal copy. The Education for All Unit of the MOE was supported to develop and pilot an 'Inclusive Education toolkit' for education officers, principals and teachers. After piloting, the toolkit was revised, translated into Tamil and finalised in both Tamil and Sinhala. It is available in draft form in English. Over 46,000 copies of the manual will be printed and disseminated to all primary teachers in all government schools across the country by the end of 2012. The cost of printing and distribution is shared with the government.

Teacher Education curricula

A further sustainability strategy has been the incorporation of the CFA approach into teacher education curricula. NIE has revised the Mathematics, Environment Related Activities and Civic Education (Sinhala and Tamil) syllabi for the National Colleges of Education, and the second languages curriculum for the Teacher Training Colleges. Each includes the principles of inclusion and child-friendly learning as an integral part of new teacher training courses. BESP also supported the NIE in the revision of two in-service training packages (i) Key Stage One (KS-1) in-service teacher development framework (including identification of school readiness milestones); and (ii) the development and piloting of KS-2 teacher development framework and integration of inclusive education principles and child friendly practices.

Primary Education Curricula

There are plans to incorporate more CFA into the primary curriculum as this is revised. In 2007 major steps were taken to incorporate elements of CFA into the Environmental Related Activities of the curriculum, especially in relation to child rights and activity-based learning. A further revision of the curriculum is in process and CFA elements are being incorporated. The development of multi-level and multi-grade teaching strategies and the development of graded learning materials currently being piloted by the Ministry needs to be integrated further into the CFA approach and into the NIE's current revision of primary school curricula. NIE staff have been very appreciative of UNICEF support for the design and printing of a resource book on clinical approaches to teaching (that focus on slow learners), and also on action research studies in primary education and of the KS1 module referred to above.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Central to the sustainability of the program is the establishment of a CFA monitoring system that will outlive BESP. This is not yet in place and could compromise the ability of the MOE, the NIE and the provinces to sustain the approach on the ground over the coming years. More than this is the requirement that the monitoring system is embedded within the MOE's and NIE's M&E systems to monitor progress towards the overall national ESDFP2 plan for education. Mainstreaming does not require a separate national and provincial system for the child friendly approach. Rather, a high quality set of indicators and procedures need to be in place for ESDFP2.

Human resource development needs

Sustainability also requires a constant renewal of staff with expertise in different aspects of primary education. Discussions with staff at NIE indicate that there is a dearth of staff at NIE, and lecturers in the colleges of education and in the Teacher training colleges with professional qualifications in primary education and in early childhood education. This situation will be exacerbated in the near future when a number of staff retires. No new appointments have been made to the NIE during the past six years. While many staff had Master degrees these were general M Ed degrees that had not focused on the specific needs of early childhood and primary education. The current primary education director at NIE is of the view that the departments of primary education and early childhood education each require appointments at the level of PhD. Officials at both the NIE and MOE acknowledged that there would be considerable advantage in the creation of a separate cadre for appointments of teachers, principals, education officers and other staff for primary education and secondary education and felt that the current reform to separate primary from secondary more clearly would in the longer term provide a firmer foundation for children's learning in the future.

Division of Responsibilities between MOE and NIE and the provinces

A third area of concern over sustainability concerns the need for a clearer division of responsibilities in relation to the CFA between MOE, NIE and the provinces. Formally, the MOE is mandated to monitor and evaluate the implementation of nation-wide programs while the NIE is mandated to develop and revise curricula for primary and secondary education, the NCOEs and TTCs, undertake training in relation to curriculum reforms and research and evaluation. The Provinces undertake a considerable amount of teacher training, some in conjunction with the NIE or MOE and some alone. Problems of duplication and course quality were raised. Added to this is the overlapping responsibilities and fragmentation of effort between departments in both the MOE and NIE. At least seven MOE directors and two NIE directors are currently contributing to the CFA effort. And while coordination between departments within MOE and within NIE has increased in recent years there may be scope for a streamlining of responsibilities. These concerns are not specific to CFA. They are generic but they will continue to affect CFA as it is gradually implemented nation-wide.

8. Gender Equality

In this section we address the following three questions:

- Did BESP promote equal access for boys and girls?
- Did BESP promote equal participation and benefits for boys and girls?
- Did BESP increase women's voice in decision-making, leadership and peace building?

The first two questions are embedded in the Child Friendly Approach. The third is not central to BESP but derives from the AusAID criteria. We comment on these briefly. Annex 16 describes the rationale for the criteria on which we have chosen to focus.

Did BESP promote equal access for boys and girls? (Pillar 1)

Sri Lanka is unusual in the South Asia region for her high rates of educational enrolment at all levels among both sexes. An estimated 2% of children never enroll and a further 2% do not reach Grade 5 (UNICEF, 2012b). The BESP expected strategic result on access is a reduction of 1% per annum in the current level of children not completing primary education in target schools in focus districts. The UNICEF ACR notes that 'BESP supported schools show an impressive advancement in survival rates from 2009 to 2011 with an average of over 100% survival to grade 5 in ten of the eleven target districts' (UNICEF 2012b, 7). As we saw above, under effectiveness, survival rates in the target schools in the focus districts have improved over the life of the project for boys and girls and they have improved relative to the performance of all schools in the respective districts. In five districts boys' survival rates were higher than girls'; in six districts girl's survival rates were higher than those of boys. Only in one district, Jaffna, are the survival rates in BESP schools lower in 2011 than among all schools in the district (UNICEF2012b). However it should also be noted that, with the exception of Kilinochchi, where communities were severely displaced by the war, survival rates are generally very high.

The number of children identified as 'out of school' children were 4338 boys and 3709 girls, with 50% of boys and 53% of girls re-integrated into schools. 315 boys and 357 girls were identified as being out of school and were enrolled in 46 basic literacy classes in three districts in Uva and Central provinces in 2011. 67.5% of girls and 65.08% of boys had been re-integrated into schools by January 2012.

Did BESP promote equal participation and benefits for boys and girls? (Pillar 1)

This question of participation is addressed through the indicator of student attendance and through two of the criteria of gender responsiveness built into the Child Friendly Schools framework – criterion 2.2 'girls and boys participate on an equal basis in all school activities (curricular, co-curricular) and criterion 2.3 physical facilities are appropriate for both boys and girls. The questions of 'benefits' is addressed through evidence on student academic achievement.

Several steps have been taken to improve attendance levels, including the formation of school attendance committees, community led feeding programs, prizes for and recognition of students with good attendance and the maintenance of a child friendly environment. The target for attendance was that 85% of girls and boys should regularly attend schools reaching and minimum of 80% attendance. In 2011 87% of girls and 86%

of boys attended for more than 80% of school days. Baseline data from 2008 are available for six of the eleven districts. Simple averages across districts (rather than schools) indicate an increase in attendance among girls from 73% to 87%, and among boys from 70% to 86%. In those districts in the Northern Province, which rejoined BESP only in 2011, attendance rose from an average of 87.4% to 91.0% among girls and from 86.2% to 90% among boys between 2010 and 2011 (Table 6, UNICEF, 2012b). There appears to be broad gender equality in attendance, with a small advantage in favour of girls. However, attendance rates for all districts in 2010 and 2011 indicate a small but consistent advantage for girls over boys in all but one case. But, as with the survival rates, the data are pooled across schools and we are unable to correlate school level interventions with school attendance rates.

Assessments of gender-wise participation in school co-curriculum activities have been made by provinces. Co-curricular activities refer to sports, aesthetic and cultural activities. In the Eastern province common activities for boys and girls increased between 2008 and 2012 from 128 to 183 in the Batticaloa district, 72 to 108 in the Trincomalee district and from 67 to 193 in the Ampara district.

Most schools and classes in Sri Lankan schools are mixed gender, but children often sit in separate groups within classrooms. Observations indicated that children in BESP schools generally sat in mixed gender groups in classrooms. In one Muslim school in the Eastern province teachers reported that where before girls and boys were divided into parallel classes in separate classrooms they now sit in the same class in mixed gender groups. One teacher expressed it thus:

Children did not like the separation. If separated they want to mix; if they are mixed, the desire to mix is reduced. (Teacher, Eravur)

CFA criterion 2.3 refers to physical facilities being appropriate for boys and girls and refers mainly to separate sanitation facilities for boys and girls. Eastern province reports that 98% of required toilets for girls and boys have been provided. All schools visited during our field trip had separate toilet facilities for boys and girls (Annex 4).

The 'benefits' of participation are measurable through an analysis of school achievement results. For reasons of data availability Grade 5 scholarship performance was selected by BESP as the strategic 'quality' result. Impressive results on this measure have been reported already in the section on effectiveness. Grade 5 performance data disaggregated by gender are not currently available for BESP schools. However gender disaggregated data are available for teacher-assessments conducted in 2011 of student mastery of essential learning competencies in the three key stages (KS) of primary education – KS1 (Grades 1 and 2), KS2 (Grades 3 and 4) and KS3 (Grade 5). In 33 gender comparisons across 11 districts and 3 key stages, girls outperform boys in 24 cases, i.e. in more than two thirds of all comparisons (Table 19, UNICEF 2012b). Awareness of gender differences in favour of girls in some schools has led school activation committees to take steps to improve boy's attendance and achievement. Nationally, girls outperform boys in Grade 4 achievement tests (NEREC, 2009). We do not currently know whether this is also the case for the Grade 5 scholarship exam.

Did BESP increase women's voice in decision-making, leadership and peace building? (Pillar 2)

BESP did not include specific results or outcomes that address increasing women's voice in decision-making, leadership and peace building. However, our observations on the gender composition of key education stakeholders that support the creation of a child friendly environment both in BESP and in the country more generally may be of interest (Figure 4). At the highest level of decision-making at the MOE the staff are more likely to be male than female. At the next level, the majority of directors with BESP and CFA responsibilities are female. In the provinces, the majority of provincial directors of education are male, the Provincial Deputy Directors of Education with responsibility for primary education are predominantly female, the Zonal Directors of education are predominantly male, the Zonal ADEs primary are predominantly female, the Divisional Directors of Education are predominantly male and the ISAs primary are female. At the school, the majority of primary section heads are female. The vast majority of primary school teachers are female. We note that at the different levels of the system (Ministry, Province, Zone, Division), males are more likely to hold the senior position of Secretary or Director. How this gendered support structure influences decision-making and resource allocations required for the sustainability of CFA nationwide, and how the feminised teacher force impacts on the survival and achievement levels of boys are matters on which the Ministry and NIE might wish to reflect. Our discussions with NIE indicated that the number of males recruited to the National Colleges of Education to train as teachers is very low and requires a review of current policy for the selection of prospective teachers.

Figure 4 Gender composition of primary education teachers and support staff

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Senior staff at MOE | M>F |
| MOE Directors responsible for BESP | F>M |
| Provincial Directors of Education | M>F |
| Provincial Deputy Directors (Primary) | F>M |
| Zonal Directors of Education | M>F |
| Zonal Assistant Directors (Primary) | F>M |
| Divisional Directors | M>F |
| In service advisors (Primary) | F>M |
| Primary school principals | Data not available |
| Primary section heads in G1-11 and 1-13 schools | F>M |
| Primary grade teachers | F>M |

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

At the time of the MTR monitoring and evaluation were identified as areas needing further improvement. The original BESP design document had specified six outcome indicators but lacked clarity on specific results and timeframes. During the first two years of the project UNICEF and AusAID worked together to design an M&E Framework based on the intentions of the original project but adjusting the indicators in line with data availability and principles of validity and reliability. Indicators were fine-tuned and targets

set. The MTR mission endorsed the M&E Framework for use for the remainder of the project period. In the framework sixteen indicators were included under two strategic results with three outcomes each.

Whilst the M&E Framework represented an improvement over what was included in the original design, it was not without fault. The link that would lead the inputs and activities to the strategic results and outcomes were not clear in the Framework. Annex 14 sets out some of these concerns.

In order to ensure data availability for Indicator 9 the focus was shifted from students' achievement of the essential learning competencies (ELCs) to raw scores on the grade 5 scholarship examinations. The indicator required data on the performance of all schools in each district whereas it would have been more relevant to compare the differences in national performance on the scholarship exam with the performance of students in BESP schools only in each district. This would have more accurately reflected the achievements of the project. (For a discussion of problems associated with Strategic Result 2 and Indicator 9, see Annex 14).

The timeline for achieving targets was not specified. The end of the project was basically the target date for completion of activities. However it should have been clear that inputs which were critical for implementing other activities effectively should have been delivered in the early years of the project. For instance distributing the CFS guidelines to all districts (Indicator 10) and establishing resource teams in all the provinces (Indicator 11) should have been completed by the second year of the project. The failure to implement these key activities in a timely way led to lower levels of achievement in terms of Indicators 15 and 16, i.e. number and percentage of schools trained in the monitoring criteria of CFA and the number and percentage of schools generating information by CFA criteria respectively. Since the project has not yet been completed there is still some time available for intensive training and information generation.

Gender is a cross cutting issue which should have been clearly reflected in every indicator. However this was not the case for four of the indicators where gender disaggregation was not required.

Since the MTR UNICEF has reported to AusAID based on the M&E Framework, and AusAID has used the framework for its internal quality monitoring and reporting. It is also being used for this evaluation. As noted already, of 16 indicators in the Framework baseline information is available for 12, three are indicators for which baseline data would not be expected as the activities did not previously exist, and for one the information is not available.

We note that the collection of information for the indicators has required very different levels of work. While some require a simple count (e.g. Indicator 13: number and percentage of schools that have conducted SSAs) others require a large scale and comprehensive survey (e.g. Indicator 12: number and percentage of schools with 80% CFA criteria). We were informed that this information will be available by the end of February 2013.

Monitoring and reporting have improved significantly since the MTR. The addition of a Monitoring and Evaluation UNICEF officer to the BESP team and her close collaboration with the MOE has added considerable value to the M&E effort. UNICEF produces an

annual report which it submits to AusAID with information related to each of the indicators as well as analysis of project progress and constraints. Regular meetings are held between UNICEF and AusAID to discuss implementation and monitoring issues. AusAID has made a number of monitoring visits to view first hand activities in the field. The MOE has conducted an annual review and semi-annual review of BESP in accordance with the project design.

A number of effective monitoring and evaluation practices have taken root at the school level through the work of the SACs, the process of SSA and the development of SDPs. Results-oriented M&E practices are being institutionalized in the education divisions, zones and provinces with monitoring tools developed by the respective provinces. The development of monitoring tools at the Ministry level for use in the provinces has continued apace but has been subject to delays. The institutionalisation of the results-based M&E system within the MOE's ESDFP M&E system requires further work in the coming year. So too does the elaboration of indicators of practices within the classroom.

BESP is a school-level intervention program with financial and management authority lying with zones within provinces. The integration of a results framework requires attention to the school as the key unit of analysis. It also requires attention to the ordering of time targets to reflect the causal connections between activities and outcomes. Inclusion of the SDC in the SSA and SDP process and in the school CFA monitoring process could be used as a means for institutionalising the impressive results achieved at school level.

The people who generate M&E information at school level have begun to use the information in their possession to reflect upon their current level and formulate locally appropriate strategies to improve their status. However, many school principals are unclear as to how the CFS activities under 6 dimensions and 29 criteria can be merged with the ESDFP themes and SDP format based on those themes. This has led to some problems in M&E at school level and sub national level. The M&E system and capacity in relation to CFA is still undergoing a challenging process of being streamlined at the national level. It is crucial that the monitoring tools developed under BESP are mainstreamed within the current ESDFP.

10. Analysis and Learning

Under the heading 'Analysis and Learning' the TOR invite the team to assess a series of questions about, inter alia, risk management, the effectiveness of WASH, the effectiveness of donor coordination. These questions are closely related to questions of Efficiency and are addressed in that section. Through its analysis the MTR made a number of recommendations for future implementation. Good progress has been made on their follow-up, underlining the value of both the analysis and the extent of professional learning from it.

There are a few areas where more concerted efforts to learn collectively might have contributed to greater project effectiveness. Already in 2008 the UNICEF consultant working in the Ministry had made a number of recommendations for analysis, learning and conceptualisation. These included the need for higher quality conceptual and process guidance, the need for a standardised set of materials, the need for baseline information and improved documentation of lessons learned that could be used as a foundation for an expansion of good practices. Delays in the establishment of an

effective M&E system were noted in 2008 and again in 2010 and have limited the extent to which project implementors have been able to learn systematically from experience.

Another area where more collective analysis might have benefited effectiveness is the conceptual link-up of the Results based monitoring and evaluation framework and the child friendly framework. We have noted already that the link is effected through just one indicator in the Results framework (i.e. Indicator 12). This is judged to be a weakness of the original project design. The CFS 'package' appears to have been accepted wholesale and relied on to achieve the outcomes and results of BESP.

But that package is itself very complex and the purpose and focus of some of the activities unclear. We give just one example. In linking CFS with the BESP results there seems to be an assumption that child-centred methodologies will lead to an increase in learning outcomes. In BESP and for reasons of data availability, learning outcomes are measured through performance on the Grade 5 examination. What evidence did UNICEF have in 2008, or in 2010 at the time of the MTR, that child-centred teaching and learning methods would lead to increased in performance in the high stakes Grade 5 scholarship examination? Similarly what evidence is/was there that healthy, safe and protective schools retain students better or leads to better exam results?

As we saw above in the discussion of Sustainability it is encouraging to see that the MOE is now thinking through how a range of CFS activities might lead causally to the broader objectives of ESDFP, but more work needs to be done.

Suggested improvements

Future analysis and learning could be improved if evidence is organised by school. Currently many of the indicators aggregate data across schools leading to district figures. BESP is a school-level intervention project and data should be aggregated at this level. While, for historical reasons, the district may continue to be used as a unit of reporting, the key units of educational implementation are the class and the school supported by the division, zone and province. The key unit for decision-making about financial allocations is the zone. Simple correlational cross schools analysis would begin to offer insights on whether increases in the CFS dimensions lead to increases in each of the results.

Another area where more analysis and learning might support the work of CFS school principals is school-based management. We have already alluded to the fact that the Program of School Improvement (PSI) has been rolled out across the country between 2006 and 2011. Both PSI and CFA Dimension 5 are expected to lead to the development of a five-year and one-year plan. Yet, BESP project designers and implementors appear to have been unaware of this important reform. Conversely many MOE officials responsible for PSI are unaware of CFA Dimension 5. While the schemes may not converge in the minds of officials they do converge in the minds of the school principal. In some cases this has led to confusion or neglect of one scheme in favour of the other. There is an urgent need to learn from both approaches and harmonise the approaches into one. The rationale for this harmonisation and a suggested approach is set out in Annex 11.

11. Conclusions, Evaluation Ratings and Recommendations

11.1 Conclusions and Evaluation Ratings

In conclusion we judge that BESP has been very relevant to the Sri Lankan context and is well aligned with the priorities of the Sri Lankan government. It has been responsive to the needs of children in disadvantaged areas and to the particular needs of children in conflict affected areas. It has been reasonably effective in meeting its targets, and has been more effective in meeting the targets set for access than quality. Fund utilization has been efficient and accountability strong. The prospects for sustaining many of the BESP activities into the future are good, though this will depend to some extent on a renewal of staff with expertise in primary education and a clearer division of responsibilities between MOE, NIE and the provinces. While BESP can claim some success in promoting gender equality across the curriculum and extra-curricular activities, it has been able to draw on a more general environment that encourages gender equality in education. While there has been considerable progress in the development and application of a monitoring and evaluation system many challenges remain - in the development and use of quality monitoring tools, in their use of evidence generated by them for improved practice and in their integration into a national system of monitoring progress towards the goals of the national education plan (ESDFP 2012-2017). As BESP approaches its end date and the prospect of 'roll out' across the country beckons there is a need to take stock of achievements to date, to analyse further the challenges posed by some elements and to reflect critically on the causal nexus that is assumed between BESP activities in schools and classrooms and the expected end results.

The evaluation ratings awarded follow the AusAID rating scale, as follows.

| | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Satisfactory | Less than satisfactory |
| 6 Very high quality | 3 Less than adequate quality |
| 5 Good quality | 2 Poor quality |
| 4 Adequate quality | 1 Very poor quality |

| Evaluation Criteria | Rating | Explanation |
|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Relevance | 5 | The project objectives are relevant to the goals of both AusAID and the GoSL. The key access and school-development strategies being implemented are relevant to the needs of disadvantaged children and schools and to Sri Lanka's priority of reducing educational disparity. Our award of 5 rather than 6 derives from our concern that the roll out of Program of School Improvement (PSI) was overlooked in the original BESP design and that those who reviewed annual implementation did not bring discrepancies between approaches to the attention of the MOE. CFA and PSI approaches to school-based planning and management are in urgent need of harmonization and merger. A proposal for how this might be done is set |

out in Annex 11.

| | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Effectiveness | 4 | Of the sixteen targets nine have been 'met' or 'almost met'. Five have been partially met. One has not been met and evidence is currently unavailable on the extent of implementation of CFA at school level. Note however that the project is due to be completed only at the end December 2012. |
| Efficiency | 5 | Finances have been focused on the school level and used accountably. UNICEF staff have shown strong commitment to the project. Project implementation and fund utilisation increased in the last eighteen months. |
| Sustainability | 4 | CFA is frequently mentioned in the education discourse. National level adoption is apparent in National Development Plans and the current five year plan for education (ESDFP 2012-2016). Implementation guidelines are being disseminated. CFA is gradually being integrated in primary education curricula and in teacher education programs. However, the M&E system for CFA is not yet integrated within the MOE M&E system. |
| Gender Equality | 5 | 'Gender responsiveness' is a core element of Child Friendly Schools. Performance on key indicators is similar for boys and girls, with slight advantages apparent in favour of girls. Classroom seating practices and co-curricular activities encourage boys and girls to learn side by side. The majority of teachers and of in-service advisors who support primary teachers are female. There is some evidence that school attendance committees are responsive to the needs of boys who are more likely to be out of school and attending school less. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | 4 | At project inception and again at the MTR the need for an implementable monitoring framework was recorded. There has been significant progress since 2010 but many challenges remain. While the quality of progress reporting has improved and the quality of UNICEF annual progress reports and the current completion report is very high, much work needs to be done to integrate CFA monitoring tools into the MOE M&E system. Because CFS is a school-based program, future M&E analysis should use the zone, the district and the school as units of analysis. Targets should be stated in terms of numbers and %s of schools expected to attain them. Aggregations at division and zone should focus on mean levels of achievement across schools and disparities between schools. |

Analysis and Learning

4

It appears that the UNICEF CFS framework was adopted wholesale rather than adapted selectively. Some of the challenges and recommendations identified in a UNICEF consultant's report in 2008 at the time of BESP inception were not adequately followed through. However the response to the recommendations offered by the MTR was positive. Now that BESP is coming to an end and as CFA is mainstreamed there is an urgent need for a careful analysis of implementation experience and the modifications to the CFA model (e.g. in relation to school based planning and management and to teacher practices in the classroom). More conceptual work is needed on working through the assumed causal connections between CFS activities and ESDFP objectives. The documents that set out CFS purposes, practices and lessons for the future, that will need to be reprinted in the future, require a review of content and presentation. Some documents are of only moderate quality.

11.2 Recommendations

We have noted that the government is committed to rolling out the child friendly approach across the country in the coming years. We have provided some evidence to support this and look forward to even more convincing evidence from UNICEF's forthcoming measurement and analysis of the Indicator 12. At the same time we have identified a number of areas that would benefit from further intensive technical work in the schools that have only recently been included under the program and in the system more generally. There is a strong case for UNICEF to continue working with the schools that joined the programme only in 2011 and with schools that are struggling to implement the child friendly approach. There is strong case for M&E specialists in UNICEF to continue working with the M&E staff in the Ministry in order to establish a high quality M&E at every level of the implementation structure. *Inter alia* a critical analysis of the assumed links between school and class activities and teaching and learning methods and expected results, and a quality assurance of monitoring tools, implementation guidelines and materials (including the CFA guidance manual) to ensure a close match between guidance and expected behaviours. In the area of school development plans there is an urgent need for a harmonization of the PSI and CFA approaches.

Based on the above, we offer seven main recommendations.

10.1 CFA should continue as a high priority within the ESDFP plan, the ESDFP budget and UNICEF Country Program budget respectively.

10.2 UNICEF and the MOE should complete the following before the end of December 2012

- (i) Distribute the education toolkit

- (ii) Develop the CFA guideline for education officials
- (iii) Advance plans for the survey necessary to provide evidence for Indicator 12
- (iv) Complete the out of school survey report
- (v) Complete and distribute the CFA training manual
- (vi) Complete teacher training manuals for key stages 1 and 2
- (vii) Complete the Basic Literacy Centre training manual

10.3 Based on its priorities and fund availability, AusAID may consider an extension of support to the MOE and the NIE and the Provinces through UNICEF to

- (i) Consolidate its work in selected schools, including the activities noted above in 10.2
- (ii) Conduct a critical review of the CFA causal model that links school and classroom activities with results
- (iii) Strengthen the analysis of school-based results and activities and lessons to be learned as CFA is integrated into ESDFP
- (iv) Support a process of quality assurance of all technical outputs (e.g. Child Friendly guidance manual, implementation guidelines, monitoring tools, curriculum guidelines)
- (v) Integrate a revised results-based M&E system into ESDFP.

10.4 AusAID should continue to support the implementation of CFA through the mandated responsibilities of the MOE, NIE and the provinces through its ongoing support to ESDFP via the World Bank. Through its ongoing support to ESDFP it should continue to advocate for

- (i) Intensive support to primary education
- (ii) The implementation of CFA
- (iii) The implementation of the inclusive education policy
- (iv) The creation of a cadre for primary education
- (v) Separate budgets and accountability for expenditure on for primary education
- (vi) Improved systems for assessing and promoting learning in primary education.

10.5 AusAID funds should also be used to promote analysis and learning by the community of educators and promote evidence-based planning through research and

integrated monitoring systems. This report could be used as the basis of one such exercise in analysis and learning.

10.6 With careful consideration of best practices and government ownership, MOE, NIE, UNICEF and other development partners should

- (i) Merge CFA and PSI approaches to school level planning and management within ESDFP to capitalise on their respective practices, using Annex 11 as a guideline.

- (ii) Establish and ensure a timely flow of funds to schools to assist the development of school plans and their implementation

10.7 MOE, the NIE and DPs should increase opportunities for professional learning from analyses of specific activities (e.g. school level planning and management, processes, teaching and learning processes and outcomes, children's participation in school planning and management, disparity analysis)

12. Final Note: BESP was not designed initially as a program for emergency education. However, project designers and reviewers always intended that BESP should be extended to districts impoverished by war as soon as this became possible. Communities which were multiply and severely displaced during and after the war have benefitted greatly from their inclusion in BESP from 2011. The BESP whole school, child-friendly approach and the development of strong school-community relations have helped women, girls, men and boys to rebuild their lives, their families and their schools.

14. References

- AusAID (2008) *Education Strategy Paper for Sri Lanka*, Colombo
- AusAID (2011) *Promoting Opportunities for all*, Education Thematic Strategy, November 2011.
- AusAID (2011) *Promoting opportunities for all Gender equality and women's empowerment*, Thematic Strategy, November 2011.
- AusAID (2012) *An Effective Aid Program for Australia: Making a real difference—delivering real results*, June 2012.
- AusAID (2011) Australian Support to the Government of Sri Lanka/UNICEF Basic Education Program 2008-2012, *BESP proposal: revised activities for 2011-12*, March 2011
- BESP (2008) Australian Support to Government of Sri Lanka/UNICEF education program 2011-2012, *Basic Education Support Program*. October 2008
- Bandara, W. M. S. (1982), *A survey on the success of the Master Teachers in the Homagama Education Region*, PGDEM thesis, Department of Education Management Development, Maharagama: NIE.
- Centre for Education Leadership Development (2001). *The capacity Issues in four selected zones in Sri Lanka*, CELD, NIE: Meepe.
- Department of National Planning (2010) Sri Lanka-The *Emerging Wonder of Asia-Mahinda Chinthana Vision for the Future: The Development Policy Framework, Government of Sri Lanka*, Ministry of finance and Planning : Colombo.
- Goyder, H., Lochhead, A., Rajapaksa, L., Regmi, R. Noij, F. (2007) *Program of Cooperation between the Government of Sri Lanka and UNICEF: Final Report*, SIDA Evaluation 07/44, *Asia Department*, Stockholm: SIDA.
- Malini, H. L. A. (2010) *An Review on the Implementation of PSI in the Dehiowita Zone, PGDEM dissertation*, CELD, NIE: Meepe.
- MG Consultants (Pvt.) Ltd. (2004) *Report to UNICEF* Colombo
- Ministry of Education (1998) *Compulsory Education Regulations 1998*, MOE: Colombo.
- Ministry of Education (2000) *School Census: 2000*, MOE: Colombo.
- Ministry of Education (2001) *Report on the SAARC Conference on small schools*, June 2001.
- Ministry of Education (2005) *Circular No. 2005/24 – Program on School Improvement*, MOE: Colombo.

Ministry of Education (2007) ***Education Sector Development Framework and Program 2006-2011***, MOE: Colombo.

Ministry of Education (2008) ***Circular No. 2008/35 – Program on School Improvement***, MOE: Colombo.

Ministry of Education (2010) ***Circular No. 2010/28 – Program on School Improvement: A supplement***, MOE: Colombo.

Ministry of Education (2011) ***School Census: 2011***, MOE: Colombo

Ministry of Education (2012) ***Education Sector Development Framework and Program, 2012-2017, Transforming the School Education System as the Foundation of a Knowledge Project***, MOE: Colombo.

Ministry of Education (2012) ***Guidance manual on the Child Friendly approach 'Towards a quality primary school'***, Sinhala and Tamil versions, MOE: Colombo.

Nedungamuwa, D. M. D. K. (2009) ***A Study on the Operational behaviour of School Development Committees at the initial stage of implementing the program for school improvement***, PGDEM dissertation, CELD, NIE: Meepe.

Little, A. W. (2000) (Ed) ***Primary Education Reform in Sri Lanka***, Education Publications Department: Colombo.

Little, A. W. (2007) 'Paradoxes of Economic and Social Development in Sri Lanka: the wages of civil war', in A.Green, A.W. Little, Kamat, S et al ***Education and Development in a Global Era: strategies for 'successful globalisation'***, London, Department for International Development

OECD-DAC ***The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness***. March 2nd, 2005, Paris: OECD

Peiris, K. (1983) ***Tiny Sapling Sturdy Tree: the inside story of primary education reform of the 1970s in Sri Lanka***, Oslo, Universitetforlaget

Perera, W. J. (2009). “How can the Administration help School Functioning Move from Bureaucracy to Collegiality?” A paper presented at the ANTRIEP seminar on Successful Education Systems for a Changing World: Monitoring and Evaluating the Effectiveness of Education Systems, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai, 16-19 September 2009.

Ranaweera, M. (2000) ‘Donors and Primary Education’, in A W Little ***Primary Education Reform in Sri Lanka***, Isurupaya Education Publications Department

Piyadasa, K. O. and Liyanage, E. S. (1984) ***Supervision of schools in management of education development in Sri Lanka***, MOE: Colombo.

Seel A., Jayaweera S., Jennings J. (2010) ***Sri Lanka Basic Education Support Program (BESP), Aid Works Initiative Number INH 574, Independent Progress Report, Final***, 24th November 2010, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

Sivagnanam, M (2002) Contribution on small schools, in the ***Report*** of the SAARC workshop on quality improvement of education in small schools. June 6-7, 2002, Colombo, Sri Lanka, The Ministry of Human Resources Development, Education & Cultural Affairs in Collaboration with The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sri Lanka

Sivagnanam, M. (2008) ***Improving Education Service Delivery for Pro Poor Growth***, Paper presented at IPS workshop held in Trincomalee, November 2008.

UNICEF (2008) ***Australian Support to Government of Sri Lanka/UNICEF Education Program 2008-2011, Basic Education Support Program (BESP), Final Version***, October 2008, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

UNICEF (2008) ***Mainstreaming Child-Friendly Schools in Sri Lanka: A Case Study***, May 2008, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

UNICEF (2010, a) ***Basic Education Support Program (BESP), First Progress Report: February 2009 – February 2010, Contribution Agreement between UNICEF and the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)***, SC/2009/0101, February 2010, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

UNICEF (2010,b) ***An Assessment of Student Competency Levels in Grades 3 to 9 Northern and Eastern and Provinces***, March 2010, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

UNICEF (2010c) ***A Study to Identify the Nature of Daily Attendance of School Children: A Survey Based on the Child Friendly Schools in Nuwara Eliya District***, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

UNICEF (2011, a) ***Basic Education Support Program (BESP), Second Progress Report: February 2010 – February 2011, Contribution Agreement between UNICEF and the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)***, SC/2009/0101, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

UNICEF (2011, b) ***Australian Support to the Government of Sri Lanka/UNICEF, Basic Education Support Program 2008-2012, Basic Education Support Program (BESP), Proposal: Revised Activities for 2011-12***, March 2011, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

UNICEF (2012, a) ***Basic Education Support Program (BESP), Third Progress Report: March 2011–February 2012, Contribution Agreement between UNICEF and the Australian Agency for International Development***, (AusAID), SC/2009/0101, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

UNICEF (2012, b) **Basic Education Support Program Draft Advanced Completion Report: 24 February 2009 – 31 December 2012**, Contribution Agreement between UNICEF and The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), SC/2009/0101, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

UNICEF (2012, c) **WASH in Child-friendly Schools 2011-13: Design Document**, June 2012, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

UNICEF(undated) **A Study to identify the Nature of Daily Attendance of School Children, A Survey Report Based on the Child Friendly Schools in Nuwara Eliya District, undated**. UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

Wetz, M. (2008) **UNICEF Sri Lanka Final Consultation Report on Consolidation of the Child Friendly Concept and Process** (05 July 2007 – 25 June 2008)

Wijemanne, H. (2003) **Making Schools in Sri Lanka Child Friendly** November 2003
Wijesundera, S., Silva, R. K. K.C., Wijesinghe, K., and Jayasena D. A. (1997). National Diagnosis of Supervision and Support Services for basic education in Sri Lanka, In **Supervision and Support Services in Asia – Volume II**, 215-316, IIEP: Paris.

Wijesundera S. and Perera, W. J (2000) *Perceptions of Teachers on National Policy on Primary Education Reforms in Sri Lanka*. In **Primary Education Reform in Sri Lanka**, (ed. Little A W.), pp. 97-141, Education Publications Department: Colombo.

Other Documents Consulted

Aturupane H. (2009) **The Pearl of Great Price: Achieving Equitable Access to Primary and Secondary Education and Enhancing Learning in Sri Lanka**, Create Pathways To Access Research Monograph No. 29: London.

Aturupane H and Wikramanayake, D. (2011) **The Promotion of Social Cohesion through Education in Sri Lanka**, South Asia Human Development Sector Report no 46, World Bank

AusAID (2006) AusAID **Risk Management Policy** (March 2006)

AusAID (2006) ANNEX 1, **To the Risk Management Policy, Risk Management Guide**, January 2006

AusAID (2007) **Director General's Blueprint**, 20 February 2007

AusAID (2010) **National Assessment and Testing Systems**, Current Issues in Education, AusAID Resource Facility, September 2010.

AusAID (2011) **An Independent Review of Aid Effectiveness**, April 2011.

AusAID (2011) **Sri Lanka Development Cooperation Report 2010**, October 2011.

AusAID (2011) ***Australia's proposed strategy for its aid program in Sri Lanka from 2011 to 2015.***

AusAID (2012) ***Our Mission, Our Values.***

AusAID (2012) ***Performance Management Evaluation Policy***, May 2012

AusAID (2012) ***An Effective Aid Program for Australia – Making a real difference – Delivering real results*** (Australian Government response to the Independent Review of Aid Effectiveness), July 2012

Department of Census and Statistics (2009) ***Sri Lanka Labour Force Survey, Annual Report 2009***, Ministry of Finance and Planning,

Grover, S. and Singh N. H. (2002) ***The Quality Of Primary Education: A Case Study Of Madurai And Villuparam Districts In Tamil Nadu, India***, Harvard Graduate School of Education, April 2002

UNICEF (2011) ***Inclusive Child Friendly Education, 2007-2010***, Revised Education Initiative Proposal as part of AusAID's New Budget Measures for future support to the education sector, UNICEF: Sri Lanka.

World Bank (2005) ***Treasures of the Education System in Sri Lanka: Restoring Performance, Expanding Opportunities and Enhancing Prospects***, The World Bank: Washington D. C.

World Bank (2011) ***Transforming School Education in Sri Lanka: From Cut Stones to Polished Jewels***, The World Bank: Washington D. C.

Annexes

- Annex 1 : Terms of Reference
- Annex 2 : The Evaluation Team
- Annex 3 : Cross Cutting Issues
- Annex 4: School Visit Field Trip Report
- Annex 5: Program of Meetings
- Annex 6: List of Persons Met
- Annex 7: Checklists and Questions
- Annex 8: CFS Dimensions and Criteria in the BESP Design
- Annex 9: Full Set of Dimensions and Associated Criteria
- Annex 10: BESP Schools by District and Year of Inclusion in BESP
- Annex 11: SSA and SDP in CFA and PSI
- Annex 12: Key Project Elements
- Annex 13: Summary of BESP achievements with Analyses
- Annex 14: Notes on Indicators
- Annex 15: National Strategic plan ESDFP-Relevance of Primary Education
- Annex 16: AusAID Gender Equity Criteria

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE PROGRAM (BESP) INDEPENDENT COMPLETION REPORT (ICR) 10 September 2012

1. BACKGROUND

This Terms of Reference (TOR) has been developed to specify the requirements for conducting the Independent Completion Report (ICR) of the Sri Lanka Basic Education Support Program (hereafter referred to as BESP). BESP is executed by UNICEF and implemented by the Ministry of Education (MOE) of the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL). A mission to develop the ICR will be conducted in accordance with the AusAID guidelines and the mission findings and recommendations will be agreed with the MOE and UNICEF before finalisation of the ICR.

A Program Strategy for Sri Lanka is currently being developed. This strategy will assist AusAID to identify opportunities for Australian engagement in Sri Lanka and provide a foundation for the future direction of Australia's aid program. The aid program focuses on three sectors, including health, education and sustainable economic development. The country program objectives are:

- i. improved social and economic indicators in lagging regions⁴, and
- ii. policies and programs implemented at national and sub-national level that are aimed at inclusive growth and improved service delivery.

BESP was the first major budget measure initiative supported by the Australian Government in the education sector in Sri Lanka. Program activities commenced in February 2009 and are due to end in December 2012. BESP was initially started in six districts, in three provinces with 800 schools. In accordance with the recommendations by the Mid Term Review (MTR) conducted in 2010, program activities were expanded to five more districts in the Northern Province in 2011 with an additional 500 schools. The overall program value is \$7.4 million. Of this, \$7.2 million has been provided to UNICEF under a Partnership Contribution Agreement. The balance was utilised for project development and reviews.

A provision is included in BESP agreement between the Government of Australia and UNICEF to conduct an ICR to assess achievements, outcomes and impacts of the program. The ICR will also assess and validate the performance data provided in UNICEF's Activity Completion Report (ACR) which will be completed by 30 September 2012.

The overall objective of BESP is *'to support universal completion of primary education and improve learning achievement by building a child-friendly learning environment'*.

The objective is supported by two strategic results under Access and Quality, and three associated outcomes for each, as shown below.

⁴ Lagging regions are parts of the country which are significantly behind in social and economic indicators compared to the rest of the country.

1. Access:

The Strategic Result: a reduction of 1% per annum in the current level of children not completing primary education in target schools in focus districts.

Outcome 1.1 - At least 50% decrease in the number of girls and boys in all five grades not enrolled in school.

Outcome 1.2 - 85% of girls and boys regularly attend school reaching a minimum of 80% attendance.

Outcome 1.3 - Out-of-school children are accessing Catch-Up or Alternative Education Programs

2. Quality:

The Strategic Result: By 2011, disparities for students in passing Grade 5 Scholarship Exam reduced by 10% from 2008 level between the national and targeted districts.

Outcome 2.1 - The CFS approach is institutionalized within the national education system in the focus districts

Outcome 2.2 - All primary schools in AusAID focus districts are participating in the CFS initiative and 25% of these schools have reached an achievement rate of 80% towards CFS criteria in all CFS dimensions.

Outcome 2.3 - Effective monitoring systems support the achievement of CFS

BESP is designed to adopt the principles of and to complement UNICEF's Child Friendly School (CFS) education program, which is being implemented by the MOE as an integral part of the GoSL's Education Sector Development Framework and Program (ESDFP), 2006-2010 and 2012-2016. UNICEF has been a key partner in the ESDFP, and supported MOE to achieve its targets. The Child Friendly Schools (CFS) concept promotes quality learning and a healthy and safe environment for children while encouraging the active engagement of students, school management and communities. BESP has a strong emphasis on social cohesion and inclusiveness, assisting some of the most vulnerable and marginalised children, including those with disabilities.

The BESP MTR, as recorded in the Independent Progress Report (IPR) 2010, made a number of key recommendations, including:

- MOE take steps to issue a version of the CFS guidance handbook and indicator framework as soon as possible.
- Consolidate work in the project areas with attention to 'whole school' and 'whole division' approaches to capacity-building and clarifying and simplifying processes and indicators for school planning and monitoring.
- Develop criteria and guidance to identify schools still without basic water, adequate toilets other urgent needs and seek to channel remaining project funds for facilities more effectively to meet priority needs.
- Undertake visioning of what national policy, capacity and institutional outcomes are aimed for by 2012 and from these identify how project learning and strategies can be fully taken forward within the national strategies of the ESDFP.
- Ensure that effective, timely data collection and monitoring takes place according to the agreed revised M&E Framework and the learning is more systematically documented.
- AusAID and UNICEF to undertake further planning to achieve an expansion of the project to the Northern Province, considering a higher level of funding to support repair and

reconstruction integrated with CFS and WASH activities.

- Both AusAID and UNICEF seek to engage in ESDFP processes as proactively as possible in collaboration with other Development Partners.

The extent to which the recommendations of the MTR have been implemented will be assessed as part of the ICR process.

2. COUNTRY CONTEXT

Sri Lanka has a population roughly the same as Australia (20 million). Although the country's economic growth in 2011 was nearly 8%, the average economic growth over the past decade has been around 4.5%. It is also noted that nearly one quarter of the population lives below the poverty line. While the long running civil war ended in mid 2009, analysts predict that without initiatives that address the root causes of the conflict, peace in Sri Lanka will not be sustainable.

The MDG outcomes for Sri Lanka appear to be better than those for other South Asian countries, but the benefits of development are unequally distributed and there are pockets of serious unmet demand in key sectors across Sri Lanka. There remain a number of challenges which could be addressed through focused approaches in conjunction with peace building initiatives.

Before the conflict, Sri Lanka was far ahead of all its South Asian neighbours in education. During the past three decades progress has not been impressive, but overall for most indicators Sri Lanka is still in the lead in South Asia. Based on current trends, Sri Lanka is in a good position to achieve most of the EFA goals and the MDGs related to primary education completion (MDG 2) and gender equality for all levels of education (MDG 3). It had already achieved the interim MDG 3 target of gender parity in primary and secondary enrolments by 2005. However, the pockets of non-enrolment and non-completion and issues related to curriculum and textbooks as well as learning achievement will need to be addressed for the goals to be fully realised.

Sri Lanka spends little on education as a percentage of the GDP (1.8%) and as a percentage of Government expenditure (6.8%). Donor inputs contribute about 8% of the recurrent education budget and 85% of capital expenditure. Teachers' salaries, administrative overheads, other major recurrent costs and some capital (infrastructure) costs are covered by the GoSL budget. GoSL does not charge any tuition fees and a policy of free education policy has been maintained by successive governments. Community contribution through 'School Development Societies' is also a significant factor in maintaining school premises and minor infrastructure works.

The Sri Lankan Government's first Education Sector Development Framework and Program (ESDFP) for 2006-2010 provided the platform for Australia's current engagement in the education sector and Australia's support is integrated into the Government system with funding through UNICEF. The ESDFP Phase 1 was completed in 2011 and arrangements have been made to commence ESDFP Phase 2 in mid 2012. Based partly on the MTR recommendations, the Australian Government is supporting the ESDFP Phase 2 through \$37 million program with MOE and the World Bank called Transforming School Education Program (TSEP). Australian grant funding will complement USD100 million concessional credit provided by the World Bank. AusAID funding will be for four years from 2012 to 2015. The intention of co-financing the TSEP is to accelerate the development and delivery of a high quality education system in Sri Lanka that enables it to produce well skilled people

able to contribute to and benefit from the country's social and economic development. AusAID's funding will ensure the TSEP gives sufficient assistance to the primary and secondary education sectors, and key initiatives supported under BESP, such as the CFS approach, are intended to be mainstreamed and taken to scale through the program.

3. PURPOSE

AusAID attaches great importance to effectiveness and quality of all its aid activities and an ICR is a quality requirement of AusAID activities. It will assess program achievements and outcomes against a set of evaluation criteria, identify and analyse lessons learned, note implications for future programming and make recommendations for AusAID consideration. The ICR will examine and build upon the findings of the ACR to be submitted by UNICEF by 30 September 2012.

4. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the ICR are to:

1. Assess the performance of BESP against the stated program objectives, including the objectives of the expansion to the North following the MTR, in accordance with the evaluation criteria and questions specified in this TOR.
2. Assess accountability for expenditure of Australian public funds on BESP activities.
3. Assess how BESP has contributed to the objective of ESDFP.
4. Based on the findings of the evaluation and an assessment of the current situation, and taking into consideration AusAID's current investment in the education sector and broader program objectives and policies, provide advice and recommendations on its future support to education in Sri Lanka.

5. SCOPE

The ICR will take due account of, and be consistent with, AusAID's relevant quality standards and procedures. The ICR Team will draw out lessons from their assessment of each of the following evaluation criterion that may be relevant to BESP's implementation. The Team will also rate BESP against each of the evaluation criterion. Standard Evaluation Questions are provided in Attachment A to guide the Team in developing questions in order to get the most value from the review. The ICR template is at Attachment B. The expected contents of the Aide Memoire are at Attachment C.

The ICR will focus on BESP's performance in delivering the outputs, achievements and outcomes specified in the design, on the expansion to the North, and will assess the program in terms of overall aid effectiveness. It will identify and draw out lessons on what has and what has not worked and the implications to inform future programming.

The Team will be guided by, but not be limited to, the criteria and considerations outlined below.

- ❖ **Relevance:** the extent to which the program contributed to higher level objectives of the aid program including how it has been responsive to changes in the objectives to maintain its relevance over the Program life.

Considering:

- Program alignment with policies and strategies of AusAID, GoSL and UNICEF.
- any changes in the priorities of AusAID, UNICEF, changes in the Sri Lanka context and any changes in GoSL priorities for its education sector, including introduction of PSI.

❖ Effectiveness: whether the program achieved its stated objectives.

Considering:

- the appropriateness of the objectives and strategies proposed under the program, assessing the extent to which these were achieved during the extended project period.
- the effectiveness of the Program in terms of initiatives such as School Self Assessments (SSAs), School Development Plans (SDPs), School Based Management (SBM), School Attendance Committees (SACs), Out-of-School Children and School Drop Outs, Alternative Education (Catch Up Education – CUE - Basic Literacy Classes – BLCs - and Accelerated Learning Programs – ALPs) as part of promoting the CFS approach.
- any associated issues or problems that impact the achievement of the objectives and cost-effective strategies.
- the extent to which the Program has been effective in involving communities in school management and in developing strong links between communities and schools during the planning and implementation and expansion stages.
- The extent to which the Program was effective in embedding key initiatives, such as the CFS approach, in the national system and plans for the second phase of the ESDFP.

❖ Efficiency: whether the Program was efficiently managed to obtain value for money from AusAID inputs (e.g. funds, staff and other resources) and to continually manage risks.

Considering:

- the efficiency of management, implementation, institutional and governance, and financial arrangements for the Program.
- the efficiency of UNICEF in managing the Program, including its role as a delivery partner.
- the efficiency of the MOE and provincial authorities as the implementation agencies of the Program, including its capability and commitment to undertake and continue with Program initiated activities at the conclusion of Australian assistance.
- the appropriateness and efficiency of overall deployment of resources (staff and finances including procurements) in delivering a high quality CFS program.
- key issues and critical factors that have influenced effective management of the Program, assessing the efficiency of management processes, procedures, strategies and structures and the roles and responsibilities of key Program staff and their expected inputs, including in the management of risks.
- engagement and communication mechanisms between different stakeholders, assessing the level and quality of stakeholder engagement.
- the appropriateness and efficiency of school based WASH activities under CFS approach. (WASH programs under BESP and School Wash programs).
- other aspects such as teachers (trained and non-trained), contributions by provincial and zonal education officers, size of schools and the school environment as part of delivering the CFS program.

- ❖ Impact: whether there are indications that the Program produced positive or negative changes (directly or indirectly, intended or unintended).

Considering:

- the effects of the Program on education promotion, with special attention to vulnerable student groups and in particular assessing the impact of SSAs, SDPs, SACs, SBM and Alternative Education Program interventions and other access and quality improvements efforts.
- ❖ Sustainability: whether the Program appropriately addressed sustainability so that the benefits will continue after funding has ceased, with due account of partner government systems, stakeholder ownership and the phase-out strategy.

Considering:

- the sustainability of the CFS approach from policy, regulatory and implementation perspectives, assessing the extent to which counterpart staff within the MOE, including provincial and zonal officers, are motivated and capacitated to implement the approach.
- the Program's influence on policy changes for more community involvement in educational management.
- the influence of the CFS approach on the development of GoSL's ESDFP 2012-16.
- the hand-over/phase-out plans and processes launched by UNICEF and the extent to which the capacity of key stakeholders has been developed to ensure sustainability.
- the benefits of the program and the overall likely sustainability of outcomes after the conclusion of Program activities.
- ❖ Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E): whether the program's monitoring and evaluation framework effectively measured progress towards meeting objectives.

Considering:

- the appropriateness and effectiveness of the monitoring, review, evaluation and reporting frameworks and procedures of UNICEF, MOE and AusAID under the Program, in terms of quantitative and qualitative baseline data collection, analysis and reporting in line with AusAID reporting requirements.
- whether the M&E framework was adjusted over the life of project to take account of changes.
- to what extent the program was successful in building capacity of the MOE's M&E system and UNICEF's M&E system.
- ❖ Gender Equality: whether the Program adequately identified and is effectively addressing, monitoring and reporting on gender equality issues.

Considering:

- the four dimensions of gender equality, namely access, decision-making, women's rights and capacity building.
- the extent to which gender equality objectives have been achieved under the Program, including activities that focus on girls/women (e. g. WASH etc.).

- ❖ Analysis & Learning: whether the program was based on sound technical analysis and continuous learning, the extent to which BESP supported *Australia's commitment to the principles of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action* and whether the Program responded appropriately to the emerging developments in its implementation and the changes in the Sri Lanka context.

Considering:

- any risks that were constraints to the success of the project in meeting its objective(s) and which may impact on the sustainability of program outcomes.
- the appropriateness and effectiveness of the approaches to risks and related risk management strategies of UNICEF, MOE and AusAID.
- the appropriateness and effectiveness of school based WASH activities (both under BESP and School WASH) towards overall program achievements.
- the level of program's coordination and integration with AusAID and other donor initiatives under the Sri Lanka program.
- the effectiveness of donor coordination within the Sri Lanka education sector.
- the extent to which UNICEF has taken steps and efforts to promote and maximise opportunities for building the identity of the program as Australian-funded (eg through appropriate references in program-related documentation and public information about the program) including enhancing Australian visibility.
- whether the Australian contribution and role was acknowledged and commended by the GoSL and communities in supporting the program.
- ❖ Cross-cutting issues: whether the program addressed cross-cutting issues including equity, disability, participation, conflict sensitivity, do no harm, poverty alleviation, HIV/AIDS and the environment.

Considering:

- the extent to which the program contributed to the fulfilment of AusAID policies on cross-cutting issues of equity, conflict sensitivity, poverty reduction, disability and inclusiveness.
- ❖ Conclusions and Recommendations: Following the assessment of the Program based on the above criteria and points for consideration, in the final chapter of the ICR team will:
 - provide a brief summary of the major findings and an overall assessment of the quality and success of BESP and the contribution of the program to the two strategic results and the six associated outcomes.
 - summarise the accountability for expenditure of Australian public funds on BESP activities.
 - summarise how BESP has contributed to the objectives of ESDFP.
 - discuss any issues or problems which adversely affected program outcomes as well as any particular strengths of the program.
 - make recommendations on how AusAID may position its future support to education in Sri Lanka to maximise the contribution of BESP considering AusAID's current investment in education and relevant policies.

6. DURATION AND TIMING

The ICR will be conducted for a period of 32 working days commencing around 2 October 2012, and completing around 31 January 2013.

For Team Leader:

Five days (2 days in UK and 3 days in SL) will be allocated for pre-mission documentation review and consultations as required, three days for travel to and from Sri Lanka, seven days for field work, eleven days (in SL) to for reading and preparation and write up the draft ICR and two days to finalise and submit the ICR after all comments have been provided by AusAID and other stakeholders on the draft ICR. One day will be allocated to participate in the Peer Review of ICR by phone. Three days will be allocated to incorporate Peer Review comments/suggestions and finalise the ICR report.

For Local Consultants: (27 days per person):

Four days will be allocated for pre-mission documentation review and consultations as required, three days to work with the Team Leader in Sri Lanka to develop a methodology, data and information collection. Seven days for field work, eleven days (in SL) for reading and preparation, to meet partners and write up the draft ICR with the Team Leader. One day to incorporate comments by AusAID and other stakeholders on the draft ICR. Another day will be allocated to incorporate Peer Review comments/suggestions and finalise the ICR report with the Team Leader.

An indicative schedule is provided below:

| | TEAM LEADER | | LOCAL EXPERTS | | Reporting date |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| PHASE | DAYS INPUT | TIMING | DAYS INPUT (Per Person) | TIMING | |
| PHASE ONE Pre-mission documentation review and consultations as required | 5 (Desk) | 2 days in early October in UK 3 days in Sri Lanka (11 to 13 Oct) | 4 3 days (11 to 13 Oct) | 2 – 11 October | |
| Travel to and from Sri Lanka | 3 | 09-10 Oct and 5-6 Nov. | | | |
| PHASE TWO Field work and write draft ICR | 18 (Sri Lanka) | 22 Oct – 9 Nov (Aide Memoire to AusAID by 9 Nov.) (Draft ICR to ERF for | 18 | 22 Oct – 9 Nov | Aide Memoire and draft ICR are due on 9 November |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| | | Quality Assurance by 9 Nov.) | | | |
| PHASE THREE Finalise draft ICR and submit to AusAID for comments by ERF. | | Draft ICR Submission to AusAID by 16 Nov | | | |
| PHASE FOUR Incorporate comments provided by AusAID and other stakeholders and finalise report | 2 (Desk) | 12 - 13 Dec. (Draft report to AusAID incorporating all comments by 13 Dec. 12) | 1 day inputs to incorporate comments and assist the team leader | 12 - 13 Dec | |
| PHASE FIVE Participation in Peer Review, incorporation of Peer Review Comments and finalisation of Report | (4 days Desk) | (1 day for PR and 3 days to incorporate PR comments) (Submission by 20 January but dependent on Peer Review dates) | 1 day inputs to incorporate PR comments and assist the team leader | | Mid January after the PR |
| TOTAL | 32 days (8 Desk and 24 in SL & travel) | | 27 days (20 home base & 7 in the field) | | |

7. METHODOLOGY

The Team will undertake (but are not limited to):

Phase 1: Pre-Mission Document Review and Consultations

Document Review and consultations before arriving in Sri Lanka will involve:

- (a) Examination of key Sri Lanka Country Program, BESP and related documents as listed in Section 10.
- (b) Briefing by key informants in AusAID Canberra, including the Sri Lanka Desk, relevant program, quality/performance, and thematic areas; and other Whole of Government partners as appropriate.
- (c) Contact with relevant AusAID Colombo (including AusAID's Regional Education Adviser based in Dhaka), UNICEF and GoSL officials for discussion as appropriate.

Phase 2: Field Review Work

Based on the pre-mission document review and consultations a field review will be undertaken by the Team involving a range of activities, including consultations, interviews, data gathering (qualitative and quantitative), program site visits and other activities as needed. The Team will consult with:

- AusAID Colombo Post officials;
- Relevant officials of counterpart Government agencies, including MOE, National Institute of Education, Finance Commission and Ministry of Local Government and Provincial Councils;
- Relevant education officials of at provincial, districts, zonal and divisional levels;
- Target schools, including regional education officers, principals, teachers, students and parents/communities;
- UNICEF;
- Other donors (including World Bank, ADB and GTZ) and INGOs; and
- Other stakeholders and/or beneficiaries.

Phase 3: Presentation of Initial Findings

The Team will document its initial findings in an Aide Memoire (Attachment C) and present it to AusAID to use as a basis for discussions. As part of consultations with the GoSL at the end of the field visit, the Mission will meet with key officials of UNICEF and the Ministry of Education and debrief them on the initial findings and recommendations.

Phase 4: Reporting and Peer Review

Based on consideration and analysis of the findings, a draft ICR will be prepared by the Team using the template provided in Attachment B as per the schedule in section 6. The Team Leader will participate in an internal AusAID Peer Review that will consider the ICR from a range of policy, thematic, program and country perspectives.

The Team will then prepare a final ICR as per the schedule in section 6. To ensure the integrity of the report, the Team, as an independent body, will incorporate changes and comments as it sees fit. In the case of any major divergence in views between the Team and the Peer Review, these should be noted in an Attachment to the final ICR.

8. TEAM COMPOSITION AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Mission will consist of the following professional members: an international education consultant who will act as Team Leader, two local education experts and AusAID's Regional Education Adviser (REA) who will provide technical advisory support to the Team. AusAID Colombo Post will facilitate the Mission's work in-country. Representatives from the MOE and UNICEF will also participate in the Mission.

The Team should have an appreciation of:

- 1 the Sri Lankan education policy context, in particular ESDFP and any recent government and development policies and particular policies relating to education;
- 2 Australia's Development Cooperation Program to Sri Lanka;

- 3 Project/Program evaluation principles and AusAID quality and performance policies and guidelines/instructions/requirements;
- 4 Relevant AusAID policies/frameworks including gender, anti-corruption, disability, peace, conflict and development, and education; and
- 5 AusAID's reporting and accountability requirements.

The Team members should have experience in consultative and participatory research methods and have appropriate analytical, research and report writing skills.

Role of Team Leader: ARF Classification Group B – Level 4

The Team Leader should have strong M&E expertise in the education sector and should have substantial experience in conducting project and program reviews and experience in being a Team Leader for appraisal, review and evaluation.

The Team Leader will:

- (i) Be responsible for the overall effective leadership, management and coordination of the Mission, including delivery of outputs in a timely manner.
- (ii) Work with AusAID Colombo and local consultants to identify key stakeholders to be visited and consulted including Government at all levels, UNICEF, beneficiaries, INGOs, NGOs and key informants to be interviewed. The Team Leader will determine key questions to be asked and information to be obtained from these stakeholders;
- (iii) Submit following within the first five days in Sri Lanka for agreement with AusAID:
 - A draft review method which summarises the methodology and work plan to achieve the objectives of the review, defining the roles and responsibilities of each members of the review team, and
 - A summary of information collected to date, identifying known information gaps and sources from which the required additional information is to be collected.
- (i) Direct the field review in accordance with the agreed review methodology and work plan as specified above, as well as allocation of responsibilities and timeline.
- (ii) Analyse data and draft sections of the ICR during the field review, delegating tasks to review team members according to agreed responsibilities.
- (iii) Prepare an Aide Memoire (up to five pages) covering the major findings, preliminary recommendations, lessons learned, and a clear summary of the review process. Upon completion of the field review the Team Leader will lead the Team's presentation to GoSL, UNICEF and AusAID in meetings as appropriate.
- (iv) Complete and submit to AusAID the first draft ICR, coordinating inputs from the review team members as per the schedule in section 6.
- (v) Submit the draft final ICR and final ICR to AusAID as per schedule in section 6.

Role of Local Education Consultants

The local education consultants should have extensive experience in the education sector with special focus on primary education. They should have a wide knowledge of GoSL education policies, management and monitoring systems at central, provincial, zonal and divisional levels.

The local education consultants will:

- (i) Work as directed by the Team Leader and assist to develop the review methodology, facilitate the field visits, arrange meetings and contribute draft inputs to sections of the ICR as required.
- (ii) Examine the program achievements in the local context with respect to cultural, religious and ethnic aspects.
- (iii) Support the Team Leader to collect and process the data and information in specified areas and with report writing.
- (iv) Report on regional disparities, challenges related to access and quality improvements and geographical and social issues with regard to the CFS approach.
- (v) Work as an interpreter where appropriate while coordinating meetings with relevant staff officers and local agencies.

Role of the Regional Education Advisor (REA)

The REA will provide guidance and overall technical support to assess the program, identify relevant issues and suggest appropriate remedies. He will visit the selected schools with the Team to monitor the achievements and provide technical guidance for further improvements of the system. The REA will guide the Team Leader to complete the Aide Memoire and draft and final ICRs as per AusAID guidelines.

9. OUTPUTS AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

At the conclusion of the Mission the Team will provide (for timing see section 6):

- 1 An Aide Memoire – The Mission will present the preliminary findings of the in-country field work in the form of an Aid Memoire (up to 5 pages) and verbal debrief prior to departure from Sri Lanka.
- 2 Draft Mission Report - The first draft of the ICR (up to 25 pages plus annexes) as per the template given in Attachment B will be submitted to AusAID Post for comment. If required it will be presented to AusAID Desk and the Education Thematic Group and a debriefing session through a teleconference may be arranged.
Post will forward the draft report to UNICEF and appropriate GoSL officials and other key stakeholders for comments. All comments from stakeholders will be forwarded to the Mission Team Leader in order to finalise the ICR.
- 3 Final Draft Report –The final draft ICR (around 25 pages plus annexes) incorporating AusAID and other stakeholders comments will be submitted to AusAID and it will be peer reviewed by AusAID with the participation of the Team Leader.
- 4 Final Report – The final ICR will be submitted to AusAID, incorporating all comments and suggestions by the Team Leader.

The final ICR should be a brief, clear and cogent summary of the review outcomes, focusing on a balanced analysis of issues faced by the Program and it should recommend ways to overcome any problems identified. Annexes should be limited to those that are essential for understanding the text.

Annex 2: The Evaluation Team

The evaluation core team comprised Angela Little (Team Leader), Wilfred Perera (national consultant), Muthu Sivagnanam (national consultant) and James Jennings (AusAID Regional Education advisor). In 2011 Little was involved in the work of AusAID in aligning its support over the period 2012-2016 with the government's Education Sector Development Framework Program via the World Bank. Perera is a former Deputy Director of the National Institute of Education and has been an advisor to the government on the Programme for School Improvement which is a central component of ESDFP. Sivagnanam is a former MOE Director of Primary Education and was director when UNICEF's child-friendly initiative commenced in 2002. The strengths of team members lie in the following: Little has worked with the Sri Lankan education system in various capacities (program design, evaluation and research) since 1975. She has worked with counterparts at every level of the system and in various capacities with SIDA, the World Bank, British Council, GIZ and, most recently, with AusAID. A former teacher and government officer, Perera has expertise in disability, school management and development. Prior to retirement from government service he was the Deputy Director General of the National Institute of Education, the apex national institute with responsibility for curriculum development for schools and teacher education institutions, research on curriculum and learning and school management and development and training for school managers. He has been involved in the development of the management program of school improvement (PSI). Sivagnanam was the director of primary education planning project (PEPP) and then the Director of Primary Education in the Ministry of Education between 1998 and 2003. Prior to that he was the MOE planning, monitoring and evaluation coordinator for SIDA supported projects. He has experience of working with schools and provincial administrations across the country and has specialized knowledge of the North and the East and the plantation areas of the Central and Uva provinces. James Jennings was previously involved in BESP at its design stage and as a member of the team that conducted the Mid Term Review in 2010. As Regional Education Advisor for South Asia he is responsible for planning and monitoring the education activities supported by AusAID in Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka and the Maldives.

Annex 3: Cross Cutting Issues

The TOR invite us to comment on the cross cutting issues of equity, conflict sensitivity, poverty reduction, disability and inclusiveness. Our assessment draws on assessments at project inception in 2008 where relevant.

Cross-cutting Issues and Responses

| Issue | Response |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Equity | <p>The program supports policy and strategy development for Education for All, with specific strategies to target the most vulnerable. Support has been provided to develop community led strategies to encourage regular attendance at school, and to reduce repetition and dropout rates. The CFS approach works within the framework of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), addressing the general principles of non-discrimination (Article 2); best interest of the child (Article 3); the right to life, survival and development (Article 6); and the right to participation (Article 12). Some of the other Articles that have direct relevance to education include: the rights and responsibilities of parents (Articles 5 & 18); freedom of expression (Article 13); freedom of thought (Article 14); right to information (Article 17); rights of children with disabilities (Article 23); right to education for health (Article 24); right to education (Articles 28 & 29); linguistic and cultural rights of children belonging to minority groups (Article 30); and right to rest, leisure, play and recreation (Article 31).</p> <p>BESP is implemented in 11 UN-designated districts, selected for their relative disadvantage. Within districts Zones were identified, again on the basis of overall disadvantage. Within Zones disadvantaged divisions were selected. Within divisions <i>all</i> schools were selected. While this process promotes synergies between project interventions in the same geographical area it also means that disadvantaged schools in less disadvantaged divisions, zones and districts are excluded.</p> |
| Poverty reduction | The extent to which BESP is leading to poverty reduction has not been assessed. |
| Disability | <p>Education for disabled children is included in ESDFP and MOE has established a designated unit to promote education for disabled children, island-wide. Support for disabled children appears to have attracted rather little attention during implementation.</p> <p>In one case where a child with disabilities was observed (deficient eyesight, spectacles destroyed in house fire) the school had no plan to support to purchase of new spectacles (in part because the child had received original pair already through normal procedures).</p> |
| Inclusiveness | CFS fosters improved articulation of the provisions noted above under equity to promote nurturing learning environments for all children, with a specific emphasis on inclusiveness, both in the sense of inclusion of all children within the school and in the |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>context of equity within the classroom, responding to the rights of all children.</p> <p>A good quality tool-kit for teachers, titled <i>Becoming More Inclusive</i> has been produced and distributed. This is of good quality and contains many points of practical guidance for teachers. Nonetheless, not all teachers are aware of the needs of (a very small minority) students excluded from learning activities at any given point in time (e.g. students who cannot participate in an activity for lack of paper or pencil).</p> <p>We observed very few 'disabled' children. Officially children with disabilities are included in mainstream classes, in special units/classes within the mainstream school or in special schools. We do not feel we had an opportunity to assess the extent to which schools are aware of the needs of all the children within their catchment area.</p> <p>Accelerated learning classes are available in many BESP schools to assist children who have fallen behind in their learning for reasons of war and displacement. There is evidence that in some schools these classes are actively used to support the learning needs of slow learners in mainstream classes</p> |
| Conflict sensitivity⁵ | <p>Equal participation and treatments are fundamental to the CFS approach, which is consistent with MOE policy. More specifically, the program for the focal districts demonstrates conflict sensitivity to social issues and poverty, together with impact of civil war, through the access strategies in Theme 1 and the various integrating strategies of the CFS in Theme 2, which are designed to assist in ameliorating conflict within local communities. After the cessation of hostilities in 2009 and the gradual resettlement of communities during 2010/11 BESP was rapidly extended to five districts in the Northern Province.</p> |

⁵ Conflict sensitivity as used in the BESP design document refers to the capacity and ability of an organisation to understand the context in which it operates; understand the interaction between the intervention and the context; and act upon the understanding of this interaction, in order to avoid negative impacts and maximise positive impacts. (Conflict-sensitive Approaches, to Development, *Humanitarian Assistance and Peace-building: A Resource Pack*, 2004).

Annex 4: School visit field report, October 21-16 2012

In addition to a round of interviews with project implementers based in Colombo the team undertook an extensive 5 day field exercise in the four provinces where BESP is implemented – the provinces of the North, the East, Central and Uva. The main purpose of the field exercise was to explore the extent to which BESP activities had been implemented and institutionalised at the level of the school. To this end we divided into two teams and visited 11 schools in the North and the East, and 6 in Central and Uva. The contribution of Janelle Denton and Dunstan Fernando, AusAID staff who accompanied the evaluation team in the field to the sections on school premises and parent perspective sections is gratefully acknowledged. In every school the principal and his/her team made impressive power point presentations of the progress of BESP implementation. We held further discussions with the 17 principals, observed teaching and learning in 17 classrooms, held discussions with over 100 teachers and 64 parents, and observed facilities in the school premises. In the Central, Uva, and Eastern provinces three additional short visits were made to three additional schools to explore three specific activities: a Basic Literacy Centre, an income-generating scheme and a school library housed in a revamped bus. In general we followed the visit schedule prepared by UNICEF. However in Uva Team 1 deviated and visited one school with short notice. We also met 6 provincial officers, 64 zonal officers, 32 divisional education officers, 25 in-service advisors in the four provinces. At each of 7 meetings officers made presentations of BESP school progress and we followed these up with small group and whole group discussions.

The report below is structured around six themes: observations of teaching and learning, observations of school premises, teacher perspectives on CFA, parent perspectives on community participation and CFA and principal and officer perspectives on school level planning for CFA and on the monitoring of CFA activity by the school, the division, the zone and the province.

Observations of teaching and learning

The observations of teaching and learning generate evidence in support of CFS criterion 3, the promotion of learning outcomes. They also provide some evidence in relation to criterion 1: rights based and proactively inclusive, criterion 4, healthy, safe and protective schools and criterion 5, engagement with students, families and the community.

In the North and East, the classes of seven Grade 4 teachers were observed. Classes were observed for an average of 20 minutes. In Central and Uva Provinces and the Ampara District of the East nine classes were observed, including one Grade 1, three Grade 2, three Grade 3 and two Grade 4. About 45 minutes was spent in each class which included observation of children's individual work, discussion with the teacher and an examination of the classroom environment and teaching-learning materials. Lessons observed included maths, First language, English, environmental science and religion. All teachers, bar one, had received training in Child Friendly teaching methods. The walls of all the classrooms were decorated attractively and included the display of children's work. The numbers of students in these classes varied from just six children to 43. Attendance rates were high in all except one school where a number of children were absent due to a local religious function. Because the classroom size was similar, classes with large numbers of children felt more congested and constrained than those where children could move around freely. In the latter the teacher was able to change the physical formation of children's activities with ease – from sitting to standing

in groups and circles. In all classes observed children sat in mixed gender groups. In most cases the group size was four, and in larger classes six. With the exception of four children in one class who sat at oversize desks, all children sat on and worked at age-appropriate, brightly painted, chairs and desks. Three of the classrooms were noisy with only half or three quarter walls. In one case the noise was so great that the teacher was forced to screech to make her heard. The greatest noise distraction was the booming and screeching of teacher voices in neighbouring classes. The hum and buzz of children working in neighbouring classes was much less distracting.

Except in the cases where children were working individually while the teacher spoke to the observer, the use of time was heavily teacher-directed. The balance and rhythm of teacher talk, teacher questions to students and student desk work varied. In some classes teacher talk was punctuated infrequently with a question posed to the whole class, inviting a chorus response in unison. In others teacher talk was punctuated more frequently with questions to the whole group, questions to individual students and desk work activities of short duration. On no occasion was a student observed posing a question to the teacher or to another student. In no case was differentiated (or multi-level) teaching observed. All children were 'taught' the same lesson and their desk work activities were undifferentiated. However in some of the classrooms learning materials for different levels were available as well as teaching aides made by the teacher and parents. The teachers reported that they used these to help weaker pupils and to stretch the more advanced. Book corners were in use in a few classrooms, and most classrooms had small stages (made by the teacher or parents) for children to share their talents.

In general classrooms were bright and colourful. Many teacher-created cardboard learning aids were displayed and in most cases these were balanced with displays of student work. In some classrooms there were teaching aides made by the parents. In one rather congested urban classroom an entire wall was given over to a hanging rack for children's colourful lunch bags, a space that might otherwise have been used for the display of children's work or for a blackboard for children's use.

In all classes the vast majority of pupils were attentive throughout and very keen to engage in activities, individually and in groups. In no case was a teacher observed punishing a child physically or verbally and overall the interaction was cordial and positive. The quality of teaching methods employed was good, but not exceptional. The average quality was similar to that observed in classes in many non BESP schools in non BESP districts (this judgement is based on one of the observer's experience of countless class observations in many non BESP districts over many years). Because only BESP schools were observed the authors cannot draw comparisons with non BESP schools in BESP districts.

Observation of School Premises

The observations of the school premises and environment address several aspects of the CFA criteria – e.g. criterion 2.3 on gender appropriateness of facilities, criterion 3 on classroom facilities and environment conducive to learning and criterion 4 on healthily, safe and protective environments. The premises of 17 schools were observed in North, East, Central and Uva Provinces. Clean and pleasant school environments were noted in all schools visited. Some schools close to towns have taken extra efforts to maintain cleanliness by banning non-biodegradable rubbish (e.g. polythene) on school premises. Most schools have compost bins and compost pits to collect garbage. Vegetable and fruit trees are being cultivated using compost fertilizer produced within schools. Most schools have well-arranged vegetable gardens

and flower gardens. Some schools sell their vegetable and fruits and use the profits to support poor school children. Others use the produce to contribute to the children's breakfast/midday meal to help improve nutrition levels. One urban school in Batticaloa with limited land still managed to have a small school garden. Other schools closer to towns did not have sufficient land to establish school gardens. Similarly, most schools located in dry zone face water shortage during the dry season and they find it difficult to maintain vegetable and fruit gardens during this season.

Schools feel that a clean and pleasant environment helps to increase attendance of students and teachers. It also motivates parents to visit school regularly and contribute their labour to improve the school premises. Principals and teams of each and every school maintain their buildings and other infrastructure by using low cost methods. They carefully plan and repair infrastructure with minimum cost but with full participation of children and school communities. A few schools had broken infrastructure e.g. taps or play equipment that they were waiting to save up money to repair.

Classrooms generally are clean and meals are eaten in the classroom. Some are more cramped than others. Classrooms are also attractive to kids with colourful educational materials and pictures/drawings. School walls are often painted with colourful educational pictures and sayings. Most classrooms were very noisy and few had a partition wall to ceiling height with the next classroom.

All schools had some toilets and running water facilities. Some may not have been sufficient according to MOE norms e.g. not enough toilets per student, not adequate drinking water (once per day in the dry season) or no sink. All schools had separate girls and boys toilets. Efforts are being made by school communities to keep toilets clean. Even in dry areas, toilets are being cleaned by students and parents every morning. It is unclear whether water quality is checked regularly, especially in the dry zone. Some toilets/water facilities were provided by BESP where this was prioritised in the SDP. Others had been provided by NGOs or the government. It was noted that some rural schools provided hand washing facilities to kids through their health clubs.

All schools had a surrounding fence, though some were better quality than others. Some schools have received funds from BESP and Ministry of Economic Development for fences or repair works. Proper coordination of funding from different sources is necessary to obtain maximum benefit to needy schools.

Guidelines given by Health and Nutrition section of MOE motivate principals, teachers and students to promote hygiene education with the support of parents and health officials. SSA and SDP provide awareness for parents and educational authorities on school requirements including buildings and toilets. Posters for international hand washing day/hygiene awareness and world mental health day were visible in some schools.

First aid boxes are available in all schools. Some only have one in the Principal's office while others have one in every classroom. Some boxes were not well stocked. A couple of schools had a dedicated sick room. Schools in vulnerable areas have implemented disaster risk reduction by indicating evacuation routes, mine risk education signs and posters about natural disasters. Support from physical planning and technical sections of provincial MOEs is necessary to develop appropriate building plans e.g. some plantation schools have only one entrance and this is against the disaster preparedness/management aspects.

All schools provided a breakfast or a midday meal for all students. This was funded either by

WFP or by the government. Food preparation areas were very basic with little storage and few utensils. Despite being old and basic, kitchens were reasonably clean and food covered. Cooking is mostly done by parents sometimes on a rotational basis or by a hired cook in wealthier schools.

No infrastructure specific to the needs of people with disability was observed.

Teacher Perspectives

Teacher perspectives

Interviews with teachers generated further evidence for criterion 3. Individual and group interviews were conducted with a total of 111 teachers in 17 schools in the Northern, Eastern, Central and Uva Provinces.

Of those interviewed all but one teacher had trained as a primary teacher at a College of Education, at a Teacher Training College or through the distance mode. The vast majority of teachers had been trained in the child friendly approach, some through school-based training provided by ISAs or divisional officers, and some through visits to Child friendly schools within the province or in the Uva or Central provinces. In most cases the CFA orientation had been provided to the whole school or at least to all the primary teachers. This was supplemented by the Principals and individual teachers attending longer training courses on CFA at zonal or divisional centres. A variety of other school based training was also reported, including on primary teaching methods, the making of teaching aides and the Essential Learning Competencies. In most cases the training was provided by Divisional education officers. In a few cases schools had engaged local resource persons to provide training on topics such as mental health and road safety. Teachers reported that when any teacher went away for training, s/he was generally expected to share the concepts from the training with other teachers in the school. The ways of doing this varied but in a number of schools it was through staff meetings or quality circles. Teachers in two schools reported that the primary teachers in their school had provided some orientation and support to introduce the CFA approach in the secondary section of the school.

The majority of the teachers had seen a copy of the recently published Guidance Manual on the Child Friendly Approach. In two schools no teacher had seen a copy, though the teachers spoke of having received handouts during training sessions. In a school with 19 Grade 1-5 teachers it was thought that five copies of the manual might be available in the school. In other schools there was only one. In only a few schools was there evidence that the manual (which was distributed during 2012 in Tamil and Sinhala was currently being well used for training or reference purposes or had been read. In one school the teachers reported that they had all read the manual. In one school the teachers where there was only one copy the teachers were reading it on a rotation basis, and one teacher had it with her during the interview. One school reported that they had discussed the manual in a staff meeting and also that they had been given a small photocopied booklet summarising the main points.

In two schools in the North teachers spoke very movingly about their experiences of multiple displacements, of their time in Nanthi Kadal and in the refugee camp at Manik Farm. Initially communities moved together along with whatever school materials and furniture they could transport from place to place. Between May 2009 and 2010 they were temporarily housed at Manik Farm. Here, interned teachers and education officers provided the rudiments of education. Female teachers spoke of the indignity of sharing a single small living space with other families and children whom they taught later in the day, often dressed only in a housecoat

and slippers. When educational materials were brought from outside to the camp, the female teachers' priority request was for saris to restore their dignity as teachers in front of their students. They spoke of their and many of their students' loss of family members. The BESP programme with its child friendly approach appears to have had an enormous impact on helping these teachers to re-establish their schools as places where students felt secure and happy. For children experiencing personal difficulties, teachers reported that they support them by providing a child friendly environment and by giving them special attention and care. Where discussed most of the teachers also reported that they had referred children to the Counselling Teacher in the school.

All teachers were able to articulate the basic idea of a child friendly school as one where children should be happy, engaged, caring and learning well, where teachers and students should enjoy friendly relations, where children feel free and where their health and safety is protected, where teachers were sensitive to children's backgrounds. Most of the teachers were able to articulate how they are ensuring the fulfilment of children's rights within their classrooms. These included ensuring gender equality and the right to express one's views, equal opportunities, safety, protection and recreation. All the teachers reported that corporal punishment had been eliminated in their schools, and many gave examples of positive measures they use to ensure classroom discipline and personal responsibility. These include giving children special attention as well as specific tasks, roles and responsibilities. Teachers reported that in implementing the CFA their classrooms have become more joyful, child centred and active.

All teachers used the essential learning competency booklets or sheets to assess their children's learning, though practices were diverse. In some cases teachers used items in the booklets to assess learning at the end of a 'unit'. Others employed items as an end of term test. Teachers distinguished between the competencies assessed through teacher observation and those assessed through student tasks. In some classes competencies were displayed in a chart on the wall. In one class children self-evaluated their performance and ticked cells in the chart; on another it was the teacher who ticked boxes. None of the teachers questioned was able to explain clearly the relationship between the continuous and one-off competency assessments, the relationship between the one off assessments and end of term and end of year assessments. Teachers kept detailed records on each child though we were unable to gauge whether the continuous and one-off assessments of competencies were used 'formatively' to effect changes in the way a teacher taught a particular child or whether they were used 'summatively' as an indicator of performance at the end of a unit or course. One teacher commented on the higher level of learning competencies among current Grade 1 and 2 children and the competencies of his current Grade 4 children when they had re-settled and returned school as Grade 3 children after spending almost two unsettled years on the move and in the refugee camp. In one school the teachers had developed a very 'inclusive' approach to the assessment of competencies by allowing children up to five attempts to demonstrate their competencies and the teacher an opportunity to change his or her teaching practices to help the student demonstrate the mastery of the competency. In their presentation of CFA achievement the principal was proud to report that '100% of children had attained 80% of mastery after up to five attempts'.

In most schools there was little evidence of teacher's adaptation of curriculum to local context, except through the use of local materials as learning aids and the choice of local sites for school outings. In a few schools teachers reported using local resource persons, including parents, for enhancing their lessons with local knowledge. Examples included village elders sharing local history as well as cultural values and local people with technical skills sharing

about their work.

In one very large urban with four parallel Grade 1 and three parallel Grade 2 classes, teachers had formed quality circles and shared their plans and teaching aids. Quality circles were referred to in a number of schools as a means of teachers' sharing their expertise and for learning from one another. All the teachers observed had lesson plans as well as detailed records of their children's work.

Although no teacher had been observed employing differentiated teaching, one reported that slow learners in her class were sent to ALP classes, while another said that she used ALP materials in her class with slow learners. Teachers reported that slow learners, or learners who, because of displacement had missed out on the foundations of learning, had little difficulty in undertaking tasks that relied on oral language and concrete manipulation of materials. Their greatest learning constraint was their inability to write language at the level expected for their grade. Very few children had been formally identified as having special education needs but teachers spoke of 'slow learners' and in a few cases of children with 'learning difficulties'. Although generally children are expected to progress at the same pace, teachers did talk about providing activities and materials at the appropriate level for each child, particularly those having difficulty keeping up and those excelling in their studies. In a few classes there were reading and maths activity cards which could be used with children according to their level. In a few schools teachers reported that they keep special records of children experiencing difficulty in learning and some teachers discussed the need to sequence activities from the simple to the more complex. Teachers also reported giving extra time and attention to 'slow learners' and providing classes for them after school. Peer support was mentioned in one school. In one school with a Special Education Unit a teacher reported that one of her children had been given special help in the unit for a few weeks and then was supported to reintegrate into the regular classroom.

In most schools it was reported that there had been no dropouts during the last year in the primary grades. In one community extreme household poverty led a small number of families to migrate in search of work, taking their children with them, or of parents in search of daily work leaving their children at home and away from school to protect their temporary dwellings from animal intrusions. In cases of poor attendance teachers reported that they contacted and worked with the parents in order to improve attendance and to prevent the children dropping out. Home visits were made by some teachers. Where attendance was a major concern teachers in a number of schools reported that they refer the children to the School Attendance Committee.

Teachers in most schools spoke of their involvement in the school self assessment (SSA) and in their definition of priorities, including minor infrastructure improvements to build protective fences and walls and to beautify the school environment. In some cases they were also involved in the development and monitoring of the School Development Plan (SDP). They were aware of their responsibilities for implementing the aspects of the SDP related to teaching and learning.

Most teachers were enthusiastic about the increased involvement of parents and communities in their schools and classrooms following the introduction of the CFA. Besides parents' involvement in the SSA and SDP processes and their contribution in kind to the schools, many of the teachers were able to show the parents' contributions in their classrooms. This included the construction and upkeep of furniture, painting of classrooms and the making of teaching-learning materials. In some schools parents are on a rota to help with the cleaning of

classrooms, and in one school there is a rota for a parent to assist in the classroom for each day of the week.

Parents/Community Member Perspectives

Interviews with parents/community members generated evidence in support of CFS criterion 5: engagement with students, families and the community. They also provided evidence in support of criteria 1-4.

In the North and the East, interviews were conducted with 34 parents/community members across six schools. In Central and Uva, 30 parents/community members were interviewed in nine schools. All parents interviewed were members of the School Development Society (SDS) and some were also members of the School Development Committee under PSI. Selected parents of the School Development Committee were also members of the School Attendance Committee (SAC). Both men and women were involved in these societies and committees. Executive positions were more often held by men but men's participation in general school affairs is less during the cultivation and harvesting seasons.

Parents/community members were able to describe the Child Friendly Approach and articulate changes which have been seen around the school. These included: improvement in learning achievement, improvement in children's attitude to teachers, a more motivated principal, no corporal punishment, better parent/teacher interaction, children happy at school and wanting to come to school, children and adults understand child rights, equal access among boys and girls, increased attendance by students and teachers, good hygiene practices and a protective, friendly school environment. Some parents mentioned that they have made some efforts to maintain child friendly environment at their homes as well.

At least one person in each group was a member of the School Attendance Committee (SAC). The committee works with teachers to track school attendance and work with other parts of the community (GN, PHI, *samurdhi* officer) to reintegrate children into school. Most schools did not need to find and reintegrate children as they said attendance was high since the implementation of CFS. One example was given in Kilinochchi of four boys who had gone to work as fisherman but with the help of the community, had been reintegrated and remain in school. In plantation communities, drop-outs can be seen after grade 6 due to long distances to secondary school, poverty and lack of parent's interest in education. The SAC conducts home visits to educate parents on the importance of education and the impact of irregular attendance. Parent meetings were also conducted in selected schools to avoid irregular attendance. If there is short term absenteeism due to financial barriers, other parents/community members will sometimes contribute e.g. washing clothes, buy shoes/books etc.

Most groups understood child rights, including that education is compulsory for children less than 14 years of age. They were also not aware of any corporal punishment since BESP began. Some said if children misbehave the teacher will talk to the child about his/her behaviour, take them to the principal's office and discuss the issue with the parents. Parents were happy that the teacher would discuss the child's behaviour with them as needed or through regular parent/teacher meetings. Some parents said the children were now very aware of their rights and this has positively changed things at home. One parent said the teacher sometimes makes a child kneel on the ground if they are naughty. Some parents had more limited knowledge of child rights. They believe that corporal punishment is out-dated but that principals and teachers should be strict enough to control the behaviour of students.

All parents/community members interviewed had been involved in the SSA process. Stakeholders involved in this process included principals, teachers, students, parents and community members (including well-wishers and past students). The participation of community based organisations, including women's forums and income generating groups, was significant in Ampara district. One group in Batticaloa said only adults, not students, were involved in the SSA. The process varied between schools with some holding one large session involving all stakeholders, some breaking into mixed groups and some into separate interest groups to discuss. Generally, both men and women equally participated in the SSA process. No parents/community members said that they had been involved in assessing the teachers or the principal but one group did say that the principal was open to feedback at any time.

Executive members of the SDC were closely involved in SDP development and monitoring activities. Parents/community members were aware of the priorities in the School Development Plan which have already been implemented but few were able to articulate the next priorities for school development. Parents/community members (outside the executive committee) do not seem to play a formal role in monitoring the implementation of the SDP but many mentioned a strong, open relationship with the principal which allowed them to ask questions about the progress of school activities. Several groups also pointed out that since the CFS started, and parents/community could see the motivation/commitment of the principal and teachers, they were much more willing to donate time and resources to the school.

None of the parents/community groups had received formal training or participated in any exchange visits arranged under BESP. They had, however, participated in several awareness raising sessions at the school level.

Planning

School planning through School Self Assessment (SSA)

The BESP aimed to strengthen school management and school improvement through a two pronged approach: School Self-Assessment (SSA); and School Development Plans (SDPs) with the participation of school teachers, principals, students and community members. SSA and SDP are essential components of CFA. Through the process of SSA school performance is assessed in relation to the six dimensions of CFA. The SSA brings parents and the community together with the teachers, principal and students to discuss the school learning environment through the CFA lens. SSA aims to:

- 1.1.1 Involve children as equal partners in decision making about the priorities for the school plan
- 1.1.2 Identify of the most vulnerable children in the schools;
- 1.1.3 Involve the community in the teaching learning process inside classrooms;
- 1.1.4 Review or develop the attendance monitoring system at the school;
- 1.1.5 Consider community-led school feeding programmes at the school; and
- 1.1.6 Consider protective, safe, and clean learning school environments.

SSA was found to be a very strong feature in all the seventeen project schools. The in-school staff explained the process of SSA with enthusiasm. We heard how the principal, teachers, parents, old pupils, well-wishers and students (Grade 5 students in type 3 schools, Grade 10/11 students in type 2 schools and Grade 12/13 students in Type 1AB/ C schools) come together to discuss issues and gaps that need to be addressed. These discussions are reported to be very open and productive. The methodologies varied from school to school. In some schools officers from the zone/division guided discussions. In others principals and teachers had an initial meeting in order to prepare for the main meeting. The numbers participating in the SSAs varied

from 24 to 50 persons. In some schools the whole group worked together. They had common meetings and pooled the ideas of different groups. They did not conduct separate group meetings for each of the group. In others they met in separate stakeholder groups (i.e. parents met among themselves and students separately etc.). Of the ten schools visited in the Northern and Eastern provinces five schools conducted separate group meetings and in the other five schools all the stakeholders met together. The ideas of each group were presented by representatives to a selected small group. A common meeting is then convened to merge the ideas presented by different groups. Meals/refreshments, paid for from BESF funds, are provided at these sessions.

Among the group of 'well wishers' there were doctors, other local hospital staff, *samurdhi-niladaris*, *grama-niladaris*, agriculture officers, PHIs, police officers, child probation officers. Since these persons participate in SSA they get first-hand information of the school and become passionate towards school improvement.

Central to CFA are new roles for education stakeholders, mainly the principals, parents, teachers, the students and well-wishers. Talking together, deliberating together and working together have created constructive and committed teams. Collective diagnosis of problems and issues, planning and progress review in groups has increased the morale, generated knowledge, inculcate positive attitudes and develop skills among the stakeholders. The stakeholders in almost all the cases consist of heterogeneous groups. Their backgrounds, experiences, values, and beliefs are diverse. However they display greater creativity, innovation. The groups are self-motivated and self-directed. Applying learning to real life situations, they have found solutions to problems. They while working together in implementing change have identified further insights and better ways of doing things.

School and the Community

The processes that started with SSA have brought about a 'marriage' between the school and the community. The school is reaching out to the community. In number schools in all the provinces, the principal and some teachers have visited almost all the homes and have in-depth information of families. Home visits provide information not only on drop outs but also on economic and social status, broken families, child abuse etc. Schools have been able intervene as necessary in such circumstances. One school in Uva conducts a night learning centre and maintains a night visit book. A school in Eastern province the school is open for fourteen hours. The commitment of parents has grown so much that they have solved a number of problems (e.g. excavating until water is found). Resource persons in the community provide valuable services to the school. These include extra classes in subjects like Science by doctors, ICT by competent persons, and agriculture by agriculture officers. In some schools parents come in the morning and clean the premises. In all the provinces parents contribute toward renovation of building, beautifying gardens. A school in the Northern Province has planted nearly two hundred trees in the school premises. Zonal directors of Mullaitivu and Kilinochchi observed that SSA has introduced a lively mode of mobilizing community resources in rural districts which are disadvantaged and very remote. Professionals of diverse sectors and civil society organizations participate in the SSA process because it leads to visible outputs.

If the school is to be viewed as an asset to the community and to gain co-operation and support from the community as a whole, there is a need to facilitate the home-school partnership, with parents perceiving the school positively, sharing with teachers the education of their children on a regular basis. Welcoming parents into school is vital. In project schools though parental involvement in many areas were commendable, parents still remain less involved in child

learning.

The implementation of the School Development Plan (SDP) including the identification of resources

BESP used SDP as a school level instrument to plan and implement strategies for achieving the six CFA criteria. Based on the SSA schools were to identify and prioritize the needs of the school. Under BESP schools have received a school grant to support primary classroom renovation, classroom separation, school fence and gate, repairs to teachers' quarters and school furniture, hiring resource persons for teaching, and teaching and learning material preparation.

After SSA the project schools developed a one year School Development Plan. The school staff and community demonstrated an ownership to this plan. The principal and staff were committed to the implementation of the SDP with parents and well-wishers. Initially the grant received helped the schools to meet urgent requirements and, motivated by this, additional contributions began to flow from parents. In most schools, parents provided voluntary labour to repair classrooms and furniture. In the Northern Province, parents and community members, though poor, came forward to add value to the school improvement activities through voluntary, unpaid work.

The schools obtained voluntary services from well-wishers to implement activities in the SDP. In the Northern Province the isolated small schools have benefitted greatly through this mechanism. A Zonal director from Northern Province noted that in most schools the SDP is formulated with the involvement of community which was hitherto kept at a distance from the school. SDP often went beyond the formal learning and infrastructure development. It also included co-curricular activities and student participation in income generation projects. In two schools in Uva pupils were involved in income generation after school. In one school a parent involved in the eekle-broom industry, came to the school from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. and a group of children were trained to make eekle-brooms. The raw material was brought by students. The school sold these eekle-brooms and the money was used for school activities. The students also gained new skills. In another school the students were making flowerpots.

The Involvement of the Zonal/ Divisional Office

One distinct change that has occurred through CFA is the involvement of the zone/division in school activities. Compared with results reported by the authors of previous studies (Piyadasa et al, 1984; Bandara 1992; Wijesundara et al, 1997; CELD, 2001; Nedungamuva, 2009; Perera, 2009; Malini, 2010) there is an improvement in zonal/divisional involvement in school development. In our discussions, the interviewees were happy to describe how schools had been helped and guided by officers. The frequency of visits to schools by officers has increased. They participated in SSA, teacher discussions and monitoring. They arrange schools to visit other schools. The Zonal director in Ampara said that schools are given guidance by the officers of the zone and the division. It is evident that they have become partners in school development through this intervention. Another Zonal director (Walapane) said that the project has given schools a new culture where all have become reflective practitioners. Another Zonal director (Samanthurai) said that the zone earlier was mainly concerned about GCE AL and GCE OL performances, but now is very keen on primary education as well. He further added that while they earlier considered parents to be a burden to school administration now appreciates parental contribution. The Zonal director (Batticaloa) said that he has less to worry about schools now as they have started assessing themselves and actively engaged in finding solutions to gaps they identify without much cost.

In the zones where the CFA has been introduced, the officers responsible for the project and the divisional director are very involved and play key roles. They are well accepted and their relationships with the schools have grown. However the extent to which the *other officers* are involved are not known as they did not participate at the meetings that were organized. The new role of the officers for all good reasons has to evolve through reflections of officers themselves. Their role will become clear through engagement, keeping with the norm '*one learn by doing*'. In the CFA initiative every school is assigned to one officer. Through their involvement in schools the officers are now engaged more deeply in their fundamental mission. A collaborative partnership between the office and the school community is enabling school improvement efforts sustain. However it was noted that the officers' involvement in effecting 'classroom change' or education development was marginal.

Basic Literacy Classes (BLCs)

In the BESP, the main objective of the BLCs is to provide basic literacy and competency for out-of-school children who could not be mainstreamed into the formal system immediately because of poor education performance. BLCs take place outside the regular school and support children to reach the minimum literacy and numeracy indicators for reintegration into the formal school system.

BLCs were not very common in schools that were visited but where they were functioning served the expected result. In the central province school, a teacher assistant was working with a group of students and was integrating the children when they reached the required literacy level. She followed up with the students that were integrated in the classes and kept close relationship with the teachers in the school. BLC classes are conducted in Batticaloa district but the teacher assistants do not get any financial assistance from BESP.

An officer from the central provincial ministry noted that there are schools in certain other divisions where the schools are more deprived but have not received attention through CFA. It was also pointed out at the central province meeting that several NGOs are active in some zones and leading in some cases to duplications of intervention, Provincial level staff suggested that it was easier for schools to access the funds they needed for CFA through UNICEF project intervention than through the slower procedures through ESDFP. The officers of the zones noted that finances sometimes arrived late through the ESDFP mode. They also mentioned of instances where the monies were diverted for other requirements.

Monitoring and Evaluation

School Level

Since the school is the level at which most of the BESP activities have taken place it is important to know whether the schools have established an appropriate information system for planning, management, monitoring and evaluation. All the schools visited have an understanding of the importance of keeping information relevant to quantitative and qualitative indicators in relation to the CFA dimensions and criteria. However, the data available were not systematically organized.

School Attendance Committees (SACs) are functioning in all the 17 schools visited. The community and village level government officers are involved in this committee, which has created an opportunity for the parents and the community to survey the catchment area of the school and assess the extent of enrolment of school going age children in schools. All schools

had a map of the catchment area of the particular school but only one school had the particulars of all children in the relevant catchment area. Those that did not have these particulars had the particulars of the out of school children. SACs monitor student attendance and potential drop outs and these records generate information on the CFS indicator on student attendance which falls under CFS criterion 1.1. One school displays a chart on teacher attendance and the principal was of the opinion that this helps reduce teacher absenteeism.

Student Attendance Committees

The community members of two SACs (one in Kilinochchi and one in Mullaitivu) work with 'focal points' in different *Grama Niladhari* Units in the extensive catchment area consisting of several villages. The focal points feed the principal with the information on children not attending any school and bring them to the school to be enrolled. They also identify the barriers for non-enrolment and seek measures to alleviate such barriers. This type of initiative was also observed in schools with multi-village catchment areas in the Uva and Central provinces as well.

Out of the ten schools the mission visited in the North and East, seven are rural schools catering to the fishing community and agricultural community. Four of these rural schools were very close to the community and helped them in resolving social and cultural problems emerging in the community. This positive relationship between the school and community was observed in a majority of schools visited in the Uva Central Provinces as well. In such schools, effective community participation in monitoring students' attendance and non-enrolment has relieved the principal and teachers of the work load of surveying the catchment area to identify children non-enrolled in any school.

School Self Assessment (SSA) was in place in all the 17 schools visited though the quality of the records maintained varied. Though SSA provides opportunities for the involvement of students in the monitoring of CFS activities, five of the ten schools visited in the Northern and Eastern Provinces did not show evidence on student participation in SSA. The five schools had classes from grade 1 to 5 only and it was pointed out that the students were involved under the guidance of teachers along with the parents and community members. In the Uva and Central provinces there was evidence on students participation in all the seven schools visited. The principals have realized the importance of maintaining school level data to facilitate the SSA process and a list of potential sources of funds to guide the SDP process.

Principals of all the 17 schools visited are of the view that monitoring of CFA indicators helps ensure accountability of the school to the community and identify constraints. The production of the school development plan is a key element of CFA and schools have developed diverse monitoring tools and their own systems which generate information for the formulation and revision of SDPs. School level review meetings are held to evaluate the implementation of SDPs. The schools have the latest information pertaining to students' achievement at the Grade 5 scholarship Examination. All the schools have prepared trend data and use them for their future plans. Evidence of records of inputs to schools was observed only in two schools in the North and East. However, these records did not include the details of different types of capacity building inputs and inputs in the form of teacher training etc. The suggestion boxes in the schools intended for students' suggestion on school improvement have proven to be a valuable source of monitoring information. The School Development Committee gets evaluation feedback from the students through written suggestions and opinions preserving anonymity. The CFS Guidance Manual has been received in all but one school visited by the mission. Currently the Manual sets out the CFA criteria and sub criteria and makes some suggestions about the types of activities that might be put in place to meet the criteria. However, some of

these are very broad (e.g. child centred methodologies are used) and no indicators are suggested.

Almost all the principals of schools visited in the North and East expressed a feeling of disgust with preparing documents containing a lot of information which are of least use to them. Moreover, it was observed that they had not been sufficiently trained on collating information required for the construction of key indicators that fall under CFS criteria.

Divisional Level

In all four provinces Divisional Education Officers (DEO) visit schools and monitor progress. They use common monitoring tools provided by the respective Provincial Education Departments. The tools differ from province to province. SACs are supported by seven divisional-based and five zonal-based attendance monitoring mechanisms in Uva and Central provinces respectively. It is not clear as to why such mechanisms have not been established in other districts such as Trincomalee and Batticaloa, which showed comparatively low student attendance rate. Divisional Education officers hold monthly review meetings with school principals. All the principals in all the seventeen schools visited reported that progress on all six dimensions of CFS is discussed at this meeting. The mission had no opportunity to peruse the records at the Divisional office in this regard.

Zonal Level

While zonal education officials monitor CFS activity at school level three principals in the North and East were of the view that the officers' feedback had provided little guidance for further improvement. The zonal monitoring priorities do not conflict with CFS dimensions and criteria. Zonal Directors of Education (ZDE) in the Northern Province have prepared their own tools basing on CFS dimension for monitoring the performance of CFA schools. Divisional Education Officers also use this tool and they visit the schools more often than the ZDEs. This six page tool is being reviewed and revised.

Provincial Level

In the Northern Province, the Additional PDE informed that Provincial Monitoring Panel monitors the progress of CFA schools. He also stated that the panel has a standardized monitoring tool to administer in the CFA schools. This tool, which is used for external evaluation by the team led by the PDE, is different from that used by the ZDEs and DEOs. The PDE Eastern province informed that the Provincial Education Department has prepared its own monitoring tools to monitor progress in all CFS dimensions at school level.

The responsibility for the monitoring of CFA in schools has been assigned to the PSI coordinators at zonal level to ensure that PSI and CFS are in harmony. Monitoring CFS is a part of Divisional Education Officer's responsibility. Guidelines and instructions are to be sent to include CFS monitoring in the list of duties of education officials at all levels in the Eastern province. CFA will be an important aspect in the external evaluation carried out by the School Monitoring Panel at the Provincial Education Department.

In the Eastern Province, CFS steering committees are functioning at divisional and zonal level. According to the PDE (E.P), the process of implementing CFS has helped the provincial department to develop and maintain a data base on student attendance and drop out. This information system is in place from school level to the provincial level. All relevant officials have been trained to manage this information system.

Impressive presentations on CFA made at school level, district level (Trincomalee & Batticaloa) and Eastern Provincial levels indicate that an appropriate M & E system is in place at all levels.

When contacted for clarification by a member of the mission, the Deputy Director (Planning) at the Eastern Provincial Department informed that officers at the Zonal Education offices have been sufficiently trained to maintain a data base in relation to student achievement at national level examinations and school based assessment on Essential Learning Competencies in addition to student enrolment, retention and completion.

In the Uva and central provinces monitoring of CFA is based on the CFA monitoring tools piloted in these provinces by the central ministry of education. Zonal/divisional offices/ISAs visit schools and monitor to the given criteria and indicators. The process was appreciated by seven of the nine schools visited in Central and Uva, but two schools felt the process to be mechanical. They felt some officers lack in-depth knowledge on certain aspects of the dimensions and their actual practice. This is some concern as this can de-motivate schools. The monitoring process also resulted in comparing schools and majority felt that this provides motivation though the argument can be raised of the different conditions that each school is working with. The zone also have the responsibility for compiling and publishing school profiles to monitor efficiency and effectiveness based upon published criteria such as student: staff ratio, success in student achievement etc. The Uva and central provinces have produced a number of such documents. The physical and content quality of the documents produced in the Uva and Central provinces need to be evaluated in the light of their cost implications.

Overall it was observed that the monitoring of CFA in BESP schools has become institutionalized in the routine monitoring by officers in education divisions, zones and provincial departments. The education officers in these provinces use appropriate checklists to monitor progress and are able to maintain a comprehensive monitoring data base in which data from BESP schools are integrated.

Annex 5: Program of Meetings

| Date | Venue | Theme / Subject | Participants |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11.10.2012 | Cinnamon Grand Hotel | Initial Discussion to prepare for meetings on 12.10.2012 | Prof. Angela Little, Dr. Wilfred Perera Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam |
| 12.10.2012 | AHC, Colombo | Discussion Review Process | Mr. Edward Archibald, Counselor Sri Lanka and Maldives Mr. Dunstan Fernando Mission members |
| 12.10.2012 | UNICEF Colombo office | Presentation by UNICEF and discussion | List 1 attached |
| 12.10.2012 | Ministry of Education, Isurupaya | Fact finding on Review themes | List 2 attached |
| 18.10.2012 | UNICEF Colombo office | Fact finding on M & E issues | Ms. M. Wickramarathna Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam |
| 20.10.2012 | Cinnamon Grand Hotel | Discussion and Agreement on tools and design for Field observation Visit | 1st meeting Prof. Angela Little, Dr. Wilfred Perera Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam Mr. Jennings James Ms. Janelle Denton 2nd meeting Ms. Katrina Stringer with Mission members |
| 22.10.2012 to 26.10.2012 | | Field visit – programme attached | |
| 22.10.2012 | Girls High School, Moon plain T V | School observation in the Nuwara Eliya District by Team 1 | 3 principals 17 teachers 5 parents 1 BLC teacher assistant |
| | Rilamulla T V (BLC Centre) | | |
| | Uduvil A.M.T.M. School | | |
| | Karanthan Ramupillai Vidyalyaya | School observation in the Jaffna District by Team 2 | 2 principals 8 teachers 6 parents |
| | Walapane Zonal Education Office | Team 1 meeting the Central Provincial / Zonal officers | List 3 attached |
| | Auditorium, Jaffna | Team 2 meeting PDE and Northern Province Education Officers | List 4 attached |
| | | | |
| 23.10.2012 | Namunukula Sinhala School, | School observation in the Badulla District by Team 1 | 2 principals 13 teachers 8 parents |
| | Uvakelle Tamil School | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 23.10.2012 | | | |
| | Ramanathapuram GTMS, Kilinochchi | School observation in the Kilinochchi District by Team 2 | 1 Principal 9 teachers 4 parents |
| | Mullaitivu RCTMS | School observation in the Mullaitivu District by Team 2 | 1 Principal 11 teachers 5 parents |
| | Passara | Team 1 meeting the Uva Provincial / Zonal officers | List 5 Attached |
| | Thamba Tourist Hotel, Vavuniya | Team 2 meeting UNICEF officers in Vavuniya | List 6 Attached |
| 24.10.2012 | Tarala K V. | School observation in the Moneragala District by Team 1 | 2 Principals 8 teachers 5 parents |
| | Kandaudapanguva V | | |
| | Tampalavala K V | Moneragala District Observation of Income Generation activity by Team 1 | 1 Principal |
| | Wellaimanal Al Azhar Vidyalaya, Kinniya | School observation in the Trincomalee District by Team 2 | 2 Principals 1 Deputy Principal 26 teachers 6 parents |
| | 24.10.2012 Bathyagama Model Primary School, Kantalai | | |
| | Provincial Education Department, Trincomalee | Team 2 meeting the PDE and Education Officers in the Trincomalee District | List 7 attached |
| | | | |
| 25.10.2012 | Pannelgama MV | School observation in the Ampara District by Team 1 | 3 Principals 2 Teachers 16 Parents |
| | Mahadir Muslim V | | |
| | Shanmugam V | | |
| | Parangiyamadu Bharathy Vidyalaya | School observation in the Batticaloa District by Team 2 | 2 Principals 12 teachers 9 parents |
| | Eravur Arafa Vidyalaya | | |
| | Sammanthurai Zonal Education Office | Team 1 meeting the Uva Provincial / zonal officers | List 8 Attached |
| | Zonal Education Office, Kalkuda | Team 2 meeting the ZDE and Officers in Kalkuda Education Zone | List 9 Attached |
| | Zonal Education Office, Batticaloa | Team 2 meeting Zonal / Divisional Education Officers in Batticaloa District | List 10 Attached |
| | UNICEF Office, Batticaloa | Team 2 meeting UNICEF Officers | List 11 Attached |
| 27.10.2012 | Cinnamon Grand | Follow up on Field Visit | Prof. Angela Little, |

| | | | |
|------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Hotel | findings | Dr. Wilfred Perera Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam Mr. Jennings James |
| 30.10.2012 | Cinnamon Grand Hotel | Fact finding | Mr. James Jennings Dr. Wilfred Perera Mrs. Padmini Ranaweera, Former UNICEF Officer |
| 30.10.2012 | MOE | Follow up discussion | Prof. Angela Mrs. Asoka Pandithasekara |
| 31.10.2012 | UNICEF | Follow up on Field Visit | Mr. James Jennings Ms. Katrina Stringer Mr. Sugath |
| 31.10.2012 | NIE | Fact finding | Prof. Angela Little, Dr. Wilfred Perera, Mr. Sibli Professor A Bandara, D G NIE, and others List 12 attached |
| 01.11.2012 | Cinnamon Grand Hotel | Finalizing the Field Report and preparing presentation | Prof. Angela Little, Dr. Wilfred Perera Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam Mr. Jennings James |
| 02.11.2012 | AHC, Colombo | Presentation on findings and discussion | Mr. Edward Archibald, Counselor Sri Lanka and Maldives Ms. Janelle Denton Mr. Dunstan Fernando Prof. Angela Little, Dr. Wilfred Perera Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam Mr. Jennings James |
| 06.11.2012 | UNICEF | Presentation on findings and discussion | Ms. Janelle Denton Mr. Dunstan Fernando Prof. Angela Little, Dr. Wilfred Perera Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam List (13) of UNICEF Staff attached |
| 07.11.2012 | UNICEF | Follow up discussion with UNICEF Country Representative | Mr. Resa Hossani, Country Representative, UNICEF- Sri Lanka Ms. Sara Poehlman, Chief, Education, UNICEF Prof. Angela Little, Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam |

| | | | |
|------------|-----|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 07.11.2012 | MOE | Presentation of findings and discussion | Prof. Angela Little, Dr. Wilfred Perera Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam Ms. Janelle Denton Mr. Dunstan Fernando List (14) of MOE& NIE officers attached |
|------------|-----|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Annex 6: List of Persons Met

List 1

Meeting at UNICEF Colombo on 12.10.2012

| Name | Designation |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ms. Lieke Van De Wiel | Regional Education Adviser, Regional office of South Asia, UNICEF |
| Katrina Stringer | Education specialist/ OIC –Education section, Colombo |
| Manoja Wikramaratne | Monitoring/ Evaluation officer, Colombo |
| Mohamed Shibly | Education specialist, Colombo |
| A. Sriskandaraja | Education officer, Colombo |
| Sugath Adikaram | Education officer, UVA, central province focal point |
| Through video link | |
| Asadur Rahman | Chief of zone office, Batticaloa |
| Nifal Alandeen | Education officer, Batticaloa |
| K. Kulendra | Education officer, Batticaloa |
| Nagdaleen Quentus | Project assistant Education, Batticaloa |
| S. Karthikeyini | Education officer, Vavuniya |
| M.Sureshkumar | Education officer, Vavuniya |
| Mussa Uwesu | OIC, Zone officer, Jaffna |
| S. Rathigadevi | Education officer, Jaffna |
| S, Varathaseelan | Education officer, Jaffna |

List.2 BESP Evaluation Meeting at MOE on 12.10.2012

| Name | Designation |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Prof. Angela Little | Team Leader, ICR Mission |
| M. Sivagnanam | Member, ICR Mission (Local Consultant) |
| Dr. Wilfred Perera | Member, ICR Mission (Local Consultant) |
| Dunstan Fernando | Senior P.O. AusAID |
| Ms. Lieke Van De Wiel | Regional Education Adviser, Regional office of South Asia, UNICEF |
| Katrina Stringer | Education specialist/ OIC –Education section, UNICEF. Colombo |
| Sugath Adikaram | Education officer, UNICEF UVA, Central province focal point |
| G.Y.Wijesuriya | DDE, NFE, MOE |
| H.P.N.Lakshman | DE, NFE, MOE |
| Kumari Senevirathna | DE, Quality Assurance, (MOE) |
| A.Sriskandaraja | UNICEF, Colombo |
| Asoka Pandithasekera | DE, PEB, MOE |
| Mohamed Shibly | Education Specialist, UNICEF, Colombo |
| Pushpa Wijesooriya | DE, MOE |
| L.N.Wijesekara | DE, MPR, MOE |
| Manoja Wickramaratna | Monitoring/ Evaluation officer, UNICEF, Colombo |
| B.P.Withanage | DE, EFA, MOE |
| M.W.Nirosha De Costa | ADE , School Health and Nutrition, MOE |

| | |
|-------------|-------------------------|
| M.M.Wehella | DE,Policy Planning, MOE |
|-------------|-------------------------|

List 3 Provincial/Zonal Meeting (Nuwara Eliya District) held in Walapane Zonal Office on 22.10.2012

| Name | Position |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr. T A Gunatilake | Assistant Secretary (Planning), Provincial Ministry of Education, Kandy |
| Mrs. P Ramanathan | DDE Primary, Provincial Department of Education, Kandy |
| Mr. A B Gangoda | ZDE, Zonal Education Office, Walapane |
| Mr. S W S Vipularatna | ADE Focal Point, Provincial Dept. of Education, Kandy |
| Ms. J A Nadan | ADE Primary, Zonal Education Office, Hatton |
| Mr. A R M R Banda | ADE Primary, Zonal Education Office, Hanguranketha |
| Mr. A U Gamaarchchi | ADE Primary, Zonal Education Office, Walapane |
| Mr. W Suraweera | ADE Primary, Zonal Education Office, Walapane |
| Ms. T A I Dharmalatha | ISA, Primary, Zonal Education Office, Nuwara Eliya |
| Mr. W A A Chandrawansa | Project Officer, Zonal Education Office, Nuwara Eliya |
| Mr. S B Rajapakse, Development Officer | Zonal Education Office, Walapane |

List 4 BESP Evaluation Meeting at Library Hall, Jaffna on 22.10.2012

| Name | Post |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Mr. P. Vikneswaran | Deputy Secretary, PME, Northern Province |
| Mr. V. Selvarajah | PDE Northern Province |
| M. Rathakrishnan | Addl. PDE, Northern Province |
| Mrs. L. Malini Weniton | ZDE, Mankulam |
| Mr. A. I. Croos | ZDE, Madhu |
| T. Jhon quintus | ZDE, Velanai |
| Mr. M. Rajakumar | ZDE, Mullaitivu |
| Mr. S. Pushpalingam | DDE, Vadamadachy |
| Mrs. R. Kuddithampy | DDE, Point Pedro |
| Mrs. V. Sukumaran | DDE, Vadamadachy |
| Mrs. U. Muneeswaran | DDE, Mullaitivu |
| Mrs. L. Suganthan | DDE, Kilinochchi |
| Mrs. U. Puvanaraja | DDE, Kilinochchi |
| DDE, North Province | DDE, North Province |
| DDE, North Province | DDE, North Province |
| DDE, Thunukkai | DDE, Thunukkai |
| DDE, Thunukkai | DDE, Thunukkai |
| Mr. R. Thamilmaran | DDE, Valikamam |
| Mrs. G. D. Thevarajah | DDE, Valikamam |
| Mr. S. Visvarajah | DDE, Madhu |
| Mr. J. A. Croos | DDE, Madhu |
| K. Krishnan | DDE, Vavuniya |

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Mrs.M.Mugunthan | DDE, Vavuniya |
| Mr. A.Stanislus | DDE, Velanai |
| Mrs.A.Arokiyanathan | DDE, Mannar |
| Mr.T. Christirajah | DDE, Mannar |
| Mr.S.Suntharasivam | DDE, Valikamam |
| Mr.P.Muthulingam | DDE, Thenmaradchi |
| K.Bradley | DDE, PDE's office |
| V.Sriskandaraja | DDE, PDE's office |
| S.Jayabalan | DDE, ZEO, Thunukkai |
| Mrs.A.S.Velantina | DDE, ZEO, Thunukkai |
| S.Sathiyaseelan | ADE, Mullaitivu |
| Mrs.Panchalingam | ADE, Vadamaradchy |
| Mr.R.Rajeswaran | ADE, North Province |
| Mr.G.Ratnasingam | ADE, Jaffna |
| Mr.S.Ganasalingam | ADE, Kilinochchi |
| Mrs.G.Pathmanathan | ADE, Thunukkai |
| Mrs.R.Uthayaratnam | ADE, Valikamam |
| S. Ganesapatham | ADE, Vavuniya |
| Mr.A.Manoranjithan | ISA, Thenmaradchi |
| Mr.N.Kanagaratnam | ISA, Jaffna |
| M.Kesavan | ISA, Velanai |
| Mr.Muraleetharan | ISA, Vavuniya |
| Mr.A.J.Bosco | ISA, Madhu |
| Mr. A. Sriskandarajah | UNICEF |
| Ms. V.Rathiga | UNICEF |
| Ms. S.Karthikejini | UNICEF |
| Mr. S.Varathaseelan | UNICEF |

List 5 Provincial/Zonal Meeting (Uva Province) held in Passara on 23.10.2012

| Name | Position |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Mr. A Ratnayake | Actg. Provincial Director |
| Mr. R M Tilakaratne | Actg. Addl. PDE |
| Ms. R M H Ratnayake | Deputy Director Development, Passara |
| Ms. B A D J Jayawardana | ADE Primary, Provincial Department of Education |
| Ms. K M A Priyadarshani | Divisional Director, Badalkumbura |
| Mr. H H N Silva | Divisional Director, Meegahakivula |
| Mr. S Ranasinghe | Divisional Director, Soranathota |
| Mr. D L N Somratne | Divisional Director, Haldummulla |
| Mr. K M Gunawradana | Divisional Director, Siyambalaanduwa |
| Mr. R M I Nisantha | Divisional Director, Passara |
| Ms. A AnandaKumuar | ISA Primary, Passara |
| Mr. H M Jayawardana | Project Officer, Passara |

List 6 Meeting with UNICEF officers in Vavuniya on 23.10.2012

| Name | Position |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Mr. Mussa Uwesu | OIC, Zone officer, Jaffna |
| M.Sureshkumar | Education officer, Vavuniya |
| S. Rathigadevi | Education officer, Jaffna |
| A. Sriskandaraja | Education officer, Colombo |
| Ms. Thevaki Sivakumar, | Project Assistant, Education, Vavuniya |
| Mr. S.Varathaseelan | Education Officer, Jaffna |
| Mr. Sutharsan | UNICEF, Vavuniya |

List 7 BESP Evaluation Meeting at Eastern Provincial Education Department on 24.10.2012

| Name | Designation |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Mr. A.M.E.Paul | PDE, Trincomalee |
| Mr.Upali Wijayalath | ZDE, Kantale |
| Mr. U.L.M. Hashim | ZDE, Kinniya |
| Mr. A.Vijayanathamoorthy | ZDE, Mutur |
| M.A.Wimalasena | ZDE, Gomaramkadawala |
| Mr. M.C.Nasar | DDE, Kinniya |
| Mr. B.M.S.S.S. Basnayaka | DDE, Gomaramkadawala |
| Mr.T.Ravi | DDE, Eastern Province |
| Mr. J.M.A.K.Senaviratna | DEO, Kantale |
| K.S.Jayathilaka | DEO, Padavisiripura |
| I.K.M. Pillangasinghe | DEO, Gomaramkadawala |
| Mr. M.M.Samsudeen | DEO, Kuchaveli |
| Mr.K.Sriskanda | DEO, Thampalakamam |
| Mrs. G.W.Sriyani | ADE, Kantale |
| Mr.A.K.D.Upaliherath | ADE, Kantale |
| Mr. S. Tharmalingam | ADE, Trincomalee |
| K.Ariyanayagam | ADE, Trincomalee |
| P.Uthayakumar | ADE, Primary Ed. Eastern Province |
| Mr.S. Ganeshalingam | ADE, Trincomalee |
| M.S.M. Arooz | ADE, Kinniya |
| A.K.D.Upaliherath | ADE, Kantale |
| Mr. A.S. Aci Sabri | Principal |
| Mr. A.S.M. Haither Salam | Principal |
| Mr. A.Somarathna | Vice principal, Kandamalawa |
| N.M.M.Nilmathullah | ISA, Kinniya |
| Mr. S.H.Nawarethna | ISA, Padavsiripura |
| Mr. V.Subramaniam | ISA, Mutur |
| Mrs. Y.Vijayakumar | ISA, Trincomalee |
| Mr.K.Chundrakulasingham | ISA, Trincomalee |
| Mrs. Y.Vijayakumar | ISA, Trincomalee |
| Mr. M.I.M.Nasar | ISA, Kinniya |
| Mr. N.M.M.Siddique | ISA, Kinniya |
| S.Srikrishnajah | APOE, Uicf, Eastern Province |
| S.I. Gnanendran | UNICEF, Mutur |

List 8 Provincial/Zonal Meeting (Ampara District) held in Sammanthurai Zonal Office on 25.11.2012

| Name | Position |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr. A D E Paul | Provincial Director, Eastern Province |
| Mr. A L M Cassim | ZDE, Zonal Education Office, Akkaraipattu |
| Mr. D Ranasinghe | ZDE, Zonal Education Office, Ampara |
| Mr. Mansoor | ZDE, Zonal Education Office, Sammanathurai |
| Mr. G G Lionel | ZDE Zonal Education Office, Dehiattakandiya |
| Mr M T A Thawofek | ZDE, Zonal Education Office, Kalmunai |
| Mr. M S M Najeem, | DDE (Development), Zonal Education Office, Kalmunai |
| Ms. S R Hasanthi | DDE (Planning), Zonal Education Office, Ampara |
| Ms. K G Murin | ADE Primary, Zonal Education Office, Ampara |
| Mr. A D E Suthur | ADE Focal point, Zonal Education Office, Kalmunai |
| Mr S M Jamal | ADE Focal point, Zonal Education Office, Akkaraipattu |
| Mr. N Abdul Waheed | ADE Primary, Zonal Education Office, Akkaraipattu |
| Mr. M M A Rasheed | ADE Focal point, Zonal Education Office, Samanthurai |
| Mr. S L Mansoor | ISA, Primary, Zonal Education Office, Akkaraipattu |
| Ms. K Thambiraja | ISA Primary, Zonal Education Office, Kalmunai |
| Ms. P K Sivarasamma | ISA Primary, Zonal Education Office, Thirukovil |

List 9 Meeting at Zonal Education Office- Kalkuda on 25/10/2012

| Name | Designation |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Mrs.S.Chakkaravarthi | ZDE |
| Mr.S.Gnanarajah | DDE |
| Mrs.P.Elango | DDE |
| Mr.A.Sugumaran | DEO |
| Mr.N.Gunalingam | DEO |
| Mrs.K.Thavarajaratnam | ADE |
| Mr.K.Yogarajah | ISA Primary |
| M.Krishanth | Focal point, UNICEF |
| Mr.K.Kulendra | EPO,UNICEF, Batticaloa |

List 10 BESP Evaluation Meeting at Zonal office, Batticaloa on 25.10.2012

| Name | Designation |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Mrs. S.Pavalakanthan | ZDE, Batticaloa |
| Mr.U.L.M.Jairudeen | ZDE, Batticaloa |
| Mrs.N.Pullenayagam | ZDE,Paddiruppu |
| Mr.K.Baskaran | ZDE, Batticaloa west |
| Mrs.S.Chakkarawarthy | ZDE,Kalkudah |
| Mr. S.M.M.Ameer | DDE, Batticaloa |
| Mr.V.Kanthasamy | DEO, Batticaloa |
| Mr.K.David | DEO, Batticaloa |
| Mr.M.Satchithanandam | ADE, Batticaloa |
| Mr.B.Varatharajan | ADE,Paddiruppu |
| Mrs.M.P.S.Sureshkumar | ADE, Batticaloa west |

| | |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Mr.I.M.Ibrahim | ADE, Batticaloa |
| Mr.M.B.T.Khan | ISA, Batticaloa |
| Mr.K.Yogarajah | ISA,Kalkudah |
| Mr.M.L.Alawudeen | ISA, Batticalo Central |
| Mr.M.R.M.Nawaz | ISA, Batticaloa |
| Mr.S.Kuruparan | Focal Point,, Inicef, Paddiruppu |
| Mr.G.Kandadas | Focal Point, UNICEF, Batticaloa |
| Mr.K.Sathiyathan | Principal |
| Mrs.T. Arudjothy | Principal |
| Mr.M. Krishananth | UNICEF,Kalkudah |
| A.Sriskandarajah | UNICEF, Batticaloa |
| K.Kulendra | EPO, UNICEF, Batticaloa |

List 11 Meeting at UNICEF, Batticaloa on 25.11.2012

| Name | Designation |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Mr. Asadur Rahman | Chief, UNICEF Zone,Batticaloa |
| Ms. Magdaleen quentus | Programme Assistant Education |
| Mr. A.Sriskandarajah | Education officer,Colombo |
| Mr. K.Kulendra | EPO, Batticaloa |
| Mr.K.Gowriswaran | Health & Nutrition officer |
| Mr. S.Nimalan | Child protection officer |
| Ms, J.Denton | AusAID |
| Professor Angela little | Team Leader, BESP Evaluation Mission |
| Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam | Member, BESP Evaluation Mission |

List 12 List of Persons National Institute of Education 31 Oct 2012

Professor W M A Bandara, Director General, NIE
 Mr. K A D P Sarathchandra, Director, Primary
 Mr. M N L N Perera, Director, Institutional Development
 Mr. J D Premachandra, Chief Project Officer
 Ms. R M K D Silva, Chief Project Officer
 Ms. M A G W Kumaratne, Chief Project Officer
 Ms. M H F Maheeza, Project Officer
 Mr. S Udayasanthiran, Project Officer
 Mr. H W W M S R Rambukwella, Project Officer
 Rev. U Udassi Thero, Project Officer
 Mr. W G S Kumara, Project Officer
 Ms J C Tapaswarage, Assistant Project Officer
 Ms. J A N D Jayasinghe, Assistant Project Officer

List 13 Presentation - BESP evaluation findings at UNICEF Office on 06.11.12

List of Participants

From Colombo Office

SugathAdikaram, Education Officer

Scalina Ratwatte, Project Assistant
H.R.M. Shibly, Education Specialist
Manoja Wickramarathne, M & E Officer
Sara Poehlman, Chief of Education

From AusAID

Ms. Janelle Denton, Second Secretary
Mr. Dunstan Fernando, Senior Programme Officer, AusAID

ICR Team

Prof. Angela Little, Team Leader
Dr. Wilfred Perera, Member (Local Education Consultant)
Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam, Member (Local Education Consultant)

List of UNICEF participants through video link

Batticaloa Zone Office:

Mr. Nifal Alawdeen, Education Officer
Ms. Magdaleen Quentus, Project Assistant, Education

Vavuniya zone office

Ms. S. Karthikeyini, Education Officer
Mr. S.Sureshkumar, Education Officer
Ms. Thevaki Sivakumar, Project Assistant, Education

Jaffna Office

Ms. Rathigadevi Veluppillai, Project Officer, Education
Mr. Varathaseelan Sinthathurai, Education Officer

From Bangkok

Mr. K Kulendra, Education Officer, Batticaloa Zone
Ms. Katrina Stringer, Education Specialist, Colombo
Mr. Arulrajah Sriskantharajah, Emergency Education Officer, Colombo

List 14 BESP Mission Meeting at Ministry of Education on 07.11.2012

| Name | Designation |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| S.V.Wijeratne | Additional Secretary ,MOE |
| M.M.Wehehella | Director, Planning |
| Ms. Jayanthini Gunasekera | ADG,NIE |
| Ms. Asoka Pandithasekera | Director (Primary),MOE |
| Ms. Pushpa Wijeoariya | Director,MOE |
| Ms. R.M.P.D.Rathnayak | ADE/Planning,MOE |
| Ms. N.C.Dasanayaka | ADE/Planning,MOE |
| Ms. P.S.Wijesinghe | D.D.E,NFE&Sp.Ed.branch, MOE |
| Ms. G.Y.Wijesoriya | D.D.E,NFE&Sp.Ed.branch, MOE |
| Mr. K.A.D.P. Sarathchandra | Director (ECCD & Primary) , NIE |
| Mr. J.D.Premachandra | CPO, NIE |
| Sara Poehlman | UNICEF |
| J.Denton | AusAID |
| Dunstan Fernando | AusAID |

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Sugath Adikaram | Education Officer, UNICEF |
| Manoja Wickramarathne | UNICEF |
| H.R.M.Shibly | Education specialist, UNICEF |
| Professor Angela Little | Team Leader, BESP Evaluation Mission |
| Dr. Wilfred Perera | Education Consultant |
| Mr. Muthu Sivagnanam | Education Consultant |

Annex 7: Checklists and Questions

Form 2. Check List for Interview with the Principal and observation of school office records.

Name of School:
District..... Visit Date:.....

Name of Principal:.....

Number of teachers in primary: Trained: Male Female

Teacher Attendance: Male Female
Untrained: Male Female

Number of Students in primary: Male Female

\ Student Attendance: Male Female

Number of 5 + to 9+ years aged Children in the Catchment Area as on 31.01.2012:

Male: Female:

Number of 5 + to 9+ years aged Children in the Catchment Area attending other schools as on today: Male: Female:

| Items | CFS Criteria | BESP Indicator | Functioning? | Effectiveness | Sustainability Indication | Remarks |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------|
| 1. School Attendance Committee | 1.1 | 4 | | | | |
| 2. Tracking Drop Outs | 1.1 | 2 | | | | |
| 3. Tracking Out of School children | 1.1 | 2 | | | | |
| 4. Reintegration of out of school children into school | 1.1 | 7 | | | | |
| 5. Follow up on absenteeism of students and teachers | 1.1 | 5 | | | | |
| 6. Maintaining records on the Above | 1.1 | 5 | | | | |
| 7. Accelerated Learning Programme | 1.1 | 6 | | | | |
| 8. Equal opportunities For all children to participate in all school activities | 1.2 | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 9. Equal opportunities for all boys and girls to utilize school resources | 1.2 | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 10. School Disciplinary Committee | 1.3 | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 11. Prohibition of Corporal and Psychological Punishment | 1.3 | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 12. CRC sensitization / awareness Programmes for all | 1.4 | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 13. Equal opportunities for boys and girls to complete primary education and transition | 2.1 | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 14. Equal opportunities for boys and girls in curricular & co curricular activities | 2.2 | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 15. Availability of Adequate teachers | 3.1. | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 16. Availability of Adequate Furniture | 3.1 | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 17. Availability of learning materials | 3.1 | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 18. Focus on inclusiveness | 3.2 | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 19. School Based Teacher Training | 3.4 | 14 & 15 | | | | |
| 20. Focus on child centred approach in Teaching / Learning | 3.5 | 1, 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 21. 'Whole school' training | 3.3 (5.1 – 5.4) | 12, 13, 14 & 15 | | | | |
| 22. Action Research | 3.4 (6.5) | 14 & 15 | | | | |
| 23. Maintaining Records on ELC and follow up Measures | 3.6 | 9 | | | | |
| 24. School level policy on Health, care and safety of students | 4.1 | 12 | | | | |
| 25. Implementation of Competency based Health Education | 4.4 | 12 | | | | |
| 26. Provision of psychosocial support and counselling | 4.5 | 12 | | | | |
| 27. Proactive measures to prevent bullying and abuse of children | 4.6 | 12 | | | | |
| 28. Disaster Preparedness and Planning | 4.7 | 12 | | | | |
| 29. School Self Assessment (SSA) Process | 5.1 | 13 | | | | |
| 30. Participation of parents / community in SSA | 5.1 | 13 | | | | |
| 31. Participation of school children in SSA | 5.1 | 13 | | | | |
| 32. Formulation of School Development Plan (SDP) process | 5.1 | 13 | | | | |
| 33. Participatory Planning and Budgeting | 5.1 | 13 | | | | |
| 34. Participatory Annual Implementation Plan (AIP) | 5.2 | 13 | | | | |
| 35. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Framework | 5.3 | 13 | | | | |
| 36. School Support for child friendly home/Community | 5.4 | 4 | | | | |
| 37. Support from Zonal Resource Team | All | 11 | | | | |
| 38. Spreading CFA to neighbouring schools | 6.5 | 11 | | | | |
| 39. Use of CFS Guidance Manual | All | 10 | | | | |
| 40. Basic Literacy Centre | 1.1 | 6, 7 & 8 | | | | |
| Source of Funds for Water: | | | Sanitation & Hygiene: | | | |

Form 3A - Check List for observation of class rooms

Name of School:

Name of Class/es:

| Items | CFS Criteria | BESP Indicator | Functioning? | Effectiveness? | Sustainability Indication? | Remarks |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------------------|---------|
| 1. Human & Child Rights Based Approach in class room | 1.4 | 5, 9 & 13 | | | | |
| 2. All class room activities are gender sensitive | 2.2 | 5, 9 & 13 | | | | |
| 3. Class room Furniture | 3.1 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 4. Class room Equipment | 3.1 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 5. Learning materials | 3.1 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 6. Class room physical condition | 3.1 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 7. Teacher attendance | 3.1 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 8. Differentiated Teaching | 3.5 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 9. Active participation of children | 3.5 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 10. Listening to the children's grievances | 3.5 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 11. Students participation in decision making | 3.5 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 12. Teacher – student interaction | 3.5 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 13. Display of students' creation | 3.5 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 14. Assessment of ELC | 3.6 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 15. Ensuring Mastery of ELC by students | 3.6 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 16. Records on ELC | 3.6 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 18. Focus on effective teaching /learning time | 3.6 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 19. Student attendance | 3.6 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 20. Follow up on non attendance of students | 3.6 | 5 & 9 | | | | |
| 21. Class room policy and practice to ensure Health Care and safety | 4.1 | 5, 9 & 13 | | | | |

| Items | CFS Criteria | BESP Indicator | Functioning? | Effectiveness? | Sustainability Indication? | Remarks |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------------------|---------|
| of children | | | | | | |
| 22. Provision of Psychosocial support to children | 4.5 | 5, 9 & 13 | | | | |
| 23. Emergency plan in the class room | 4.7 | 5, 9 & 13 | | | | |
| 24. Involving community to support class room activities | 5.1 | 5, 9 & 13 | | | | |

Form 3B - Check List for Interview with the teachers
teacher:

Name of

Name of School:

| Items | CFS Criteria | BESP Indicator | Functioning? | Effectiveness? | Sustainability Indication? | Remarks |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------------------|---------|
| 1. Follow up on drop outs | 1.1 | 2 | | | | |
| 2. Accelerated Learning Programme | 1.1 | 6 | | | | |
| 3. Fairness in providing school resources to children | 1.2 | 1 | | | | |
| 4. All children participate in all school activities without any discrimination | 1.2 | 1 | | | | |
| 5. Prohibition of corporal punishment | 1.3 | 1 | | | | |
| 6. Prohibition of threatening or insulting children | 1.3 1.1 | 1 | | | | |
| 7. Awareness of CRC by teachers | 1.4 | 12 | | | | |
| 8 .Inclusive practices in the class room | 3.2 | 12 | | | | |
| 9. Adaptation of curriculum to local context | 3.3 | 9 | | | | |
| 10. Teacher Capacity building by external actors | 3.4 | 9, & 14 | | | | |
| 11. School Based Teacher Training | 3.4 | 9 & 14 | | | | |
| 12. Peer Learning among teachers | 3.4 | 9 & 14 | | | | |
| 13. Parent involvement in Assessment of | 3.4 | 9 & 13 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------|--|--|--|--|
| Teachers | | | | | | |
| 14. Action Research practices by teacher | 3.4 | 9 & 14 | | | | |
| 15. Whole school Development training | 3.4 | 4 & 13 | | | | |
| 16. Child Friendly Approaches in the T/L process | 3.5 | 9 | | | | |
| 17. Support provided by Zonal Resource Team | All | 11 | | | | |
| 18. Teacher Participation in SSA | 5.1 | 13 | | | | |
| 19. Teacher Participation in Preparing SDP | 5.1 | 13 | | | | |
| 20. Responsibilities in Annual Implementation Plan | 5.2 | 13 | | | | |
| 21. Responsibilities in Monitoring the implementation of SDP | 5.3 | 13 | | | | |
| 22. Teacher contribution to CFA in community | 5.4 | 12 | | | | |
| 23. CFS Guidance Manual | ALL | 10 | | | | |
| 24. Contribution to introduce CFA to other schools | 6.5 | 16 | | | | |

Form 4A: Check List for observation of school premises

Name of School..... District:.....

School lay out plan available / not available

Area of school premises:

Buildings adequate/ not adequate

Condition of Buildings: Satisfactory /

Unsatisfactory

Class room Floor: Suitable / Unsuitable

Reason if unsuitable:

Usable Class room area:

| Items | CFS Criteria | BESP Indicat or | Functioning? | Effectiveness | Sustainability Indication | Remarks |
|------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------|
| 1. Appropriate facilities for disabled | 1.2, 3.2 | 1 & 5 | | | | |
| 2. Inclusive Play area | 2.2 | 1 & 5 | | | | |
| 3. Gender Sensitive provision of physical Facilities | 2.3 | 1 & 5 | | | | |
| 4. School Garden | 4.1 | 1 & 5 | | | | |
| 5. School Premises protected by fence / wall | 4.1 | 1 & 5 | | | | |
| 6. Clean & Pleasant Physical Environment | 4.2 | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 7. Pleasant Social Environment | 4.5 | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 8. Cleaning & maintenance plan | 4.2 | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 9. Food Preparation is clean & hygienic | 4.2 | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 10. Eating place is kept tidy | 4.2 | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 11. Waste Disposal | 4.2 | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 12. Facilities for hand washing | 4.3. | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 13 Sufficient & pure drinking water | 4.2, 4.3 | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 14. Male / Female toilets with adequate water supply | 4.3 | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 15. Child Protection practices | 4.6 | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 16. Safety measures & standards | 4.6 | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 17. Health Education & practices | 4.4 | 1, & 5 | | | | |
| 18. Disaster | 4.7 | 1, & 5 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------|-----|--------|--|--|--|--|
| preparedness | | | | | | |
| 19. First Aid Practices and Facilities | 4.7 | 1, & 5 | | | | |

Form 4 B :

Check List for Interview with parents

Name of School:.....

Names of parent/s

| Items | CFS Criteria | BESP Indicator | Functioning? | Effectiveness? | Sustainability Indication | Remarks |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|---------|
| 1. School Attendance Committee Participation | 1.1 | 4 | | | | |
| 2. Tracking Drop Outs | 1.1 | 2 | | | | |
| 3. Tracking Out of School children | 1.1 | 2 | | | | |
| 4. Reintegration of drop out children into school | 1.2 | 3 | | | | |
| 5. School Disciplinary Committee | 1.3 | 5 | | | | |
| 6. Prohibition of Corporal Punishment | 1.3 | 5 | | | | |
| 7. CRC sensitization / awareness | 1.4 | 12 | | | | |
| 9. School activities reflect HRB Approach | | 5 | | | | |
| 9. Involvement of parents and community in SSA | 5.1 | 13 | | | | |
| 10. Gender Parity in SSA committee | 5.1 | 13 | | | | |
| 11. Parent involvement in Assessment of teachers | 3.4 | 13 | | | | |
| 12. Parent involvement in Assessment of the principal | 5.1 | 13 | | | | |
| 13. Involvement of parents and community in preparing SDP | 5.1, 5.2 | 13 | | | | |
| 14. Involvement of students in SDP | 5.1 | 13 | | | | |
| 15.. Parents involvement in monitoring SDP | 5.2 | 13 | | | | |
| 16.. Monitoring Framework | 5.2 | 14 | | | | |
| 17. School Support for child | 5.4 | 13 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----|--|--|--|--|
| friendly home/community | | | | | | |
| 18. 'Whole school Training" | 1.4, 3.3, 5.1 | 13 | | | | |

Form 7**Details of Persons met**

BESP Evaluation Meeting at..... On
.....

| Name | Designation | Official Address | Signature |
|------|-------------|------------------|-----------|
| 1. | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |

Form 1 :

**Interview Schedule in the School Office at the beginning of the School Visit participated
by Principal and other possible Staff**

Name of School

District

Guiding Questions

1. How was CFA introduced to your school? When? By whom?
2. How the principal (or teacher in charge) go about introducing it in the school?
What is it you do in order to make the school child friendly?
3. What is CFA? Your interpretation?
4. Are there any activities/presentations done with parents on CFA?
5. What is the change in child behavior due to CFA?
6. What is the change in teacher/principal behaviour due to CFA?
7. What is the change in parent behaviour due to CFA?

8. Explain the process of School Self assessment in your school?
9. How is the School Development Plan made? Who do participate?
10. What activities were done on School based teacher training?
11. How and what support for CFA you receive from zone/division/ ISAs?
12. How and what support for CFA you receive from any others?
13. What about School Attendance Committee: What do they do and How?
14. What about Basic Literacy Classes (BLCs):
15. Anything about the Accelerated learning Programme:
16. How do you go about CFA in your school in the future? How do you see the future?

Any Suggestions for the Future:

FORM 5 : Interview/ Discussion Schedule at the Zonal Office

Name of Zone:

District/Province:

1. A brief explanation as to how CFA is introduced to the schools in the Schools in the zone:
2. The total number of officers in the zone and how many are knowledgeable and work on CFA:
3. How does an officer get involved:
4. What is it that an officer does in a school:
5. How does an officer help in schools in SSA SDP:
SBTD:
6. How do you monitor / evaluate CFA in schools:

What systems are there in place for monitoring and evaluation?

7. Can you say about Basic Literacy Centres (BLCs) in your zone: How do they function:

What about the Accelerated Learning Programme (ALP):

School Attendance Committees in Schools:

What is the zone's involvement in out of School children and Drop- outs?

8. How do you see the future of CFA

What steps are needed to strengthen/sustain CFA?

FORM 6: Guiding Questions for Interview / Discussion with the Provincial Director of Education

1. To what extent does the Child Friendly Approach (CFA) intervention support your work?
2. What is your impression about the flow of funds through different channels to implement the planned activities under the CFA intervention?

Any bottle necks? Any suggestions for improvement?

3. How are gender sensitive issues in CFA schools managed to ensure gender equality in education service delivery?

Are you satisfied with what has been achieved? Any suggestions?

4. What is the current status in the CFA intervention schools in terms of enabling greater participation of students, parents and community in developmental decision making in schools?

5. Do you feel that the CFA intervention is efficiently managed and the results gained are worth the effort, time and cost?

Any recommendation?

6. How can the province replicate this CFA model in other schools in the province? Please explain briefly.

7. How well is the provincial education system prepared to continue this CFA model with its own capacity and resources?

What steps are to be taken to ensure this?

8. How do you monitor and evaluate the progress of this CFA intervention?

9. Could you briefly express your judgment on the relevance of the CFA model to the context of the province?

Any modification needed?

10. What are your suggestions to improve the design and implementation of the CFA intervention model in the future?

Annex 8: Child Friendly Dimensions and Criteria in the BESP

Child Friendly Schools⁶

This annex appears as Annex D in BESP (2008).

Schooling is the one experience most commonly shared by children all over the world, and the most common means by which societies prepare their young for the future. On any given day more than one billion of the world's children are at school – in permanent or temporary school buildings, in tents, or even under trees – all hopefully sharing the experience of learning, developing their potentials and enriching their lives. But schooling is not always a positive experience for all children. It can mean sitting cold and shivering in unheated buildings, or hot and sweating in airless sun-baked classrooms. It can also mean being tired from standing in unfurnished classrooms, being hungry, thirsty or unwell, or simply scared and apprehensive about the risks of punishment, bullying, violence and various forms of humiliation at the hands of teachers and fellow pupils.

These conditions are not conducive to learning, and are made worse when learners have no competent teachers to guide them, no textbooks to learn from or exercise books to write on, and schools have no toilets or running water. It is quite a challenge that some 100 million primary school aged children around the world do not attend school, but it is even more daunting that millions of those who are in school have to endure these types of conditions that are so counterproductive for learning and the well-being of children.

However, it is not only in schools that children face these negative conditions. The home and community environment can also pose challenges that make it difficult for some children to access school, attend regularly, attain to the final year of the cycle and achieve the prescribed learning in the curriculum. Food insecurity, under-nutrition, parasitic infestations, unhygienic surroundings, chronic poverty, household chores, traditional beliefs and practices, domestic over-crowding, gender discrimination, impact of HIV on families, domestic violence, child care deficiencies, etc, are all factors in homes and communities that can affect the right of children to access and complete school.

The worldwide quest to address this problem through the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) requires not just getting all children into school, but also making all schools work in the best interest of children. This needs safe, healthy and protective schools, with trained teachers, adequate resources and appropriate conditions for learning. Such schools will build on the assets that children bring from their homes and communities, while also compensating for shortcomings in the home and community environment. They are the types of school that will enable children to achieve the knowledge and skills prescribed in the curriculum and much else. They will help children develop the ability to think and reason, build up their self-respect and respect for others; and enable all children to reach their full potential as human beings, as members of their communities and citizens of the world. This is what Child Friendly Schools (CFS) are about - schools that work in the best interest of all the children that they serve – building on what is positive and compensating for what is negative in the life of each child! They are schools that embrace a multi-dimensional concept of quality and address the total needs of the child as a learner.

⁶ Source: UNICEF, Sri Lanka, Colombo Office, March 2008

The Child-Friendly School approach was introduced in the mid to late 1990s and is presently the flagship quality education program of the Education Sector of UNICEF with more than 50 countries worldwide implementing CFS initiatives.

The child-friendly school concept is based on the principles of child rights as expressed in the Convention on the Rights of the Child. UNICEF globally defines Child-Friendly Schools by the following six dimensions:

Child-friendly schools are:

- rights-based and proactively inclusive;
- gender-responsive;
- promoting quality learning outcomes relevant to children's need for knowledge and skills;
- healthy, safe and protective of children;
- actively engaged with students, families and communities;

Moreover they require:

- child friendly systems, policies, practices and regulations.

The CFS framework is particularly relevant to the Sri Lankan situation where GoSL/ MOE, through EDSFP, is seeking to promote equitable access and quality, in the context of inclusiveness and social cohesion. The framework promotes child-seeking, child-centred, gender-sensitive, inclusive, community-involved, protective and healthy approaches to schooling and out-of-school education. These approaches are intended to increase the learning effectiveness, efficiency and reach of education systems and to enable all children to realize their right to learn. They also help expand the focus of attention beyond formal schooling per se into the broader environments and spaces where learning of all sorts takes place. This is in line with the holistic, child-centred approach that stresses connections between home, school and the larger environment. The child-friendly framework - in its various dimensions – has been applied in many settings around the world, in both formal and non-formal education, early child development, and educational responses to emergencies. In all such settings, the CFS/ learning space is promoted as the locus for fulfilling many of the rights of the child and – as such – calls for inter-sectoral partnerships and stakeholder participation in educational processes and outcomes that aim at the holistic development of the child within a supportive and protective environment.

Explanation of CFS Achievement Criteria for Outcome 2.2: All primary schools in focal districts are participating in the CFS initiative and 25% of all primary schools have reached an achievement rate of 80% towards CFS criteria in all CFS dimensions.

Six dimensions for assessing a CFS are listed above. Each dimension has a number of criteria that have to be met to say that the dimension is fully implemented. Ideally, a perfect CFS would score 100% in achievement on all criteria for all six dimensions. As this is unrealistic, after discussion within MOE, it was decided that a school achieving 80% for criteria on all dimensions is a successful CFS.

For a five-year period, it was decided that an achievement rate of 25% of all schools in the focal districts being successful in CFS as defined above was as much as could be expected. All schools in focal districts will be participating in the initiative, but it is not expected that all will meet the criteria within that space of time.

Schools will measure achievement rates themselves on a monthly basis and these will also be measured biannually by zonal support staff, with verification checks by provincial staff.

ANNEX 9: Full Set of Child Friendly Dimensions and Associated Criteria

1. First Dimension: Rights Based and Proactively Inclusive.

Criteria:

- 1.1 Effective mechanisms for preventing dropouts and responding to out-of-school girls and boys are in place and in use.
- 1.2 All girls and boys have equal access to all activities and resources in school.
- 1.3 Corporal or psychological punishments are not practiced. Preventive measures and responses to bullying and harassment are in place.
- 1.4 The entire school community is knowledgeable on the Rights of the Child. School undertakings are based on this understanding.

2. Second Dimension: Gender Responsive.

Criteria:

- 2.1. Equal opportunities exist for girls and boys to enter Primary Education and Secondary Education.
- 2.2. Girls and boys participate on an equal basis in all school activities (curricular, co-curricular).
- 2.3 Physical facilities are appropriate for both girls and boys.

3. Third Dimension: Promoting Quality Learning Outcomes.

Criteria:

- 3.1. Adequate human resources and classroom facilities are available to support learning.
- 3.2. The classroom atmosphere is inclusive, stress-free, democratic and conducive to learning.
- 3.3. School curriculum is adapted to include the local environment, culture and knowledge.
- 3.4. Teachers are continually improving their capacity through opportunities given and by their own initiatives.
- 3.5. Child-centred teaching methodologies are used.
- 3.6. Essential Learning Competencies are regularly assessed and effective remedial measures are taken.

4. Fourth Dimension: Child Friendly Schools are Healthy, Safe and Protective.

Criteria:

- 4.1. School level policies on health, safety and protection are in place.
- 4.2. School has sufficient facilities related to food, water and sanitation.
- 4.3. School environment and facilities related to food, water and sanitation are well protected.
- 4.4. Competency-based health education is effectively conducted for students.
- 4.5. Effective psychosocial support and referral services are available and utilized.
- 4.6. Children are protected from harm, abuse and injury.
- 4.7. Emergency/disaster preparedness and response plans and systems are in place and operational.

5. Fifth Dimension: Child Friendly Schools are actively engaged with students, families and community.

Criteria:

- 5.1. Schools conduct self-assessments and develop School Development Plans with effective participation of students, families and communities.
- 5.2. Principal, teachers, students, families and the community actively participate in the implementation of the School Development Plan.
- 5.3. The Principal, teachers, students, families and the community actively participate in monitoring and evaluating the School Development Plan.
- 5.4. Schools are actively engaged in promoting and supporting the child friendly home and community environment.

6. Sixth Dimension: Supported by child-friendly systems, policies and regulations.

Criteria:

- 6.1. Government policies, regulations and their implementation support the development of the Child Friendly School.
- 6.2. Effective coordination exists between all relevant government agencies at all levels.
- 6.3. Appropriate financial resources are allocated at different levels.
- 6.4. Quality technical support systems exist at all levels.
- 6.5. Child friendly principles are incorporated into the curriculum, textbooks and teachers manuals.

ANNEX 10: BESP schools by district and year of inclusion

| Districts | Number of Schools as in 2012 | Number of Schools under project in 2010 | Number of Schools added to project in 2011 | Number of Schools under project in 2011 | Number of Schools added to project in 2012 | Number of Schools under project in 2012 | % of project schools as against Total Schools |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Ampara | 408 | 94 | 58 | 152 | 01 | 153 | 38 |
| Badulla | 574 | 126 | 71 | 197 | 03 | 200 | 35 |
| Batticaloa | 332 | 104 | 18 | 122 | Nil | 122 | 37 |
| Jaffna | 416 | Nil | 163 | 163 | 56 | 219 | 53 |
| Kilinochchi | 88 | Nil | 50 | 50 | 06 | 56 | 64 |
| Mannar | 115 | Nil | 50 | 50 | 17 | 67 | 58 |
| Moneragala | 264 | 55 | 34 | 89 | Nil | 89 | 34 |
| Mullaitivu | 83 | Nil | 60 | 60 | 19 | 79 | 95 |
| Nuwara Eliya | 517 | 110 | 53 | 163 | 01 | 164 | 32 |
| Trincomalee | 281 | 103 | 28 | 131 | Nil | 131 | 47 |
| Vavuniya | 188 | Nil | 55 | 55 | 24 | 79 | 42 |
| Total | 3266 | 592 | 640 | 1232 | 127 | 1359 | 42 |
| Added in Northern province | | | 378 | | 122 | | |
| Added in 6 original focal districts | | | 262 | | 5 | | |

Source : Table 1 in ACR

Note: Number of addition of schools by year was calculated by the consultant using the table cited.

ANNEX 11: SSA and SDP in CFA and PSI

Program for School Improvement (PSI), School Self Assessment (SSA) and School Development Plans (SDPs)

In the section on Effectiveness (and also in Annex 12 which follows) we describe the roles played by school attendance committees, Alternative Education Programmes such as ALP and Basic Literacy Centres. In this section we focus on two specific project components School Self-Assessment (SSA) and School Development Plans (SDP). BESP aimed to strengthen school management and school improvement through a two pronged approach: School Self-Assessment (SSA); and School Development Plans with the participation of school teachers, principals, students and community members.

In the Relevance section of the main report we described how the Programme for School Improvement (PSI) had been introduced to the schools from 2006. PSI was introduced to all schools within selected zones at a given point in time. PSI was introduced to schools of eight zones in 2006, to schools of another nine zones in 2007, schools of eighteen zones in 2008, schools of ten zones in 2009 and schools of seventeen zones in 2010. It was expanded to all zones and schools in 2011. The programme focuses on the development of school-based plans to improve the school through the more effective delivery of school development programs. Responsibility and accountability for school improvement lie with a School Development Committee that comprises the principal and deputy principal, teachers, parents and past pupils. The functioning of PSI is embodied in a circular (PSI Circular No. 2005/24; PSI Circular No. 2008/35; PSI Circular No. 2010/28), key extracts of which appear at the end of this document. The functioning of the school-based management approach in CFA is not contained in a circular. Rather guidance is provided in Chapters 6 and 8 of the Guidance Manual on the Child Friendly Approach. To date, BESP has promoted a system of school based planning and management that operates in parallel with PSI. CFA has been introduced to 40 zones in the country. In 2006 PSI was introduced to all schools in two of the BESP zones in 2006, to three zones in 2007, eight zones in 2008, four zones in 2009 and fifteen zones in 2010. It was introduced to the final eight BESP zones in 2011 at the time of the final roll out country-wide.

Despite these parallel developments in approaches to school-based planning and management many MOE and some UNICEF officials are unaware of the details of PSI implementation. Conversely, many MOE officials involved in the development and revision of PSI in recent years are unaware of the details of BESP/CFA implementation. While the schemes may not converge in the minds of officials they do converge in the minds of the school principal. In recent years school principals have been encouraged at various times to develop school development plans through the PSI and CFA approaches. The direction of and guidance for each approach emanates from different branches of the National and Provincial Ministries.

Despite their different origins the schemes share common features. Both PSI and CFA aim to prepare and implement strategic and operational plans for school improvement and maintain a coherent and coordinate approach to all aspects of planning and to deliver school

development programs more effectively; to involve community representatives in school planning and encourage schools to respond effectively to the needs of parents and the demands of the community, thus strengthening the partnership between teachers and the school community; to focus on pupil/student academic performance that leads to higher student achievement to become useful citizens. Both schemes require the development of a five year plan and a one year operational plan. Both schemes are designed to increase transparency in school management and the spending of school funds. Both are intended to encourage curriculum implementation in line with local needs and to utilise local resources.

Alongside these common features are some key differences. PSI is oriented to school improvement in general. The CFA approach is oriented to school improvement within the six-dimension Child Friendly framework. The PSI approach has legal force through the issue of an MOE circular that has been sent to all schools in the country. The CFA approach to the school development plan is encapsulated in chapters 6 and 8 of the Guidance Manual on the Child Friendly approach and in a note of steps presented at the end of this document. In PSI the plan is developed by a School Development Committee (SDC). The principal and deputy principal are members the SDC. Depending on school size between 3-5 years teachers are elected to the committee. Between 3 and 5 parents are selected/elected to represent parent members of the School Development Society (a longstanding feature of schools in Sri Lanka). Three past pupils of the school are selected/elected. In CFA the plan is developed by the principal and in-school staff through an extensive School Self Assessment (SSA) process which involves: child participation, the school development society, principal, teachers and community members. The SSA process involves two stages (i) sensitisation and (ii) consultation and decision making. Those involved in stage 2 are known as the 'representative group'. The sensitised group may be larger than 10-25, but the representative group comprises 10-25 members, dependent on school size, and is selected from among teachers, current students, parents, well-wishers and community representatives. During SSA the representative groups discuss priorities separately before working as a whole group. This representative group is also responsible for implementing, monitoring and evaluating the plan. A marked difference between the PSI and CFA approaches is the inclusion in PSI of past pupils and in CFA/SSA of current students and well-wishers. In the PSI the SDC members are supposed to meet once a month. The zonal representative in addition to her/his participation at the SDC meeting is supposed to spend a day or more in a given month in the school. In the CFA/SSA regular and frequent meetings are not prescribed. The funding of planned activities with the SDP of the PSI is not automatic. In CFA elements of the SDP are funded through school grants that are linked with 'project funding' but in PSI this is not the case. In CFA, the schools received a grant to implement the plan, whereas in PSI only few centrally selected schools received a grant. Through CFA the SSA has resulted in the identification of additional funds. Principals) are expected to submit their SDP initially to divisional officer and to the zonal officer responsible for CFA, or to both simultaneously. In CFA there is feedback and follow up. In other words plan implementation is monitored and evaluated and while this is also an expected practice in PSI, it is not common.

During our field trip we uncovered diverse practices on the part of principals in the handling of PSI and CFA expectations. For example:

Practice 1: the school uses SSA to develop a one year plan. The school only recently (2010) received the circular on PSI and has, for the moment 'put it aside, concentrating on a one year SDP informed by the process of CFA.

Practice 2: the school prepares a five year strategic plan and one year operational plan as informed by PSI. The one year plan is strengthened by the outcomes of the CFA/SSA.

Practice 3: the school prepares two SDPs: one for PSI and the other for CFA with overlapping activities.

Some attempts to streamline the PSI and CFA approaches to school planning have been made at ground level. For example in the Eastern province the PD reported that the same officer is responsible for supervising the PSI and all the CFA activities in the schools. This action was taken to harmonise the two approaches. UNICEF field officers have witnessed discussions about PSI during CFA training of trainers workshops. And in some schools the school development committee formed under PSI is also involved in the CFA SSA and SDP process. In schools that had both the PSI and CFA planning tools, UNICEF field staff worked with principals to support PSI planning through a SSA process.

The zonal director (Kalkudah) noted that zonal officers are more interested in contributing to the formulation of the development of SDP in CFA, as it has proven to be a plan with high probability of being implemented in addition to being very close to the aspirations of the community. Leadership in CFA schools is not confined to principals only; the participation of others such as deputy principal, sectional head and teachers is high. Informal leaders among teachers have emerged. In the PSI approach developing the five-year strategic and the one-year operational plan, in most cases is the responsibility of the principal. In PSI, principals do not involve a wide range of individuals from the school itself. This is a matter for concern and capacity has to be built in schools, more so in the principal, for distributed leadership. In PSI intervention though plans are submitted to the Zonal Education office, there is no follow up after that and neither specific grants are received by schools. SSA and implementation of SDP has less occurred in PSI schools as there was no monitoring, neither any incentive provided to carry out this process. At the same time the guidance provided to schools in the CFA guidance manual could be clarified.

Given the commitment of the MOE to both PSI and CFA within ESDFP it is time that the two approaches are merged into one with clear guidance for provinces, zones, divisions and, most of all, school principals. Overall the following recommendations are suggested.

- * PSI objectives which were set out in 2006 should be updated in terms of current ESDFP objectives: access and participation, improvements in the quality of education, social inclusion, reduction of disparities and healthy, safe and protective environments.
- * Following CFA, the PSI approach should include an initial stage of school self assessment involving consultation among stakeholders, including students.
- * Following PSI, the SDC should be retained and, dependent on the circumstances of the school (small school, large schools, primary school, secondary school etc) be developed to include relevant sub-committees.
- * Membership of the SDC should include well-wishers and, preferably, current students. Student representatives should be included in the SDC subcommittees that implement and monitor plans.
- * SSA should result in one five-year plan and one one-year plan, rather than two. Plans should be costed, indicate resource gaps, and responsibilities for action. Plan(s) should be submitted to the same officer in the zone. The purpose of sending the plans to the zone is for refinement/feedback and the provision of some funds for implementation.

* Unless feedback and funds for implementation of the plan are received by schools, there is little point in sending them to the zone. A transparent and speedy process of granting funds to the schools under ESDFP needs to be put in place.

Extracts from (i) the PSI circular and (ii) the CFA Process of School Self Assessment and the development of the School Development Plan

(i) PSI Circular

Objectives and Outcomes of PSI

- Prepare and implement strategic and operational plans for school improvement and maintain a coherent and coordinate approach to all aspects of planning and to deliver school development programmes more effectively;
- Responsibility and accountability of decisions on school improvement are given to a group that functions on a democratic management structure;
- Increase congruence between staff training and school needs thus improving staff development which leads to higher student achievement;
- Increase transparency in school management;
- Involve community representatives in school planning and encourage schools to respond effectively to the needs of parents and the demands of the community, thus strengthening the partnership between teachers and the school community;
- Schools, to use government and community resources efficiently to achieve national goals of education;
- Be sensitive to local needs and resources in the implementation of the curriculum
- Focus on pupil/student academic performance that leads to higher student achievement and become useful citizens.

School Development Committee

The SDC is responsible to achieve the objectives of the PSI within the school. The SDC would consist of teacher/ parent/ past pupil representatives and a representative of the education authority. The principal shall function as the chairperson of the SDC. The SDC shall meet at least once a month.

The School Management Team (SMT)

This is a team established within the school to help to carry out the decisions of the SDC. The in-school representatives of the SDC, the other deputy principals, assistant principals and selected group of sectional heads will constitute the SMT.

Functions of the SDC

(a) Planning

- (i) Schools are required to prepare a 5-year school development plan and an annual operational plan.
- (ii) Development of the 5-year school development plan and an annual operational plan has to be based on the guidelines, "*Instructions for School Level Planning*", by the Ministry of Education (MOE).
- (iii) The sub-committees may be involved in the preparation of the plans.
- (iv) In the preparation of the plan school priorities have to be considered.
- (v) The plans have to be submitted to education authorities.
- (vi) The zonal/provincial/central ministry Offices will review the plans and resources will be allocated to each school, based upon a needs analysis against previously identified criteria.

(b) Curriculum

- (i) Implement the curriculum to best suit the needs of each and every child so that they become useful citizens.
- (ii) According to the given curriculum organize the teaching learning process, by removing the deficiencies.
- (iii) Develop mechanisms to better utilize the quality input grants.
- (iv) Encourage students to engage in a wide range of curricular and co-curricular activities and increase the range and quality of co-curricular activities.
- (v) Provide library facilities and instructional aids.
- (vi) Increase the participation of the wider community to provide expertise and knowledge which could contribute to the co-curriculum.
- (vii) Ensure sufficient flexibility to accommodate the particular needs of students and reflect local needs and employment opportunities.

(c) School Based Staff Development

- (i) Conduct staff appraisal to enable the school to identify the strengths to be developed and weaknesses to be addressed and to negotiate personal and professional development needs of teachers.
- (ii) Organize programmes to address areas of staff development, both individual and collective.
- (iii) Support in providing staff professional needs.
- (iv) Give priority to staff training that will benefit student achievement.

(d) School Infrastructure Maintenance and Development

- (i) The schools may initiate construction work and repairs as deemed necessary for the development and effective functioning of the school.
- (ii) Organise participatory management programmes to improve the school plant.

(e) School-Community Relations

- (i) Organize and implement programmes to obtain the support of the community in school improvement
- (ii) Inculcate a positive attitude in the community on the school.
- (iii) Implement programmes by the school towards the welfare of the community.
- (iv) As student achievement is related to home factors, help homes to create the appropriate environment for learning, get the parents to support children in their academic work.

Functions of the School Management Team (SMT)

- (i) This team will implement the SDC decisions within the school.
- (ii) SMT will work in close collaboration with the SDC.
- (iii) SMT will help the SDC as needed.
- (iv) Bring the school priorities to the attention of the SDC.
- (v) Inform the SDC on urgent school needs.

The Sub-Committees

The SDC in consultation with the SMT may appoint any other sub committees for school improvement and decide upon tasks according to the requirements of the school. These sub-committees may consist of teachers, parents, past pupils, resource persons drawn from the community and pupils. Each sub-committee has to have a leader. It also can have a secretary and a treasurer if necessary.

Extracts from the CFA approach to School Self Assessment and the School Development Plan

School Self Assessment and Developing the School Development Plan in CFA

1. The Principal invites the in-school staff, parents, old pupils, well wishers and other community representatives for a sensitization programme on CFA and will help them realize that their school can become child friendly by undertaking certain interventions. This principal should be supported by an external facilitator such as an officer from the zone/division or the ISA trained by the province. Motivation will be created and at the end the whole group should

agree to participate in the process.

2. A representative group from above is chosen including teachers, students, parents, well-wishers and community representatives with the consensus of the whole group.
3. The representative group is further oriented on the CF concept and indicators.
4. Parents, students, teachers and others work as separate groups and assess the position of the school against the CF indicators. Facilitators identify relevant indicators for each group without giving all the indicators to every group. For example: indicators such as “Teachers are trained on primary education” and “Teachers share what they gained at training workshops with fellow teachers” could be given only for the teachers group.
5. The groups discuss the available data/findings (from school records, from the principal, etc) and prepare assessment feedback that they report at a plenary with all groups. Each group presents its priorities and after a discussion the group agrees on a list of school priorities.
6. According to these priorities the group develops the School Development Plan. The SDP should be presented to the entire school community that participated in the sensitization workshop. This will help them to identify resources available and volunteers as well.
7. Implementation of the plan by the school under the guidance of the Principal and the representative group.
8. Monitoring of the plan by the representative group.
9. Evaluation of the plan by the representative group.
10. The annual plan for the following year should be based on the lessons learned from implementation of the previous year’s plan

ANNEX 12: Key Project Components

Group 1 including the excluded

School based Attendance Committees (SACs)

The establishment of School based Attendance Committees (SACs) are an essential means identifying out-of school children (OOSC) and students with irregular attendance. SACs are intended to closely monitor pupils with low attendance and help in early detection of dropouts. SACs are created with the participation of principals, teachers, parents, community members and students. SACs have been established in the BESP supported schools over the past four years and are functioning well. By September 2012, 1196 out of 1359 BESP supported schools had functioning SACs.

SACs have used multi-approaches such as home visits and community sensitization been two key approaches. Through home visits and meetings with the community, SACs at the BESP supported schools have identified 8,047 out of school children, (4,338 boys and 3,709 girls) between 2009 and 2011. The BESP has initiated further interventions to reach out of school children, reduce drop outs, increase attendance etc. These include class room, school based and divisional/zonal based approaches. In classroom based approaches teachers are equipped with management techniques to encourage good attendance: such as display of attendance charts, rewarding 100 per cent attendance in a month with a 'Gold Star'. School based approaches include community led school feeding programs; and maintaining child friendly environment in the entire school. Under zonal/divisional approaches, divisional-based and zonal-based attendance monitoring mechanisms had also been set up respectively to complement the SACs. Under this initiative the Divisional/Zonal Director and his/her team conduct monthly visits to schools with the lowest reported attendees.

The Target on attendance is more than 85% of students attend for more than 80% of school days. The ACR concludes that 87 per cent of girls and 86 per cent of boys regularly attend school reaching a minimum of at least 80 per cent attendance. However, further analysis indicates the target has not been reached all in five districts that have been part of the programme since its inception in 2009. Here attendance rates of more than 85% in 2011 are apparent for neither boys nor girls, though girls and boys in one district achieve between 80 and 85%. Compared with their respective performances in 2009, one district shows a decline for boys and girls (Badulla), and one a decline for boys (Batticaloa). At the same time commendable increases can be seen in Moneragala (point increase of + 13 for girls and + 10 for boys), in NuwaraEliya (+ 14 for girls and + 13 for boys) and Trincomalee (+ 19 for girls and +14 for girls). We should also note however that four of the five districts in the Northern province that joined the programme in 2011 already had attendance rates 85% or higher at the point when they joined BESP. These figures will have inflated the cross district average in 2011 and throw into question the extent to which increases in attendance rates can be attributed to the actions of the School Attendance committees *per se*.

Catch-up Education (CUE)

Catch up education (CUE) was implemented in 2009, but ceased to function the following year following a recommendation by the MTR team. Catch-up education classes were intended to provide opportunities for students outside mainstream classes. They were intended for learners who had dropped out of school for various reasons, including displacement due to conflict. Catch-up education was a standard government program and UNICEF supported its

implementation in the catchment areas of BESP schools through funding surveying, training and basic equipment such as exercise books. The classes under BESP were established by the Department of Non Formal Education with the Provinces and Zones. As such they ran separately from other BESP components which were led by the Primary Education Department of the MOE with the Provinces and Zones. Following a review of CUE conducted in 2009, UNICEF stopped supporting CUE in its and focused its attention on the strengthening of Basic Literacy Classes (BLC) (Seel et al, 2010).

Basic Literacy Classes (BLCs)

The main objective of the BLCs is to provide basic literacy and competency for out-of-school children. BLCs take place outside the regular school and support children to reach the minimum literacy and numeracy indicators for reintegration into the formal school system. BESP was to provide technical assistance to the NFE unit at the MOE was to support BLCs through Material development and training of BLC class teachers.

In this intervention, teacher 'assistants' work with students and integrate them in mainstream classes when they reach the required literacy level. The teacher assistants follow up with the students that are integrated in the classes and keep close relationship with the teachers in the school. By 2011, 551 BLCs were functioning across the country reaching 10,540 children (5,228 boys and 5,312 girls). BESP directly supported 46 Basic Literacy Classes serving 672 children aged 5-14 in Badulla, Moneragala and Nuwara Eliya districts; 446 children (55 per cent) were reintegrated back into schools in 2012. A comprehensive BLC Instructor Guide and BLC Learning Materials for first Language and Mathematics in both Sinhala and Tamil languages have been developed, approved and printing is underway for distribution. Approximately 126 professional Non-Formal Education teachers were trained on teaching methodologies and implementation of the BLC program. BLC classes are conducted in Batticaloa district but the teacher assistants do not get any financial assistance from BESP. BLC classes were established in Nuwara Eliya, Badulla and Moneragala districts in 2010 under BESP and were started voluntarily in Batticaloa district in 2011.

The Accelerated Learning Programme (ALP):

The Accelerated Learning Program was designed as a supplementary education program, supporting displaced students re-entering into the formal school system to reach an acceptable standard of learning achievement. From the end of 2009 UNICEF has assisted the Ministry of Education, the National Institute of Education and the Northern and Eastern Provincial Departments of Education (PDE) to implement key activities for an Alternative Learning Programs (ALPS) to address the learning needs of students mainly in IDP camps in the North. The Accelerated Learning Programme (ALP) was intended to be a temporary school-based intervention to help students rapidly reach their age-appropriate learning competency thus promoting grade 1-9 retention. The design of the ALP was expected to allow students who have fallen behind in education to enter the program at the appropriate designated competency level regardless of age. They were to exit the program once they have reached their age-appropriate learning competency and transition back to the corresponding grade level in the formal system. The design of the ALP was expected to ensure that older students will be able to sit for Ordinary level and Advanced level examinations with minimal disruption. The intervention was to take place inside regular classrooms, or after school hours, and supports students to catch up and survive in formal schools

In the BESP first progress report for 2009, outcome 1.3 was stated as: out of school children are accessing Catch-Up or Alternative Education Programs. Information on children covered by ALPS was not mentioned in the report since BESP was not in operation in the Northern

Province in 2009. At that time there were 1526 children benefiting from CUE in four districts, Amapara, Badulla, Moneragala and Nuwara Eliya with assistance from BESP. The Accelerated Learning Programme (ALP) came into existence in the Northern Province in 2011 when BESP was extended to the Northern Province. Intended for displaced children, nearly 20,000 children were covered by the programme. The same number continued to participate in ALP in the Northern Province in 2012. Another 9,000 marginalized children were included in ALP in Batticaloa in 160 schools in mid-2012. Since the start of ALP in the North 1,466 principals, teachers and education officers have been trained on the ALP teaching methodology. An additional 240 teachers are now trained until the end of 2012. During 2011, 2,270 sets of teacher hand books were distributed across the Northern Province. The program is valued by parents and the community and the children are quickly catching up with their peers. A review of the ALP program in the North and East provinces is to be completed before the end of 2012. This review may shed light on the effectiveness of the program and based on the findings could be further extended to other areas.

Group 2 Strengthening school management

The BESP aims to strengthen school management and school improvement through a two pronged approach: the conduct of School Self-Assessments (SSA); and the development of School Development Plans (SDPs) with the participation of school teachers, principals, students and community members. The conduct of SSAs and the development of SDPs with effective participation of students, families and communities constitute criterion 5.1 of CFA Dimension 5 Child Friendly schools are actively engaged with students, families and community.

School Self-Assessment (SSA)

School Self Assessment is 'the assessment made of the school with the active participation of the community according to Child Friendly school criteria. The participation of the whole school community is essential for this' (CFA Guidance Manual, English draft version, 2012, page 47). The assessment is also described as a 'sensitisation process' (CFA Guidance Manual, English draft version, 2012, page 57). A few steps to be followed in sensitisation are set out in chapter 7 of the manual. An improved set drafted by a former UNICEF officer is appended in the latter part of Annex 18.

Under the BESP 98 per cent of schools have completed the SSA process. Even the two percent that have not completed the process are newly selected schools of the Northern Province. SSA is found to be very effective and had given a new impetus. The principal, teachers, parents, old pupils, well-wishers and students have had constructive discussions to identify school needs and solutions. Collective diagnosis of problems and issues, planning and progress review in groups has increased the morale, generated knowledge, inculcate positive attitudes and develop skills among them. They while working together in implementing change have identified further insight and better ways of doing things. The processes that started with SSA have created extended ties between the school and the community. The schools have reached out to the community, have in-depth information of families and have been able intervene when necessary. SSA has introduced a lively mode of mobilizing community resources in rural districts which are disadvantaged thus transforming not only schools but the way of life of the community. In project schools though parental involvement in many areas were commendable, parents still remain less involved in child learning. We return to these observations in later section that compares CFA-promoted school based management practices with those of a parallel Non BESP system know as the Programme for School Improvement (PSI).

School Development Plan (SDP)

The School Development Plan is 'the compiling of priority needs to be accomplished as identified by the school self assessment. All the community groups should participate effectively in the process of preparing the plan. The involvement of the school community is very importance in the compilation, implementation and monitoring of the SDP' ((CFA Guidance Manual, English draft version, 2012, page 47).

SDPs are intended to be an instrument that sets objectives and the implementation of strategies for achieving the six CFA criteria. The project schools were expected to develop a one year and five year SDP. Following the development of the plan schools could expect to receive a school grant to support improvements such as Primary classroom renovation, classroom separation, school fence and gate, teachers' quarter's repairs, furniture repairs; hiring resource persons for teaching in the classrooms; and the preparation of teaching and learning materials.

Under the BESP 98 per cent of schools have developed SDPs. In 2011, 230 and in 2012, 973 schools received funds to implement the SDPs. The principal and staff were committed to the implementation of the SDP with parents and well-wishers and demonstrated ownership. In some cases professionals from diverse sectors and civil society organizations participated in the implementation of SDP activities. The grant received helped the schools to meet urgent requirements and further motivated them to make voluntary contributions. Parents provided labour in most instances to repair classrooms, furniture etc. The SDP was an appropriate and timely intervention as the MOE was also proposing the schools to do the same through another (PSI) route. What is striking in project schools are the school's commitment to the implementation of the plan. The provision of school grant has been an effective strategy in the implementation of the plan. In some schools the SDPs had more emphasis on infrastructure development. Overall this objective has been well realized.

ANNEX 13: Summary of BESP Achievements with Analyses

BESP Achievements against Indicators and Targets

| Strategic Result 1: A reduction of 1 % per annum in the current level of children not completing primary education in target schools in focus districts Outcomes: (Indicator 1) 4. At least 50% decrease in the number of girls and boys in all five grades not enrolled in schools (<i>Indicators 2,3 &4</i>) 5. 85% of girls and boys regularly attend school reaching a minimum of 80% attendance (<i>Indicator 5</i>) 6. Out-of-school children are accessing Catch-Up or Alternative Education Programmes (<i>Indicators 6, 7 & 8</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------|--|--|------|--|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| Indicators | Targets | Achievement as per ACR and data from end 2011 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indicator 1. Survival Rate (By sex and by district) | All the BESP supported districts show progress in survival rates | <p>Survival rates increased in five of the six originally supported districts. This increase was also observed in the BESP schools within those districts. Four of the six original districts show a percentage point increase of more than 3 %. Ampara and Badulla lag behind while Moneragala shows a remarkable increase. Five districts in the North were included in BESP only in 2011 and are not assessed here.</p> <p>Survival rate to Grade 5 for BESP supported schools in original six districts in 2009 and 2011 by gender and District</p> <table> <tr> <th rowspan="2">District</th><th colspan="3">2009 (Baseline)</th><th colspan="3">2011</th><th rowspan="2">Point increase in BESP schools (one year before completion of the Programme)</th></tr> <tr> <th>Boys</th><th>Girls</th><th>Total</th><th>Boys</th><th>Girls</th><th>Total</th></tr> <tr> <td>Ampara</td><td>95.98</td><td>92.08</td><td>94.14</td><td>99.45</td><td>99.11</td><td>99.29</td><td>+ 1.83</td></tr> <tr> <td>Badulla</td><td>98.57</td><td>98.12</td><td>98.35</td><td>98.95</td><td>101.12</td><td>100.02</td><td>+ 2.16</td></tr> <tr> <td>Batticaloa</td><td>103.75</td><td>102.64</td><td>103.21</td><td>100.94</td><td>102.00</td><td>101.44</td><td>+5.82</td></tr> <tr> <td>Moneragala</td><td>98.22</td><td>98.09</td><td>98.16</td><td>112.13</td><td>117.45</td><td>114.77</td><td>+17.24</td></tr> <tr> <td>Nuwara Eliya</td><td>98.04</td><td>95.09</td><td>96.61</td><td>100.54</td><td>103.03</td><td>101.78</td><td>+5.88</td></tr> <tr> <td>Trincomalee</td><td>99.61</td><td>97.03</td><td>98.18</td><td>118.21</td><td>100.39</td><td>108.96</td><td>+4.05</td></tr> </table> | | | | | | District | 2009 (Baseline) | | | 2011 | | | Point increase in BESP schools (one year before completion of the Programme) | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Ampara | 95.98 | 92.08 | 94.14 | 99.45 | 99.11 | 99.29 | + 1.83 | Badulla | 98.57 | 98.12 | 98.35 | 98.95 | 101.12 | 100.02 | + 2.16 | Batticaloa | 103.75 | 102.64 | 103.21 | 100.94 | 102.00 | 101.44 | +5.82 | Moneragala | 98.22 | 98.09 | 98.16 | 112.13 | 117.45 | 114.77 | +17.24 | Nuwara Eliya | 98.04 | 95.09 | 96.61 | 100.54 | 103.03 | 101.78 | +5.88 | Trincomalee | 99.61 | 97.03 | 98.18 | 118.21 | 100.39 | 108.96 | +4.05 |
| District | 2009 (Baseline) | | | 2011 | | | Point increase in BESP schools (one year before completion of the Programme) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ampara | 95.98 | 92.08 | 94.14 | 99.45 | 99.11 | 99.29 | + 1.83 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Badulla | 98.57 | 98.12 | 98.35 | 98.95 | 101.12 | 100.02 | + 2.16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Batticaloa | 103.75 | 102.64 | 103.21 | 100.94 | 102.00 | 101.44 | +5.82 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moneragala | 98.22 | 98.09 | 98.16 | 112.13 | 117.45 | 114.77 | +17.24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nuwara Eliya | 98.04 | 95.09 | 96.61 | 100.54 | 103.03 | 101.78 | +5.88 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Trincomalee | 99.61 | 97.03 | 98.18 | 118.21 | 100.39 | 108.96 | +4.05 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indicator 2. Number of identified out of school girls and boys | <p>Number of identified out of school girls and boys.</p> <p><i>No target number can be specified can be specified in advance</i></p> | <p>4,338 boys and 3,709 girls identified in the BESP supported schools' catchment areas since 2009 to 2011</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Indicator 3. Number and % of identified out of school girls and boys enrolled into school. | At least 50 % of identified out of school children enrolled into school. | 4,149 (52%) of identified out of school children enrolled into school since 2009 to 2011 2170 out of 4338 out school boys (50.23 %) and 1979 out 3709 girls (53.57 %) were reintegrated into schools. Six out of eleven districts show a re-integration rate over 50 per cent. The three conflict affected Northern Province districts (Mannar, Mullaitivu and Vavuniya) which were included in BESP from mid 2011 onwards show the lowest re-integration rates of 37%, 38% and 38% respectively. Badulla and Trincomalee districts show 46% and 40% respectively. |
| Indicator 4. Number and % of schools which have mechanisms in place to successfully identify and support children out of school and at risk of dropping out. | All BESP supported schools have functioning School Attendance Committees (SACs) | As of mid 2012, 1196 (96%) BESP supported schools had functioning SACs. Seven divisional-based and 5 zonal-based attendance monitoring mechanisms were set up in Uva and Central provinces respectively to complement the SACs. BESP supported a nationally led Out-Of-School Children's Study as part of a global UNICEF initiative. The study was completed in collaboration with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) and UNICEF in 2011 and will be published in late 2012. The study shows that over 25,000 (1.9 per cent of total primary age children) children of primary school age and over 43,000 (3.3 per cent of total junior secondary age children) children of lower secondary school age are out of school. (Based on the Demographic Health Survey 2006/7 data). Community mobilization programmes were organized with innovative communication approach targeting parents and community members. Key messages on primary education were disseminated to approximately 20,000 parents and community members. |
| Indicator 5 % of girls and boys who attend at least 80% of school days. | 85 per cent of girls and boys regularly attend school reaching a minimum of 80 per cent attendance 85 per cent of girls and boys regularly attend school reaching a minimum of 80 per cent attendance <i>85% of girls and boys for each district (As in BESP M & E Framework, Annex III in ACR)</i> | The UNICEF ICR reports that overall 87 per cent of girls and 86 per cent of boys are attending more than 80 per cent of school days – 'this is a massive 15 per cent point increase since the start of the BESP'.. The overall conclusion drawn in the UNICEF report is misleading for two reasons. The target is stated in terms of districts and should be reported as such. And five out of eleven districts entered the programme only in mid 2011, of which four already had attendance rates c 85% or higher. Since they have been included in the 2011 totals and have inflated the cross district average in 2011. Of the six districts included from the beginning one (Ampara) has exceeded the target of 85%, but from an already high base of 77% for girls and 79% for boys. Two other districts (Moneragala) and Trincomalee have seen significant improvements. In some districts landslides and floods negatively impacted attendance during 2011. |

| | | Districts | 2009 | | 2010 | | 2011 (one year before completion of the Programme) | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------|---------|--------|----------------------------------------------------|--------|
| | | | Girls % | Boys % | Girls % | Boys % | Girls % | Boys % |
| | | Badulla | 81 | 79 | 80 | 77 | 77 | 77 |
| | | Batticaloa | 71 | 91 | 84 | 82 | 78 | 74 |
| | | Moneragala | 69 | 69 | 82 | 79 | 82 | 79 |
| | | Nuwara Eliya | 70 | 68 | 81 | 81 | 84 | 81 |
| | | Trincomalee | 63 | 65 | 70 | 67 | 82 | 79 |
| Indicator 6. Number and % of identified out of school children completed BL (Basic Literacy) Classes and Accelerated Learning Programme (ALP). | Enrolling all identified children lagging behind in BL skills into BL classes; and incorporating all identified children who need ALP into ALP classes | <p>In 2009, 1200 of 2488 out of school children identified were in CUE classes in Badulla, Moneragala and Nuwara Eliya districts. The CUE component was dropped in 2009 during the first year of BESP implementation, after which all CUE students were absorbed into the Basic Literacy programme into schools.</p> <p>672 (357 girls and 315 boys) out-of-school Children (100% of identified children lagging behind in BL skills) enrolled in BL classes. The BL programme was not supported in the Northern and Eastern provinces. A comprehensive BL Instructor Guide and BLC Learning Materials for Language and Mathematics in both Sinhala and Tamil languages have been developed, approved and printing is underway for distribution before the end of 2012. Approximately 126 professional Non-Formal Education teachers were trained on teaching methodologies and implementation of the BLC programme. Training and standardised teaching/learning resources in both Tamil and Sinhala have provided the teachers with improved teaching and classroom management skills for working with out-of-school children. Support for BLCs in Batticaloa district began in 2011 but the teacher assistants do not get any financial assistance from BESP.</p> <p>Accelerated Learning Programme (ALP) has reached 260 schools in the northern province and supports approximately 20,000 displaced students in the northern province and 9,000 marginalized children in the Eastern province, who had fallen behind their age-appropriate competency. In addition to 10 Education officials and 165 School Principals, 1291 teachers were trained on ALP strategies. Another 240 teachers are to be trained before end 2012. To support the teachers involved in ALP, 2270 sets of Hand Books have been distributed. A review of ALP is expected to be completed before end 2012.</p> | | | | | | |

| Indicator 7. Number and % of children reintegrated into school | At least 50 per cent of the enrolled students in BL classes reintegrated into schools | 446 i.e. 66 percent of children in BL classes in Nuwara Eliya, Badulla and Moneragala districts, reintegrated into schools in 2012 (241 out of 357 girls and 205 out of 315 boys). Indicator does not apply to the other 8 districts. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|--|--|--------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|---------|-------|--------------|-------|------------|-------|--------|-------|-------------|-------|--|--|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-----------------|--------------|
| Indicator 8. Number and % of children who have been retained after reintegrating into school. | 80 per cent of reintegrated children will be retained at the end of first year | 246 (167 girls and 79 boys) out of 446 reintegrated students (55%) in Nuwara Eliya, Badulla and Moneragala districts are retained in schools by 30 th July 2012. Indicator does not apply to the other 8 districts. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strategic Result 2: By 2011, disparities for students in passing Grade 5 Scholarship Exam reduced by 10% from 2008 level between the national and targeted districts (Indicator 9) Outcomes: 1. The Child Friendly Approach is institutionalized within the national education system in the focus districts (<i>Indicators 10 & 11</i>) 2. All primary schools in AusAID focus districts are participating in the CFA initiative and 25% of these schools have reached an achievement rate of 80% towards CFA criteria in all CFA dimensions (<i>Indicators 12, 13 & 14</i>) 3. Effective monitoring systems support the achievement of CFA (<i>Indicators 15 & 16</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indicators | Targets | Achievement and comment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indicator 9. The absolute difference in the percentage of students who achieved 70+ marks on the Grade 5 Scholarship Exam between the national rate and the district rate. | By 2011 disparities for students in passing the Grade 5 scholarship Exam reduced by 10 percentage points from 2008 level between the national and targeted districts. | <table><tr><td colspan="6">Percentage of students who achieved 70+ at the grade 5 scholarship exam in 2011</td></tr><tr><td>Ampara</td><td>63.07</td><td>Moneragala</td><td>56.19</td><td>Mullaitivu</td><td>37.83</td></tr><tr><td>Badulla</td><td>62.16</td><td>Nuwara Eliya</td><td>52.16</td><td>Batticaloa</td><td>54.20</td></tr><tr><td>Jaffna</td><td>59.89</td><td>Trincomalee</td><td>51.54</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Kilinochchi</td><td>44.22</td><td>Vavuniya</td><td>60.10</td><td>National</td><td>65.09</td></tr></table> <p>The indicator is based on all schools in a district and not simply the project schools. It is therefore not a good indicator of BESP school performance. During the review of program design during the MTR it was agreed that school level data will not be collected as it was not compatible with Department of Examinations baseline data because of different definitions. However since the data reported to schools are generated by the Department of Examinations data base it is felt that these definitional problems were, in principle, surmountable and an opportunity to compare school performance over time and in relation to national averages was missed. In terms of the agreed indicator the gap between national and district levels has diminished in 5/6 original districts between 2009 and 2011. In the 5 districts in the North three show a reduction between 2010 and 2011. However, the national % has increased dramatically from 57.6% in 2009 to</p> | Percentage of students who achieved 70+ at the grade 5 scholarship exam in 2011 | | | | | | Ampara | 63.07 | Moneragala | 56.19 | Mullaitivu | 37.83 | Badulla | 62.16 | Nuwara Eliya | 52.16 | Batticaloa | 54.20 | Jaffna | 59.89 | Trincomalee | 51.54 | | | Kilinochchi | 44.22 | Vavuniya | 60.10 | National | 65.09 |
| Percentage of students who achieved 70+ at the grade 5 scholarship exam in 2011 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ampara | 63.07 | Moneragala | 56.19 | Mullaitivu | 37.83 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Badulla | 62.16 | Nuwara Eliya | 52.16 | Batticaloa | 54.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jaffna | 59.89 | Trincomalee | 51.54 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kilinochchi | 44.22 | Vavuniya | 60.10 | National | 65.09 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | 65.09% in 2011, compromising 'catch up'. Note that 70 marks out of 200 would not indicate close to mastery or half way to mastery. |
| Indicator 10. Implementation guidelines approved and disseminated to all districts | Implementation guidelines approved & disseminated to all districts | CFA guidance manual was developed, approved and launched at a national CFA symposium with the Minister of Education and has been distributed to all the government schools in the country. 23,000 copies of CFA Guidance Manual (15,000 in Sinhala and 8,000 in Tamil have printed and distributed in June 2012. Not clear whether all schools, or all BESP schools, have received at least one copy of the manual. The translation of the English version is in the final stages. Preparation of the training manual for education officials is underway. Not clear why Indicator 10 might lead to Result 2 during the life of the project. It is an indicator of institutionalization and sustainability. |
| Indicator 11: Provincial resource teams established in all provinces | Provincial resource teams established in all provinces | Provincial resource teams established in 9 out of 9 provinces. |
| Indicator 12. Number and % of schools with 80% CFA criteria achieved | At least 25 per cent of BESP supported schools with 80 per cent of CFA criteria achieved | CFA Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and collection tool finalized. UNICEF report that data will be available in early 2013 through a CFA evaluation. |
| Indicator 13. Number and % of schools with SSAs. | All BESP supported schools with SSAs | 1,230 of 1,359 BESP supported schools have completed the SSA and developed and implemented a SDP in their schools. BESP funds directly supported 230 and 973 schools to implement their SDPs in 2011 and 2012. Many items in the School Developments Plans (SDPs) do not need external funding. Some schools receive a school grant up to 220,000 rupees for improvement of physical facilities and teaching learning materials. |
| Indicator 14. Number and % of schools with teachers trained on CFA. | All BESP supported schools have teachers trained on CFA | Of the 8,829 teachers in the project schools, percentage of teachers trained on CFA varies across project schools. However each of the 1,359 project schools has at least one teacher trained on CFA. (UNICEF, 2012,). More than 75% teachers trained in the project schools in the original 6 focus districts and in the Jaffna district. The percentage in the project schools in the districts of Kilinochchi, Mannar, Mullaitivu and Vavuniya (all of which came into the programme only in mid-2011) is 55, 50, 55 and 48 respectively 1035 more teachers are expected to be trained before end 2012 |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Indicator 15 Number and % of schools trained in monitoring criteria of CFA | All BESP supported schools have been trained on CFA monitoring criteria | <p>All (289) BESP supported schools in 2 districts in Uva province have been trained. CFA Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and collection tool finalized. Data from schools are being collected and information on achievement of target will be available by the end of 2012.</p> <p>The CFA monitoring tool is part of an on-going target to mainstream CFA into the national strategy for school development. Progress on this expected outcome has been slower than planned.</p> <p>Capacity building of relevant government officers in all the provinces is required before the tool can be delivered at the school level. Nearly 200 trainers were trained on CFA monitoring tool from Central, Eastern, North Central, North-Western, Sabaragamuwa, and Uva provinces; and an additional 75 trainers from Northern, Southern and Western Provinces will be trained before the end October 2012</p> |
| Indicator 16. Number and % of schools generating information by CFA criteria. | All BESP supported schools are generating information by CFA criteria | <p>All (289) BESP supported in schools in Uva province have been trained in collection of information using the CFA monitoring tool. Over 500 schools, including 289 directly supported by BESP started collecting information using the CFA criteria. BESP funds were used to develop the tools but not to administer the tools through training since the provinces selected by the MOE for piloting fall outside of BESP targeted districts.</p> <p>Primary Education Branch at the MOE has a plan to establish and manage a database that will capture child-friendly indicators of schools. It is, however, expected that substantial technical support will be required to successfully implement the database. Given the slow progress thus far, it is unlikely that all BESP schools will be able to generate information for systemic monitoring on CFA by the end of 2012. As such, the BESP annual survey, designed by UNICEF, will be used as a proxy indicator at the end 2012 if the MOE monitoring system is not yet functional. Discussions are being held with the EFA Unit of the MOE to incorporate some of the CFA indicators into the national system, thus enabling the MOE to measure inclusion and the effectiveness of interventions.</p> |

ANNEX 14: Notes on Indicators

Note on Indicators 1 and 5 and Strategic Result 1

The performance on access is impressive, though we should note also that the calculation of survival rates in both BESP and non BESP is subject to myriad errors and artefacts of measurement. In principle the survival rate of a cohort of children who enter Grade 1 should not exceed 100% by Grade 5. The fact that this happens reflects many factors. First the rate is based on a comparison of students enrolled in Grade 5 in the current year with students enrolled in Grade 1 four years earlier. It is not based on a tracking of individual children from Grade 1 to Grade 5. While decreases in Grade 5 enrolment may indicate dropout, they may also indicate repetition, which occurs despite an official policy of automatic promotion, outward migration and resettlement, incomplete or incorrect records. Conversely increases in Grade 5 enrolment may indicate improved survival and re-entry of dropouts they may also indicate inward migration and resettlement, entry to Grade 5 of 'overage for grade' children from among previously displaced populations and incomplete or incorrect records. Several of these factors can also affect records of Grade 1 enrolment and hence the ratios of Grade 5 and Grade 1 enrolment below and above 100%. The survival rates are based on data pooled across BESP schools within districts. For reasons of data availability comparisons are drawn across districts or across districts across time rather than across schools or across schools across time. To date school-specific survival rates have not been calculated, though in principle they could be. The significance of this is that interventions to improve survival (and attendance) are rooted at the level of the school and school community. Only if we can correlate school-level interventions with school level results can we begin to explore and attribute causality to those interventions.

Note on Indicators 10 and 11

Indicators 10 and 11 require that implementation guidelines are approved and disseminated to all districts and that provincial resource teams are established in all provinces. These indicators go beyond the BESP result on quality which, strictly, would have required that these be achieved in the eleven focal districts in four provinces. These indicators more properly relate to the goal of mainstreaming that assumed greater importance after the Mid Term Review. This should have appeared as a separate outcome or result within a modified M&E framework.

Note on Indicator 9 and Strategic Result 2

As noted in the MTR the agreement between AusAID and UNICEF had specified the expected outcomes and outcome indicators. This was taken from the UNICEF Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) and referred to the baseline year of 2004. Early in implementation of the program AusAID and UNICEF started working on a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for BESP based on the original agreement. However UNICEF reported that reliable information was not available on a number of stated indicators. This led to a lengthy dialogue in which the indicators were adjusted. Every effort was made to maintain the original intention of agreed outcomes and indicators whilst also adjusting the baseline year, ensuring that the data required would be

available for monitoring and that the indicators would be a reflection of genuine progress. The discussion continued for the first two years of the program and during the MTR a revised M&E Framework was submitted along with a justification for each change in the outcome or indicator. The MTR mission endorsed the M&E Framework and recommended it be used as the basis for monitoring, evaluation and reporting for the remainder of the project period. Since the MTR UNICEF has reported to AusAID based on the M&E Framework, and AusAID has used the framework for its internal quality monitoring and reporting. It is also being used as the basis for this evaluation. (For a full discussion of this issue see Annex G of the BESP ICR, 24 November 2010.)

Whilst overall the agreed M&E Framework has been a useful instrument for monitoring progress, it was recognised from the beginning that one of the strategic results and its associated indicator was likely to be problematic. In the original design document the first Expected Outcome under Quality of Education was, "By 2011 disparities in obtaining essential learning competencies between highest performing and the six AusAID supported districts are reduced from 2004 levels." Whilst the intention of combining quality and disparity reduction was noteworthy, there were a number of problems with the outcome as it was stated. The first was that the program started in 2009 five years after the proposed baseline year. Secondly it was found that data on the essential learning competencies was only available at the province level and not at the district level. Also, not all schools in a district were to be covered by BESP. To formulate a revised strategic result and indicator as near as possible to the original intent, it was agreed to use the results of the grade 5 Scholarship Exam, which is available each year by district and nationally. Thus the original Expected Outcome for Quality of Education was replaced with Strategic Result 2, "By 2011 disparities for students in passing Grade 5 Scholarship Exam reduced by 10% from 2008 level between the national and the targeted districts," and with Indicator 9, "The absolute difference in the percentage of students who achieved 70+ marks on the Grade 5 Scholarship Exam between the national rate and the district rate." The statements were very useful for establishing the baseline so that progress could be monitored each year. The problem of the Scholarship Exam not being designed to ensure comparability across years was addressed by monitoring results in the focal districts against the national average each year rather than noting whether or not average marks had improved (which could be simply because the exam was easier one year than the other). UNICEF has collected the information and reported on it for the last two years, and this has proved useful for monitoring not only quality but also reduction of disparity. From 2009 to 2011 the difference between the national average of students achieving 70+ marks and the district average of students achieving 70+ marks has been reduced in five out of the six original districts, which is noteworthy. However, upon reflection the MTR team is of the opinion that Strategic Result 2 and Indicator 9 as stated in the M&E Framework were overly ambitious and cannot be used as reliable indicators of progress. There are inherent and circumstantial reasons for this assessment, as follows:

- Considering that the focal districts were selected because of low development indicators, including educational outcomes, it was unrealistic to expect such a large reduction of disparity within only four years. This would have meant a reduction of two and a half percent each year.
- In fact data is available for only a two year period. The data for the baseline year was incorrectly labelled as 2008 in the M&E Framework but UNICEF later informed that it was for 2009 and that the 2008 data was not available. This made the baseline year

one year after the start of the project. The 2012 exam will be conducted at the end of the year and is therefore not yet available. To reach the target the reduction would have had to be five percent each year, double the stated expectation.

- The BESP schools are only a portion of all the schools in a district. Therefore for the effects of BESP to show such a positive improvement overall for the district the achievement in BESP schools would have to be even higher to make up for the schools in the district where achievement did not improve. (It would have been interesting to see a comparison of the difference in national rates and the average of BESP schools only in each district. This would have more accurately reflected the effects of the project).

Based on this analysis the evaluation team will not judge the progress of the component against Strategic Result 2 and Indicator 9 as stated. It has noted that there has been an improvement in achievement in comparison to the national average and a decrease in disparity in five of the six original districts.

Note on the measurement of CFA criteria

In preparation for our field visits to schools we drew up checklists of questions to ask and things to observe. We based these on the 29 criteria and on draft versions of monitoring tools. We wish to note however that we found the application of these CFA criteria at school level very time consuming.

We felt that many of the criteria need to be disaggregated into many more criteria/expected behaviours before they could be used reliably. Many of the criteria imply more than one set of actions and often involve a judgement of effectiveness. This, we believe will lead to high degrees of subjectivity on the part of the evaluator or monitor. For example take the first criterion. *1.1 effective mechanisms for preventing dropouts and responding to out of school girls are in place and in use.* Judgement against this criterion involves analysis of the following, *inter alia*. Is there a mechanism in place for girls? Is there a mechanism in place for boys? Is the mechanism for girls in use? Is the mechanism for boys in use? Is the mechanism succeeding in identifying girls? Is the mechanism succeeding in identifying boys? Is it successful in encouraging girls to enrol in school? Is it successful in encouraging boys to enrol in school? Already, an assessment of criterion 1.1 involves asking 8 sub-questions and the making of judgements of 'in place', 'successful in identifying' and 'successful in encouraging'.

ANNEX 15: National Strategic plan ESDFP-Relevance of Primary Education

The National Strategic Plan for Education, 2012-2016

Objectives for Primary Education

- Ensure equity in access to quality primary education.
- Ensure meaningful participation of age 5 -9 children in primary education.
- Ensure that 100% of the children complete primary education achieving essential learning competencies.
- Ensure that 80% of the children complete primary education attaining mastery level in desired learning competencies.
- Ensure an inclusive, enabling learning environment promoting child-friendly approach to learning and teaching.
- Ensure provision of infra-structure facilities for all primary schools according to the national norms.

Strategies for Primary Education

Review existing curriculum and revise and upgrade as a standards-based curriculum. This involves child development standards for each the three key stages of primary education, syllabi and teacher instructional materials, revision of the essential learning competencies and piloting of revised curriculum

Improve the quality of primary education through the adoption of a 'child friendly' framework (CFF) along six dimensions, the introduction of school self-assessment (SSA) and the preparation, implementation and monitoring of school development plan with effective participation of school community, the development of a multi-level methodology of learning and teaching, the development of co-curricular activities, the development of a monitoring and evaluation system linked with CFF, professional development in CFF

Establish a coordination and a feedback mechanism to improve communication between curriculum and teacher education authorities, between curriculum implementation at school level and curriculum authorities and between research and classroom practice

Establish, maintain and use an effective primary education EMIS in support of M & E of the primary education.

Provide physical infrastructure facilities to all primary schools/sections.

Develop around 5,000 selected primary schools/primary sections to ensure that networks of attractive, efficient and well-performing primary schools are in place linking to proposed 1,000 secondary schools, this development to be guided by new standards and norms.

Source: abridged from National Strategic Development Plan, MOE (2011)

The MOE listed the following activities contributing directly to the access priority:

- School level attendance committees

- Daily assessment of student attendance
- Use and maintenance of play areas
- Implementation of co-curricular activities
- Advocacy to prevent corporal and psychological punishment
- Awareness programmes for parents on child rights (inclusive education, child protection etc)
- Availability of drinking water and sanitary facilities
- Improvements in the physical appearance of the school
- Positive attitudes of the school community to keep differently abled children in the same class

The MOE identified the following as contributing to the improvement of quality in education:

- Preparation of training manuals by NIE for each (curriculum) key stage to train those teachers serving in the primary grades without professional training in primary
- Training programmes for non primary trained teachers, at zonal level
- Capacity building programmes for principals and teachers
- Preparation of teaching aids in collaboration with parents
- Teacher adoption of child centred methodologies
- Encouragement of child initiatives
- Identification of child health problems by SMI and referrals to relevant clinics
- Cordial relations between all school stakeholders
- School-based training for all teachers in CFA conducted by principals and resource teachers

The MOE identified four CFS activities that were contributing to the preparation of the school development plan (SDP).

- The implementation of the school self assessment exercise to identify activities that should be included in the SDP
- Ownership of the SDP
- Children's involvement in decisions
- Transparency

ANNEX 16: AusAID Gender Equity Criteria

Note on AusAID gender equality criteria

The TOR invited the team to address questions on gender equality consistent with AusAID strategy as follows:

Did the activity promote more equal access by women and men to the benefits of the activity, and more broadly to resources, services and skills?

Did the activity promote equality of decision-making between women and men?

Did the initiative help to promote women's rights?

Did the initiative help to develop capacity (donors, partner government, civil society, etc) to understand and promote gender equality?

These questions reflect AusAID's gender criteria pre-2011. However the most recent gender thematic strategy (AusAID 2011) defines its gender criteria a little differently. Its four 'pillars' are

- Advancing equal access to gender-responsive health and education services
- Increasing women's voice in decision-making, leadership and peace building
- Empowering women economically and improving their livelihood security
- Ending violence against women and girls at home in their communities and in disaster and conflict situations

In both lists, criteria 1 and 2 are broadly similar while criteria 3 and 4 diverge. After taking advice from AusAID Canberra and AusAID post we follow the second list, noting that criterion 3 does not apply to BESP objectives. In our report we address the following 3 questions:

- Did BESP promote equal access for boys and girls? (Pillar 1)
- Did BESP promote equal participation and benefits for boys and girls? (Pillar 1)
- Did BESP increase women's voice in decision-making, leadership and peace building? (Pillar 2)

At the end of our report we offer a final note about the role of BESP in contributing to post conflict resettlement for girls and boys, women and men (Pillar 4).

