



**UKaid**  
from the Department for  
International Development



# Support to IDP Education and Pupils Transition from ABE to Formal School in Puntland

---

## Project Evaluation

**Camilla Lodi**

**8/21/2011**

*This Report discusses the findings and recommendations from the final evaluation of a pilot project that aimed at: (i) enabling 1,000 displaced and other vulnerable children in IDP settlements around Bossaso, Puntland, to access quality primary education, and (ii) improving the learning environment in 10 partner schools. The evaluation focused on assessing the effectiveness of providing conditional cash transfers (in the form of a voucher system) to vulnerable households as well as subsidies and capacity building to partner schools and education authorities to address immediate demand and supply-side constraints to attendance. It concludes that this incentivized approach was overall highly effective, and recommends a four year extension in target schools, as well as the scaling up of the voucher system in other locations to support vulnerable children in completing the upper-levels of formal primary school.*

## Acknowledgements

This Report was written by Camilla Lodi, as evaluation team leader.

The author wishes to thank all the stakeholders involved in the conduct of the evaluation.

The NRC team in Norway, Nairobi and Bossaso provided hands-on support, valuable guidance as well as feedback on successive iterations of the Report. A warm thanks to Ibrahim Omar Dualle, the Project Coordinator, who was actively involved throughout the evaluation mission, to Miresi Busana, the former Project Manager, who provided useful background information as well as to the four enumerators who helped the author gather and analyze primary data in the field.

The author also wishes to acknowledge the support received from UNICEF-Somalia staff, who shared their thinking on Puntland's strategic landscape and helped shape the evaluation findings and recommendations presented in this Report.

Finally, a special thanks goes to all the boys and girls, parents, teachers and head teachers, CEC members, IDP/CLT representatives, merchants and MoE staff who took some valuable time away from their day to day activities to share their challenges, thoughts and ideas on how to improve education for vulnerable children. All took a vivid interest in this participatory process, and became active evaluators of their own project.

## Executive Summary

This Report discusses the findings and recommendations from the final evaluation of the *'Support to IDP education and pupils' transition from ABE to formal school in Puntland'*

(hereafter the Project). This Project aimed to: i) enable displaced and other vulnerable children in IDP settlements to access quality primary education; ii) improve the capacity and quality of the learning environment in schools hosting them. It targeted 1,000 graduates from NRC's Alternative Basic Education (ABE) program (an informal, catch-up education program) who

could not transition to formal primary school – or had to discontinue schooling – because of the costs of school attendance. The Project piloted a two-sided approach to address *immediate* constraints to school attendance. On the *demand-side*, it provided vouchers for foodstuff, scholastic materials etc. to the families of ABE graduates who met an attendance conditionality. On the *supply-side*, it supported school expansion through the construction and rehabilitation of classrooms, subsidized partner schools' operational costs (against the waiving of tuition fees for ABE graduates) and provided basic competency trainings to teachers, school management and education authorities. The Project used a school improvement framework to support more effective partnerships between all education stakeholders for the sustainable provision of quality education. Importantly, a gender dimension was mainstreamed in all aspects of the intervention, with a minimum of 50% girls targeted. NRC implemented the Project within the framework of a DFID/UNICEF Strategic Partnership for primary education in Somalia. The Project was financed by UNICEF - with NRC providing matching funds - for a total budget of US\$ 852,886 over a 24-month implementation period (August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009 to September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011), i.e. two-years of schooling for transitioning learners.

'I'd like to be a teacher one day and make a difference in the community, help those in need just like I was helped once.'

Hawa - 14 year old, from Mogadishu, comes from a family of 8 siblings, 4 of whom attend school. Her 19 year-old sister had to leave school to get married at 15.

The overall objective of the evaluation, which was conducted between July 21<sup>st</sup> and August 13<sup>th</sup> 2011, was to ascertain the results of the pilot project and inform potential follow-on/repeater programs. The evaluation team used a qualitative, participatory methodology to gather and analyze primary data. Preliminary findings and recommendations were discussed with local stakeholders to confirm their robustness as well as build consensus and ownership over them. The methodological options available were somewhat constrained but the evaluation team is confident nonetheless that findings accurately reflect the Project's *initial* results on the ground; clear and consistent patterns emerged from both interviews and focus group discussions, with no major discrepancy with project reports.

The evaluation concludes that **the project has achieved what it set out to do in terms of supporting the successful transition of 1,000 ABE graduates (516 girls and 484 boys) to formal schools and improving their learning environment.** Its main findings are summarized below:

- Appropriateness:** Both the project's objectives and intervention strategy clearly addressed the hierarchy of constraints to access, both on the demand-side (i.e. direct/indirect costs of school attendance for vulnerable families through the voucher system) and supply side (i.e. inadequate infrastructure and budgetary constraints through school construction and subsidies to partner schools' operational costs). The Project focus on girls' education was also relevant in light of the entrenched discriminatory beliefs and practices which constrain their educational opportunities. Interviews with all local stakeholders consistently emphasized a high degree of buy-in for the Project's incentivized approach, and its relevance to Puntland's context, which is characterized by extremely low enrolment rates (across gender/age). Such buy-in translated down the line into tangible support to its implementation. **Interviews with all stakeholder groups consistently emphasized, however, the longevity of the voucher system as a major, shared concern.** Vouchers were indeed provided for the first two years of formal schooling only (i.e. during a transition period), regardless of how many grades ABE learners would have to go through to complete the upper level (from four to seven, depending on their entry level). The Project's focus on supporting a 'transition' to formal school – rather than 'completion' of a full primary cycle – seems to somewhat underestimate the ongoing risk of dropout *throughout* the primary cycle (not only transition years) because of their caretakers' poverty.
- Efficiency:** Overall, Project inputs/activities were delivered according to plan and with sufficient quality. NRC has built a solid reputation as a reliable implementing partner in the education sector in Puntland. A cursory review of the budget also suggests efficient implementation, with only 1.75 staff covered and over 55% of the budget going to tangible, direct benefits to vulnerable households and partner schools (vouchers, construction, subsidies etc.), not counting trainings. A participatory approach supported activity progress while fostering ownership over the project. With this overall very satisfactory background, the evaluation notes a number of critical areas for improvement, including: (i) the baseline assessment was rushed, and somewhat fell short of generating a fully informed intervention strategy; (ii) **the value of vouchers did not adequately cover the costs of school attendance** – nor the basic survival needs of vulnerable households - while their allotment did not reflect the hierarchy of needs of beneficiary households, particularly as regards food security; (iii) the lack of predictability in voucher distribution, particularly the decreasing value of transfers; and (iv) the lack of tailoring of the training program to local learning needs.
- Effectiveness:** The Project met or went over its targets for attendance (particularly girl attendance), training delivered and school construction/rehabilitation. 1,000 children attended 10 formal schools. The targeting strategy for girls was highly effective, with 516 girls (vs. target of 500) for 484 boys enrolled. 30 classrooms were built/rehabilitated (vs. 20 targeted). Interviews confirm that the **voucher system alters the incentive structure that underpins family decisions** as to whether or not maintain their children in school. Likewise, subsidies and broader support to school operation and development removed *immediate* supply-side constraints to increased enrollment. **The Project**

does not seem to have, however, fundamentally altered (nor could it be expected to) the deeply entrenched discriminatory practices that constrain educational opportunities for girls (e.g. early marriage) and more broadly undermine the realization of their rights. All trainings were delivered as planned, with adequate attendance (including one third female) and anecdotal evidence of a positive contribution to both improved school management and more 'child-friendly' teaching practices. **An arguably narrow approach to capacity building (focused on trainings rather than continuous adult learning) may have circumscribed competency gains**, however. The main weakness of the training program lied in the absence of a more customized approach to building MoE capacity for school monitoring/supervision.

- **Coordination:** The evaluation concludes to an adequate level of coordination across the board. Local stakeholders (parents, teachers/Head teachers, CECs, IDP/CLT communities and merchants) were actively engaged throughout implementation. MoE representatives also expressed a high degree of satisfaction with having been involved in all stages of the project cycle. Interviews suggest a need, however, for improved inter-agency coordination at the field level to standardize approaches (e.g. teacher trainings) and establish effective partnerships between potentially complementary interventions.
- **Impact:** The voucher system supported a successful transition of ABE graduates and there is a wealth of anecdotal evidence that it has *initiated* (but not necessarily cemented) a process of behavior and attitude change. 990 ABE graduates completed two-years of schooling; only 10 pupils (1%) dropped out in Year 2 (and were replaced). This is a major achievement considering the high average dropout rate in partner schools. There is also some evidence that two-years of schooling helped consolidate competency gains made through the ABE program. The Project clearly contributed to the social integration and empowerment of vulnerable children, with numerous examples of improved social skills and interaction. Children and mothers also reported some tangible welfare benefits. There is **little evidence of the Project having effectively protected children against violence and other rights' violations** however. **It is also clear that the voucher system is not a 'silver bullet' to address the broad range of supply and demand side constraints to equitable educational outcomes.** The quality of teaching, school management and educational achievement are conditioned by multiple factors, beyond the scope of the Project, not the least the multi-dimensional nature of poverty.
- **Sustainability:** Although chronic poverty as well as capacity and resource deficits on the supply-side create real constraints to future attendance, **the Project seems to have catalyzed changes in communities and among education stakeholders toward more supportive policies and practices**, including ongoing commitments to reduce/waive fees for targeted ABE graduates. **Shall the transfers be discontinued, hard realities are likely to prevail however**, as families may revert to pre-Project cost-benefit calculations as regards their children's education, leading to dropouts. This could affect the credibility of an incentivized approach to enrolment among communities (and therefore future enrolments) but

also create perceptible stress among targeted children. The voucher scheme also presents an inherent risk of creating ‘over-dependency’ on outside support. **The multiplication of community-owned schools in Puntland in recent years shows that communities are capable, and willing to invest in education; this provides a solid foundation for sustainability.**

Recognizing the overall effectiveness of the Project but also the need to cement the process of change it initiated, the evaluation recommends:

#### **At minima:**

- **See ongoing commitments from various stakeholders through,** particularly CEC’s commitment to waive or reduce fees for vulnerable children. This is vital to generate a sense of ‘responsibility’ among participating communities and create a critical path towards sustainability.
- **A four-year extension to ensure that the first cohort of 1,000 pupils can complete the primary cycle.** This extension would complement ongoing pledges by local stakeholders (e.g. waiving of school fees), rather than substitute for them. Ensuring that the first cohort of ABE graduates can complete the primary cycle is vital not only from a rights-based perspective but also to enhance the credibility of the CCT mechanism with MoE and local communities, as part of a long-term investment strategy in primary education. This extension should include a contingency plan to anticipate and help address the impact of the current drought on vulnerable households and their communities; the voucher system could provide a foundation for a safety net mechanism. The extension may incorporate some of the design improvements discussed below.
- **Upstream work to boost learning under the ABE scheme:** Underperformance of many ABE learners on the entry test (a majority of them entered under Grade 5) may be explained by multiple factors beyond the quality of ABE implementation but creates a significant challenge to the operation of supportive voucher schemes, as practically, it increases the number of years during which the voucher scheme may be needed after graduation.

#### **Strongly Recommended:**

- **Increase the number of beneficiaries in target locations, and rollout the voucher scheme in new locations:** Given the extremely low enrollment rates in IDP settlements and their vicinity, follow-on programs should clearly be sourced. Two types of (complementary) follow-on programs could be envisioned:
  - (i) **NRC may consider focusing on supporting remaining ABE graduates (who did not transition to formal schools or had to discontinue schooling) in completing a full primary cycle.** The dropout rate for a second cohort of ABE graduates who integrated the formal school system, without receiving vouchers, was indeed 30-40% higher than average, highlighting the need for such an

intervention. In the locations where NRC operates, NRC could also support the attendance of other vulnerable children who were not enrolled in the ABE program.

- (ii) **Other agencies may replicate the CCT mechanism in locations non-covered by NRC.** Such programs would not only target displaced children, but more broadly vulnerable children who discontinued schooling or at risk of doing so because of income-related constraints. Evidence from other countries clearly shows that CCT mechanisms that support school attendance do not require preliminary interventions (such as the ABE program) to be effective.

Rather than supporting a transition to formal schooling, follow-on programs – whether NRC or other agencies implement them – should aim to support a completion of the full primary cycle for their target beneficiaries. The question of their duration is a difficult one. Taking note that long-term interventions are usually hard to source, **the evaluation would recommend four-year programs and a focus on the upper level.** The opportunity-cost of schooling children increases indeed over time, and dropout rates are much higher in the upper-levels. The targeting should continue to emphasize girls' education, and indeed higher targets (e.g. 60%) could be set.

- **Create a path towards sustainability:** An extension of the ongoing Project or follow-on projects should not, however, reinforce local stakeholders' reliance/dependence on outside transfers. As such, they could involve (and help test) digressive investment strategies, which would increasingly leverage local resources over the years. This should not necessarily imply reducing the value of vouchers over time (on the contrary, the voucher system should reward attendance in upper grades), but fostering 'bell-shaped' investments from local education stakeholders (i.e. gradual increase in local contributions during the lifetime of the Project, and guaranteed support to target pupils after its completion).

#### **Recommended design improvements for repeater/follow-on programs:**

- **Ensuring that the value of vouchers covers the total costs of school attendance** and that their allotment reflects the hierarchy of needs, as well as ongoing monitoring of market prices;
- **Strengthening the targeting process** and criteria;
- **More predictable and frequent distributions;**
- **Explicit focus on under-achievers** (i.e. ABE graduates who enter in lower primary levels);
- **Tailoring the training program to local learning needs**, with accreditation and ongoing monitoring of training outcomes, and the development of a customized capacity-building program for MoE;
- The adoption of a **more integrated approach to capacity-building**
- Integration of a **child protection component**, including mechanisms to prevent and report cases of violence/abuse;
- Integration of – or linkages with – **adult literacy/parenting skills schemes;**
- Establishment of a **partnership with WFP** for a school feeding program;
- Links with and contribution to broader supply-side interventions to reform the education sector, particularly **teacher-training programs.**

### Ideas to explore:

- **Program targeting children living in the street:** The presence of 4,500 to 5,500 children living in the street in Bossaso, many of them displaced children, highlights the need for a specific intervention targeting these extremely vulnerable children, including the establishment of hosting facilities.
- **Piloting of community or school centered incentives/rewards for local performance on education outcomes:** Such incentives could include the provision of grants or non pecuniary rewards to communities and/or schools that reach a set of pre-defined performance targets as regards attendance, quality of teaching and school management and educational value-added (as opposed to achievement, to cancel-out initial differences in the level of pupils). Some degree of 'yardstick' competition between schools/communities with similar baseline values could be introduced, with grants provided to best performing communities/schools. Such an approach would not alter the voucher system's emphasis on attendance, but provide an extra-incentive for communities/schools to focus on broader issues of school performance and educational achievement. Approaches focusing on teacher performance – such as skills-based programs or merit-pay programs – could also be looked into.

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>A. Context</b>                                       | <b>10</b> |
| <b>B. Project Description</b>                           | <b>11</b> |
| <b>C. Methodology</b>                                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>D. Findings</b>                                      | <b>15</b> |
| i. Relevance/Appropriateness                            | 15        |
| ii. Efficiency  | 17        |
| iii. Project Effectiveness                              | 19        |
| iv. Coordination  | 22        |
| v. Impact   | 23        |
| vi. Sustainability                                      | 27        |
| <b>E. Recommendations</b>                               | <b>29</b> |
| i. At Minima  | 29        |
| ii. Strongly Recommended                                | 30        |
| iii. Recommended Design Improvements                    | 33        |
| iv. Ideas to explore                                    | 36        |
| <b>Annex 1</b> Entry level                              | <b>38</b> |
| <b>Annex 2</b> Participants in the Evaluation Workshops | <b>38</b> |
| <b>Annex 3</b> Key informants                           | <b>39</b> |
| <b>Annex 4</b> Evaluation Work Program                  | <b>40</b> |
| <b>Annex 5</b> Secondary Sources                        | <b>41</b> |
| <b>Annex 6</b> Evaluation Terms of References           | <b>42</b> |

## Abbreviations

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| <b>ABE</b>       | Alternative Basic Education  |
| <b>AIDS</b>      | Acquired Immuno-Deficiency Syndrome                                  |
| <b>APES</b>      | Accelerated Primary Education Support                                |
| <b>CCT</b>       | Conditional Cash Transfers   |
| <b>CEC</b>       | Community Education Community  |
| <b>CLT</b>       | Community Leadership Team  |
| <b>DIFD</b>      | UK Department for International Development                          |
| <b>DRC</b>       | Danish Refugee Council   |
| <b>EVC</b>       | Extremely Vulnerable Children  |
| <b>FEWS NET</b>  | Famine Early Warning System Network                                  |
| <b>FSNAU</b>     | Somalia Food and Nutrition Analysis Unit                             |
| <b>GBV</b>       | Gender Based Violence  |
| <b>HHs</b>       | Households   |
| <b>HIV</b>       | Human Immuno Virus   |
| <b>ICDESEA</b>   | Integrated Capacity Development For Somali Education Administrations |
| <b>IDP</b>       | Internally Displaced Persons   |
| <b>INGO</b>      | International Non Governmental Organization                          |
| <b>IPC phase</b> | Integrated Food Security Phase Classification                        |
| <b>IRIN</b>      | Integrated Regional Information Networks                             |
| <b>YEP</b>       | Youth Education Pack   |
| <b>M&amp;E</b>   | Monitoring and Evaluation  |
| <b>MoE</b>       | Ministry of Education  |
| <b>MoU</b>       | Memorandum of Understanding  |
| <b>NGO</b>       | Non Governmental Organization  |
| <b>NRC</b>       | Norwegian Refugee Council  |
| <b>REO</b>       | Regional Education Officer   |
| <b>UNHCR</b>     | United Nation High Commission for Refugees                           |
| <b>UNICEF</b>    | United Nations Children Fund   |
| <b>UNOCHA</b>    | United Nation Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs        |
| <b>USD</b>       | United States Dollar   |
| <b>WFP</b>       | World Food Program   |

## A. Context

Since the outbreak of the civil war in 1991, **Somalia** has been without a central government and the site of intense factional fighting and civil war; casualty estimates range from 300,000 to 400,000. Endemic violence, chronic food insecurity and regular occurrences of famine have led to massive population displacements. The IDP population has reached 1.4 million people (UNHCR, 2010). Humanitarian needs are immense, with 43% of the population in need of immediate, lifesaving assistance (Food Security Analysis Unit - FSAU, 2010). A Transitional Federal Government has been established and recognized by the international community in 2004. An African Union peacekeeping mission has also been deployed to restore security. Their joint-forces only control part of the capital and center of the country, however, and the international community struggles to respond to emergencies in a context where humanitarian access cannot be guaranteed. Southern Somalia has been affected by a severe drought in recent months, leading to massive displacements. The Bakool and the Lower Shabelle regions, specifically, have been classified by FSAU as IPC Phase 5-Famine since July 2011, with tens of thousands of excess deaths already reported. The current situation represents the most severe humanitarian crisis since the 1991/92 famine.



**Puntland**, a region in Northeast Somalia, declared itself autonomous in 1998 but unlike Somaliland does not seek independence. The move was, in part, an attempt to avoid the clan warfare engulfing southern Somalia. Puntland has not escaped the spillover effects of the security and humanitarian situation in Southern Somalia, nevertheless. The region has indeed endured armed conflict and terrorism as well as major influx of IDPs; it has recently grabbed the world headlines with an upsurge in pirate attacks on international shipping in the Indian Ocean. Puntland has over 125,000 IDPs (UNHCR, 2010), who are largely concentrated in settlements around Galkaiyo and Bossaso. 60 % of the IDP population is under 18 years of age. Conditions in IDP settlements vary, but are generally characterized by acute deprivation of access to basic services, rampant disease as well as regular outbreaks of violence. The influx of IDP has put local resources under strain as the few services available struggle to accommodate both IDP and host communities. 76% of the children of school age (6 – 17 years) are not receiving any form of basic education (Danish Refugee Council, 2007). Child protection is not guaranteed in IDP settlements and their vicinity, with a high prevalence of gender-based violence (Carole Welt, 2011), and growing number of children living in the streets.

## B. Project Description

NRC supports education and shelter projects in IDP settlements in Puntland since 2006 to improve the living conditions, enhance the protection and promote the rights of displaced people. NRC's signature 'Alternative Basic Education' (ABE) project has provided over 4,000 displaced and other vulnerable children aged 9-14 with free basic education in Puntland. This accelerated catch-up education program aims to equip ABE learners with the necessary skills to enter the upper primary formal education system. **Although ABE learners may attain the competencies required for entry into formal schools, their enrolment and attendance is seriously hindered by the direct and indirect costs of schooling.**

The NRC 'Support to IDP Education and Pupils Transition from ABE to Formal School in Puntland' project – hereafter the 'Project' – builds on the ABE scheme to support the transition of ABE graduates into the formal school system. The Project is implemented within the framework of the DFID/UNICEF 'Strategic Partnership' for primary education in Somalia. Project activities are co-financed by UNICEF and the NRC, with a total budget of US\$ 852,886 over a 24-month implementation period (or two Grades of formal school) from August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009 to September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011. Its two specific objectives are:

- **Objective 1: To enable displaced and other vulnerable children in the IDP settlement to access quality primary education;**
- **Objective 2: To improve the capacity and quality of the learning environment in schools hosting displaced and other vulnerable children.**

**The project targets 1,000 vulnerable children living within or in the vicinity of IDP settlements,** who graduated from the ABE program but were not able to transition to formal schooling or had to discontinue schooling. It also supports the 10 community-owned or public schools that host them in the Bossaso area. **The Project's intervention strategy seeks to address both demand and supply-side constraints to the access of vulnerable children to formal primary schools,** while also fostering more effective partnerships for the provision of quality basic education in partner schools, to the benefit of the wider community.

**Demand-side interventions:** The Project's **intervention strategy is anchored in a voucher system designed to alter vulnerable household's opportunity-cost** of sending their children to school. Vouchers are provided on the express condition that selected learners commit to attend school regularly (i.e. 85% of school days each month) and that caretakers undertake to ensure that learners do not forego regular attendance due to household obligations that compete for schooling time. The composition of vouchers (uniforms; scholastic materials; sanitary kits and materials - for girls exclusively; and food items) as well as their allotment was determined through a baseline assessment involving local stakeholders. Vouchers stipulate the items (and their value/weight); they can only be exchanged in pre-selected shops.

**Supply-side interventions:** The Project also addresses supply-side constraints to access by **subsidizing the costs of schooling 'additional' children.** Education is

provided to vulnerable children against an investment in school development and operations. School expansion is carried-out through the construction and rehabilitation of classrooms in 10 partner-schools. The Project also provides subsidies to cover part of their operational costs (e.g. electricity/water costs, security guards and cleaners, basic repairs, costs for examinations) while school management undertakes to provide free schooling to selected vulnerable children for an agreed number of years (in this case two, initially). In addition to pecuniary and in-kind support, the Project provides basic competency trainings to head-teachers/teachers, Community Education Committees (CECs) and Ministry of Education (MoE) staff to create a better run, more child-friendly learning environment as well as raise their awareness on the specific needs of vulnerable children.

**Strengthening the ‘handshake’ between authorities and communities for basic education:** Both demand and supply-side interventions are anchored in a **school improvement framework**, which promotes active community and children participation in school governance, supports the formulation of holistic plans for school improvement, and holds education authorities responsible for children enrollment, attendance, learning and successful completion. The Project’s intervention strategy mainstreams stakeholder mobilization in all aspects of implementation, whereby regular meetings are organized with MoE, mothers, teachers/head teachers, CEC members as well as retailers/merchants to coordinate project activities and support transitioning learners. The Project’s engagement approach emphasizes sustainability and supports the formulation and sourcing of concrete measures to support continued attendance after project completion. Implicit to the Project’s intervention strategy is the assumption that local resources - although in short supply - can be mobilized to effectively support the schooling of vulnerable children.

**Gender Mainstreaming:** **Gender equity concerns and the empowerment of girls and women are effectively mainstreamed into the intervention strategy**, in a context where entrenched beliefs and discriminatory practices seriously constrain educational opportunities for girls (with lower enrollment rates and higher drop-out rates) and, more broadly, infringe the realization of their rights. Girls are targeted at 50% and their attendance rewarded with additional vouchers (sanitary kits). Transfers are channeled directly through mothers, while gender equity is included as a central theme in all training and awareness raising activities. Dedicated efforts are also made to ensure strong female representation in all activities.

Importantly, **the Project also pays attention to social dynamics between the IDP and host communities** through the inclusion of 20% of non IDP children into its targeting; this to minimize potential tensions around differential treatments but also to create robust bridges for improved social interaction, a pre-requisite for durable solutions.

## C. Methodology

The overall objective of the evaluation, which was conducted between July 21<sup>st</sup> and August 14<sup>th</sup> 2011, was to **ascertain the results of the Project to ensure accountability for fund use and to inform potential repeater and/or follow-**

**on programs.** The evaluation purposively focused on drawing lessons learned from the Project to inform the design of similar projects, in Puntland and potentially beyond. It also discusses the rationale/need for continuing or scaling-up ongoing activities in Puntland (See *Recommendations section*) to inform NRC and UNICEF’s strategic planning. The evaluation’s terms of reference are presented in Annex 6.

The evaluation team, which comprised an international consultant and four local enumerators, adopted a **qualitative methodology to gather and analyze data.** The work program is presented in Annex 4. The collection of primary data in the field (10 working days) articulated semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with 165 informants from various stakeholder groups (See *breakdown in table 1 and Annex 3 for a list of key informants*), backed up by the administration of standard questionnaires to determine patterns in answers. **Great care went to ensuring an adequate gender balance in respondents** (with 53% of female respondents, both mothers and girls), as well as in **involving local stakeholders in the design of the evaluation** (including, the definition of guiding questions, design of questionnaires, identification of key informants etc. – see Annex 2 for a list of participants) to ensure its relevance to field concerns. Preliminary findings and recommendations were discussed with local stakeholders to confirm their robustness and build consensus and ownership over them. Primary data collection was complemented by a cursory review of secondary sources (inc. project reports, policy and research papers etc.); see Annex 5 for a list of documents consulted.

**Table 1. Informants**

| <b>Informants</b>                 | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| Children                          | 17          | 24            | 41           |
| CECs members                      | 20          | 15            | 35           |
| Mothers                           | -           | 32            | 32           |
| Teachers/Head teachers            | 32          | 4             | 36           |
| IDP/CLT community representatives | -           | 12            | 12           |
| Merchants                         | 4           | -             | 4            |
| MoE                               | 2           | -             | 2            |
| UNICEF                            | 2           | -             | 2            |
| NGO                               | -           | 1             | 1            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                      | <b>77</b>   | <b>88</b>     | <b>165</b>   |

**The methodological options available to the evaluation team were somewhat constrained.** The absence of a robust baseline and randomization in the project design (i.e. counterfactual/control group) precludes ‘scientific’ conclusions on project impact (issue of attribution etc.). Besides, **the sustainability of Project outcomes** (e.g. retention of learners after the voucher system is discontinued, support provided to vulnerable children by local stakeholders after project completion etc.) **simply cannot be ascertained while activities are still ongoing.** The period during which the evaluation was conducted - coinciding with the summer school holidays and partially with Ramadan - also limited the pool of informants available while preventing direct observation of the quality of teaching and school management in

partner schools. Conclusions are thus derived primarily from stakeholder interviews. As such they capture their ‘perceptions’ rather than a fully independent/external assessment.

Bearing these caveats in mind, **the evaluation team is confident that findings accurately reflect the project’s initial results on the ground.** Clear and consistent patterns emerged from both interviews and focus group discussions, with no major discrepancy with project reports.

## D. Findings

Findings are discussed below under the organizing questions listed in the evaluation’s terms of reference. There was some degree of overlap between categories, particularly as regards questions related to capacity building and stakeholder engagement. Findings are thus reported where most relevant.

### i. RELEVANCE/APPROPRIATENESS

Guiding questions include: the extent to which the stated objectives correctly addressed the problems and real needs of target groups; the relevance of project within the framework of the MoE program and policy guidelines. Although design improvements could be considered for potential repeater/follow-on programs (See *Recommendations section*), **both the project’s objectives and intervention strategy were clearly appropriate in Puntland’s context.**

**Project Objectives:** Enrolment rates are extremely low in Puntland, across gender and age. A profiling of IDPs in Bossasso (Danish Refugee Council, 2007) showed an **enrolment rate of 24.7% for children of school age (6-17)**. The massive influx of IDPs/returnees in Puntland, with over 104,000 IDPs recorded (UNHCR, 2010), creates a **growing strain on local resources and services available**. This is particularly true for primary schools as over 35% of IDPs are of school age (UNHCR, 2010). Interviews with children, mothers and education authorities confirm that access issues top their agenda as regards education matters. In a context where school facilities are in short supply and struggle to accommodate enrolment needs, issues related to teaching/learning quality clearly come second. **The Project’s emphasis on access thus seems in tune with local concerns and needs.** Interviews with MoE staff as well as a review of the ‘*Puntland Education Policy Paper*’ indicates, however, that the Project responded to a broader – and arguably more ambitious – set of policy priorities, particularly as regards: unequal access to educational opportunities; inadequate quality of education; lack of gender sensitivity; inadequate school management capacities; and weak coordination mechanisms among key stakeholders.

**‘Before the Project there was no education because of my family poverty; did not get food on a daily basis. We were not integrated in the community and parents didn’t have work in the town.’**

**Um al Kheyer Abdi  
Hassan, Grible school**

**Intervention Strategy:** The Project sought to address *immediate* demand and supply-side constraints to access, identified roughly as the costs (both direct and indirect) of school attendance for vulnerable households and the deficit of school infrastructure and other educational resources (budget for operational costs, qualified teachers etc.).

**'My parents asked me to work before the project but now they understand that it is important to go to school'**

**Umal Kheyer Abdi Hassan, Gribble school**

**Interviews with mothers and children confirm that the main constraint to the enrolment of vulnerable children, on the demand side, is chronic poverty.** Poor families simply cannot afford to cover the direct costs of schooling, i.e. tuition and other schooling costs such as uniforms, school materials etc. Interviews emphasize the cost-benefit calculation underpinning household choices as regards the education of their children. There is an opportunity cost to maintaining children in school in a context where income-generation tops households' hierarchy of needs. Poor families clearly prioritize food needs over any other concerns, including children education, with children, whatever their age, expected to contribute to the family income. With that background, anchoring the Project in a voucher system – designed to 'compensate' immediate income 'losses' associated with schooling and thus to alter household choices – was right on target. Interviews with girls, mothers, and education stakeholders emphasize specific constraints to girls' education, in the form of 'survival strategies' and discriminatory beliefs/practices that relegate girls to the domestic sphere, require a higher contribution from girls to the running of the household (e.g. house chores), but also promote early-marriages. Within this cultural background, the opportunity-cost of educating girls is simply higher than for boys; families 'lose more' while the potential 'returns' they can expect are lower as girls leave their families to join their husband's household/community once they marry. In that perspective, **the Project's focus on girls' education through equal targeting, extra-incentives (to compensate extra 'losses' and lower 'returns' to the family) and awareness raising on gender equity is clearly appropriate.** Investments in girls' education are important not only from a right-based perspective. The literature highlights higher returns in terms of community welfare. Each additional year of basic education for girls (who will act as caretakers as mothers) is indeed strongly correlated with gains on health and hygiene practices, maternal care etc.

**Interviews with education authorities, particularly CECs and Head Teachers, also confirm that inadequate school infrastructure and budget constraints as immediate obstacles - on the supply-side - to increased access.** Although they did not 'dissuade' enrollment of vulnerable children (before the Project), education authorities simply did not actively support it to avoid budget trade-offs, and *de-facto* prioritized those who could pay, despite the Ministry's ambition to increase equitable access. The creation of community-owned schools in target areas simply confirms a situation in which education authorities are too slow or not capable of accommodating increasing demand for education. The Project tackled supply-side constraints through school construction and rehabilitation as well as subsidies for operational costs. **Overall, the Project's incentivized approach seems to**

**adequately reflect the hierarchy of needs, both on the supply and demand-side.** Focus group discussions with education stakeholders confirmed a high degree of initial ownership over the Project concept, which down-the-line translated into concrete, tangible support to its implementation.

Besides, **although the Project tested-out a new intervention strategy in Puntland to incentivize attendance, evidence suggests that Conditional Cash Transfers (CCTs) represent a viable solution in Somalia's context** (Horn Relief Guidelines for Cash Interventions in Somalia - September 2010). Security and humanitarian concerns as well as capacity constraints somewhat preclude more structural, facilitation/resource intensive interventions (for which Puntland's context might not be ripe). Direct transfers to intended beneficiaries also minimize, though do not annihilate, the risk of leakages and misuse of funds. In that respect, the channelling of transfers directly through mothers, who in Somali culture traditionally act as children's caretakers, maximized the chances that vouchers would be used to benefit children and but also enhanced their role as household managers and, more importantly, as community leaders.

**Interviews with all stakeholder groups consistently emphasize the longevity of the voucher system as a major, shared concern.** Vouchers were indeed provided for the first two years of formal schooling only (i.e. during a transition period), regardless of how many grades ABE learners would have to go through to complete the upper level (from four to seven, depending on their entry level). While the demand and supply-side constraints alluded to above may dissuade entry in to formal schools, they also create an ongoing risk of dropout *throughout* the primary cycle (not only transition years). While an effective intervention may tackle immediate obstacles to entry and partially address more structural constraints to retention (through awareness raising and securing commitments to waive/reduce tuition fees etc.) it is unlikely that poverty-related constraints, which fall out of its scope, will have changed upon Project completion. In that perspective, the Project's design offers no 'guarantee' that learners will complete the primary cycles; it does foster more 'supportive' policies, on the supply-side, but these might weigh little in a context where acute poverty effectively frame household choices.

Potential design improvements are discussed in the recommendation section, but a cursory review of the Project paper points-out to **a lack of emphasis on 'hard' protection issues, such as the prevalence of gender-based violence** against girls, including violence on the way to school and in the school-setting. Besides, while the Project paper takes stock of attitude/behavioural constraints (particularly on the demand-side as regards girls' education) and proposes activities to 'raise awareness' on the importance of education for all, it somewhat **falls short of formulating a more integrated strategy to address the deeply entrenched discriminatory beliefs/practices (e.g. early marriage, responsibility for house chores etc.) as well as broader social dynamics/structures that constrain educational opportunities for girls and undermine their rights.** Likewise, while the Project takes stock of capacity constraints, and provides for the training of a range of education stakeholders, it is unlikely that a few days of training will significantly increase competency.

## ii) **EFFICIENCY**

Organizing questions include: whether similar results could have been achieved through other means; whether project activities were done right; the degree to which stakeholders were involved; responsiveness of project management to changes. **The evaluation concludes to satisfactory, efficient implementation**, particularly in light of Puntland's challenging context (high security risks, logistical challenges etc.).

Interviews with Project stakeholders suggest that the NRC has built a solid reputation as a reliable partner in Puntland and overall emphasize the quality of implementation. This organization's management, logistics and fiduciary control systems have been field-tested, in Somalia and elsewhere. Overall, **project inputs were delivered on time, according to targets and with sufficient quality**. Interviews suggest that NRC adopted a participatory approach to implementation, and that regular meetings were held with parents, CECs, teachers/head teachers and IDP/CLO representatives in order to mobilize stakeholders in project implementation, discuss progress, pass-on critical information and organize activities (especially distributions). **NRC's participatory approach supported activity progress while fostering ownership over the project**. This is particularly important for an intervention that, albeit sometimes implicitly, sought to empower local actors over education matters, particularly IDPs.

A review of the budget also indicates an adequate allocation of resources across expense categories. **55% of the budget was allocated for 'tangible' direct benefits to targeted households and schools** (38% of the budget went to vouchers/sanitary kits and 17% to school construction/rehabilitation and subsidies to operational costs). 4% was allocated for training activities and 6% for baseline assessments, community mobilization, joint-supervision and evaluation. 27% of the budget went to staffing, travel and other direct operations costs, while a standard 5% was charged for administration/overhead costs. It is important to note that the budget only covered 1.75 staff (1.5 for technical specialists and 0.25 for administration/finance). This suggests that **reducing staffing costs to increase allocations for trainings (which at first glance appear under-budgeted) or vouchers (to better cover primary needs) – with a view to improving overall efficiency – would have been difficult**. A cursory review of the budget suggests, though, that 'economies of scale' could be sought for future projects. Investments in vouchers/school expansion and trainings could be increased significantly (to reflect increases in beneficiary numbers), while maintaining a relatively light staffing/implementation support structure (e.g. 3 staffs for 4,000 beneficiaries) and reasonable M&E/supervision costs. Allocations for M&E should, however, be increased to ensure more rigorous data collection throughout the Project cycle.

With this overall very satisfactory background, the Report does not dwell on everything that NRC has 'done right', but rather outlines a number of areas for improvement.

- The baseline assessment was rushed.** The identification of target schools and beneficiary households, as well as of the livelihoods needs that would be addressed through the voucher system, was wrapped-up in one week. This was simply not enough to produce a fully informed intervention strategy. UNICEF/NRC later on decided on a complementary research on the Project's CCT mechanism (Oscar Milafu Onam *'Reaching out of school children through conditional cash transfer: A study on households schooling choices in Bossaso- Puntland, Somalia'*, 2010) to provide insights on how to improve the voucher system, but these recommendations to provide insights on how to improve the voucher system, came somewhat too late to be fully incorporated into the ongoing project. This research provides, however, a solid basis for design improvements shall a repeater/follow-on program be sourced, and indeed many of its insights are reflected in the recommendations section below. Besides, the baseline assessment simply did not generate robust and comprehensive baseline data to allow for time-series/comparative analyses on the evolution of attendance rates, practices, behaviors and capacities as a result of the Project; this precludes a rigorous evaluation, as mentioned in the methodology section.

**'Our role was to accept the outcome of the selection criteria even if there were a lot of needy children that still needed assistance'**

**CEC Nawawi school**

- The vouchers did not cover the total costs of school attendance, nor the basic survival needs of vulnerable households.** All interviews with mothers emphasized this. The field research on the CCT mechanism mentioned above adequately discussed this issue, and discussed it in-depth; the evaluation therefore refrains from duplicating its analysis. Interestingly, interviews with merchants highlight that some mothers, as a coping strategy, brokered deals to use vouchers intended for sanitary materials to buy foodstuff. Likewise, merchants mentioned that mothers also tried to convert vouchers intended for scholastic materials for food, with somewhat less success as merchants refused, 'pretexting' that NRC would not allow it. This suggests that **the allotment of vouchers did not adequately reflect the hierarchy of needs of beneficiary households, particularly as regards food security**, and the ongoing risk that vouchers intended for essential school materials will be used for other purposes (i.e. the 'earmarking' of vouchers for specific items can be (and indeed was) over-ridden by families).

**'We appreciate the quality of items but the quantity of food items only covers 10% of what we really need'**

**Mothers in Ugas-Yassin school**

- Lack of predictability in voucher distribution:** Mothers consistently mentioned the lack of predictability in the value of transfers as a serious problem. The value of transfers indeed decreased over time from US\$ 35 to US\$ 18, without this information having been communicated to families from day 1. The lack of predictability in transfers creates a significant risk for an approach that primarily seeks to 'actualize' household choices by providing incentives for a long-term investment (i.e. children's education to support their, and the family's, transition out

of poverty) versus short-term decisions (i.e. child labor to cover immediate needs). It also **affects the overall credibility of a CCT mechanism** among participating communities (i.e. same performance, but lower rewards). The voucher distributions were also relatively few and far between (5 total), and interviews with mothers suggest that more frequent transfers (ideally a monthly distribution) would have helped them better allocate these resources.

- **Lack of tailoring of the training program to learning needs.** Interviews with teachers/head-teachers as well as CEC members suggest that they were overall satisfied with the quality and topics covered by the training program (more on this later). That being said, the fact that the design of training materials was not informed by participatory needs assessments, nor the outcomes of sessions assessed, bears the question of whether the modules and refresher trainings were accurately tailored to local learning needs. A ‘wholesale’ approach to training is unlikely to attain significant competency gains.

**Different, potentially complementary intervention strategies could potentially be tested.** UNICEF is currently financing a government-executed project, which provides scholastic materials and food to vulnerable families to incentivize attendance. The outcomes of this narrower set of activities should be properly evaluated to provide a basis for comparative analysis. Another approach would be to test community/school-centered (vs. household centered) incentives, in the form of block grant funds rewarding local performance on attendance and other benchmarks (See recommendations section). The fact is that Project’s intervention strategy has been tested and that, based on all available evidence, it worked. **More relevant is the issue of how the transfer mechanism could be perfected, and linked to broader efforts to create more supportive education policies.**

### (iii) PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

The guiding questions include: the extent to which the project achieved its stated results, based on its logical framework; and whether efforts to build the capacity of key stakeholders worked. The evaluation concludes that **the Project met its targets for attendance, girls’ attendance, training delivery and school construction/rehabilitation.** For ‘softer’ capacity building outcomes, anecdotal evidence and feedback suggest a positive contribution to both school management and teaching practices but methodological constraints somewhat preclude firm conclusions. Achieved results are summarized in the table below (for ease of review) and followed by a brief analysis of key effectiveness issues.

Table 2. Project Results

| Expected Results   | Indicators  | Evaluation Conclusions  |
|--|---|---|
| Children in IDP settlements who have attended ABE and those who discontinued schooling due to household financial or livelihood limitation are enabled to access formal primary schooling. | 1000 children in IDP settlements (50% female) accessing primary education                           | <b>Achieved.</b> 1,000 children attended 10 formal schools, with 1% drop out reported during the 2-year period. Highly effective targeting strategy for girls, with 516 girls for 484 boys enrolled.  |
|  | 1 baseline assessment conducted   | <b>Conducted, but with concerns on quality.</b> That said complementary field research was later on conducted to improve the voucher system.  |
|  | 80 teachers and head-teachers trained   | <b>Delivered.</b> 80 teachers (59 males/21 females) trained in teaching methodologies (6 days). 80 teachers (60 males/20 females) trained in psychosocial support and gender (1 day).   |
|  | Level of teaching and learning quality in IDP hosting schools improved                              | <b>Anecdotal evidence that this was achieved.</b> 9 schools out 10 reported improved teaching practices as a direct result of the training.   |
|  | Level of improved development planning and management of IDP hosting schools                        | <b>Anecdotal evidence that this was achieved.</b> 19 head-teachers and CECs (18males/1females) representatives were trained in school management and improvement plans (14 days), and tangible improvements reported for some schools.  |
|  | Number of meeting with parents to discuss matters   | <b>55 meetings held.</b> 3 meetings to present and discuss project activities organized at the NRC office. 2 meetings on sanitary kits held in workshop halls. 5 meetings prior distribution day to discuss details in 10 partner schools. Meetings were also organized by CECs with communities to discuss education-related issues. |
|  | % of pupils able to retain the material provided  | <b>90%.</b> NRC/MoE conducted random checks during their joint monitoring missions.   |
|  | Level of improved children participation in the programme   | <b>Anecdotal evidence that this was achieved.</b> Many children reported feeling ‘more comfortable’ in the classroom and because teachers’ attitude encouraged them to ‘express themselves’.  |
| Capacity of the IDP settlement neighborhood schools is enhanced to enable them enroll and provide quality education to Children in   | 20 classrooms constructed / renovated   | <b>Target exceeded.</b> 12 classrooms were constructed, 18 rehabilitated while 1 office and 1 store were also constructed. 15 benches and 15 desks were also provided for each classroom.   |
|  | 10 latrines constructed   | <b>Target exceeded.</b> 14 latrines constructed.  |
|  | 1,000 pupils supported with uniforms  | <b>Target met.</b> 2 uniforms were provided per pupil (1 set a year).   |
|  | 500 pupils supported with sanitary kits   | <b>Target exceeded.</b> 516 sanitary kits were provided to girls. Special attention went to explaining to girls/mothers how to use these kits.  |
| 1000 pupils supported with   | <b>Target met.</b> However, interviews with merchants show that some families tried to exchange the |   |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>IDP settlements who have attended ABE and those who discontinued schooling due to household financial or livelihood limitation</b> | scholastic materials   | vouchers meant for scholastic materials for food.   |
|   | Level of participation of parents in decision making                           | <b>95 % of mothers attended meetings</b> , and some concrete evidence of influence on decision-making   |
|   | 10 schools equipped with instructional materials                               | <b>Delivered.</b> Instructional materials included maps, notebooks, teachers lesson plan books, box files, manila papers, brush for paint, black board paint, dusters, rulers and assorted blue and red pens.   |
|   | 75 CECs and education official trained   | <b>Delivered.</b> 70 CEC members (41 male/29 female) attended a four-day training on school management and administration, strategic planning and structure of CECs, resource mobilization and management, and other key child protection issues (HIV/AIDs, children’s rights, gender equality, conflict resolution etc.). Education officials participated in all Project training sessions. |
|   | Level of beneficiary satisfaction with the voucher program                     | <b>High satisfaction with the CCT mechanism but concerns as regards its longevity</b> and the fact that it did not cover full costs of attendance.  |
| Frequency of engagement to coordinate activities and share information with authorities   | <b>Regular coordination meetings held</b> between NRC, UNICEF and authorities. |   |

**The Project clearly achieved what it set out to do in terms of attendance, particularly for girls.** The voucher system emphasized attendance as a conditionality (with a mandatory 85% attendance rate for school days); this conditionality was met by learners and their caretakers. Project staff checked attendance on a monthly basis, and no household had to be taken out of the voucher list. 1,000 children attended formal school, with only a 1% dropout rate (*See Impact section below for an analysis*); dropouts were replaced by new ABE graduates in year 2. Interviews with mothers confirm that the voucher has altered the incentive structure that underpins family decisions as to whether or not maintain their children in school. It proved particularly effective for girls, with 516 of them enrolled. Likewise, subsidies and broader support to school operation and development removed *immediate* bottlenecks on the supply-side.

**Positive results of the training program but a somewhat narrow approach to capacity building.** Trainings were delivered according to plan, and trainees expressed overall satisfaction with the quality of modules/sessions. Most, however, highlighted the need for refresher trainings (some of which have already been planned by the Project team).

**‘The best teacher training we had in 2010 was the one provided by NRC.’**

**Teachers in Bendarkazim school**

**Importantly, the trainings reached female teachers/CEC members, with approximately one third of female participants.** In a context where female teachers/CEC members are few, this indicates effective engagement from Project staff. Although the summer school holiday precluded direct observation in partner schools,

interviews suggest that trainings were followed by tangible changes both in terms of quality of teaching and school management in 9 schools out of 10. In one school, the Head Teacher reported no tangible changes in teachers' performance; Project staff mentioned low base competencies as a reason for the ineffectiveness of the training. Trainings proved most effective with teachers, who reported tangible changes in the way they teach and manage the classroom such as: the elaboration of lessons plans, improved interaction with pupils and better management of the classroom, improved approach to special needs children, and improvements in girls' participation. Their responses, which are backed up by consistent perceptions from children themselves, suggest a more dynamic and participatory approach to teaching/learning as a result of the Project. The training program for head-teachers and CEC representatives led to the elaboration of written action plans. Head-teachers reported improvements in the way school running costs are managed as well as increases in school savings in some schools as a result. The training seems to have encouraged a more innovative, engaged school leadership; for example one school organized football competitions and recreational activities, another decorated classrooms. The results of the training for CECs seem to be more mixed, with concerns as regards knowledge retention; most of the CEC members interviewed seem to have only a distant recollection of contents.

The objective of the project was not to support reforms in the education sector, or to build MoE's capacity to more effectively manage, plan for and deliver formal and non-formal educational services. However, interviews with MoE staff suggest that the **Project could have contributed more to their capacity building through specific trainings, customized to their needs, particularly as regards field monitoring/supervision.** MoE staffs participated in all trainings, but their perception was clearly that they attended as 'experts' to support training delivery, rather than as 'learners'.

**'NRC should provide support to REO's office in order to be more effective in daily activity provision; presently we cannot even monitor schools properly.'**

**REO- Bari region MoE**

With this background, **training is a good and necessary start, but as evidence shows worldwide, a few days of training are highly unlikely to significantly raise competencies,** particularly for teachers (See recommendations for a broader approach to capacity-building).

#### **(iv) COORDINATION**

Guiding questions included: the degree to which the project has encouraged full involvement of all stakeholders; the involvement of other actors in the region; the collaboration with UNICEF; and cross feeding with other NRC projects. **The evaluation concludes to an adequate level of coordination across the board.**

Local stakeholders (parents, teachers/Head teachers, CECs, IDP/CLT communities and merchants) were actively engaged throughout implementation (See efficiency section above). There are some **concrete examples of mothers' influencing aspects of implementation** (e.g. items made available in local shops, distribution strategy etc.).

That being said, stronger involvement during the baseline assessment could have led to a voucher system more tailored to basic needs. **Another area for improvement may be to give a more visible role to CECs in the distribution of vouchers to reinforce their legitimacy.**

Regular meetings were held with MoE to coordinate activities and address implementation challenges. More importantly, there is **solid evidence of hands-on involvement of MoE in implementation**, such as systematic participation in training sessions, bi-annual joint field monitoring missions, supervision during the distribution of vouchers and school construction etc. **Interviews with MoE representatives highlight a high degree of satisfaction with having been involved in all stages of the project cycle.**

UNICEF organized review meetings in Garowe, which served as a platform to inform education stakeholders on project progress and implementation challenges. Interviews with UNICEF/INGOs suggest the **need to reinforce coordination at the field level** through inter-agency sectorial meetings to support the mainstreaming of standardized approaches to teacher training, for example, and ongoing sharing of lessons learnt. This would allow for more effective, tangible cross feeding between projects implemented by NGOs. For example, NRC's education projects (particularly its future YEP project) could establish a partnership framework with Mercy Corps' *'Emergency response to IDPs and host communities'* project in Puntland, which focuses on economic recovery and skill training for youths.

The Project team collaborated actively with the NRC shelter team, who oversaw directly school construction and rehabilitation work, ensuring that it met minimum standards.

## **(v) IMPACT**

Guiding questions include: achievements against outcomes specified in the log-frame; level of awareness of stakeholders; level of ownership of the Project by education stakeholders and their commitment to support the project; extent to which the Project has impacted the quality of teaching, school management and educational outcomes. Recognizing the methodological constraints alluded to above and that educational and behavioral outcomes are typically slow to materialize, the evaluation refrains from making firm conclusions on Project impact. With this caveat in mind, it is clear that **the voucher system has effectively supported the transition of learners to formal schools (over two years); there is a wealth of anecdotal evidence that it has initiated (but not necessarily cemented) a process of attitude/behavior change.**

**Retention: 990 pupils (out of 1,000) completed two grades; this is a major achievement in Puntland's context.** 10 pupils (7 female and 3 males) dropped out during the second year of the Project, and were replaced by 10 new ABE graduates from the 2010/11 cohort, who entered in Grade 5. Dropouts were not caused by income-related constraints, but rather by returns to communities of origin and (for some girls) by early-marriages (more on this below). The evaluation could not access reliable data on the average dropout rate in partner schools, but interviews with stakeholders show that 1% of dropout is way below average. Removing the bottlenecks presented by the costs of

attendance and learning did prove an effective ‘trigger’ to elicit a strong response on both the demand and supply side. Incentives altered household choices in schooling but also initiated supply-side ‘affirmative actions’, such as a reduction in school fees for vulnerable children, provision of scholastic materials, etc. (See *sustainability section below*).

**Change of behavior/attitude:** The Project seems to have initiated a process of attitude/behavior change, although it is too early to say whether it cemented lasting changes among caretakers and education authorities towards children’s education. The Project seems to have supported the emergence of a more enabling educational environment, both in the classroom and at home, which may support more effective learning (more on this below). Children reported that the Project had helped change the attitude of parents towards their education. Numerous

examples of a more hands-on parental involvement were reported. There is little evidence, however, of parents pro-actively engaging teachers; CEC members or teachers systematically initiated contacts. In schools, the interviews suggest that trainings and awareness raising activities contributed to a more ‘inclusive’ and ‘child-friendly’ schools, with teachers/school management paying more attention to the specific needs of vulnerable children. A more ‘caring’ behavior contributed to making vulnerable children feel ‘more comfortable’ and able to ‘express themselves’ in the school-setting. The Project achieved a great deal as regards girls’ attendance. That being said, and not surprisingly, **two-years of ‘positive discrimination’ did not fundamentally alter the discriminatory beliefs and practices that undermine girls’ education and welfare.** Girls’ education continues to rank low on the ladder of family priorities, and although incentives provided the necessary ‘push’ for enrolment, interviews with mothers, especially, highlighted that gender roles/stereotypes (i.e. women as mothers and wives) were deeply rooted in their mindset, and the ever constant ‘threat’ of early-marriage. Indeed, out of the 10 pupils who dropped out, 7 were girls, most of them to get married, often against their will. Another concern is the fact that some mothers seem to have equated positive discrimination (e.g. minimum 50% target for enrolment, sanitary materials for girls) with girls being ‘more needy’ (quote).

**Educational outcomes:** There is some anecdotal of project impact on educational outcomes. Interviews with teachers, CECs, and children themselves tended to emphasize the educational achievements of

‘Our parents asked us to work before the Project but now they understand that it is important for us to go to school.’

‘They reduced the housework and sent us to school early.’

‘They check our books when we come back to school and work on our exercises.’

Children from Omar Bin Aziz school

CEC member – Shafi’i School: ‘One of the ABE/UNICEF student has become number 2 in the whole school’

Abdullah from Nawawi school :‘I am able to write my name in English. I have new friends and I was satisfied when I beat by one point my friend who first taught me how to write my name’

vulnerable children. The Project clearly catalyzed, but also built-on, children's passion for learning. A number of interviews with teachers and children suggested that two years of additional formal schooling helped solidify competency gains made through the ABE program, particularly as regards basic literacy and numeracy skills. In the absence of standard baseline and post-project values for basic competencies, it is difficult to ascertain these gains, however. Besides, the **under-performance of many ABE learners during the entry test is a concern**. After undergoing an entry test in target schools, roughly 43% of children entered the primary upper level (Grade 5), as aimed by the ABE program, but 57% entered lower levels (Grade 2 to 4) (See Annex 1 for a breakdown). This suggests the need to further boost learning under the ABE scheme and ensure that graduates can meet the minimum standards required for entry at the upper level. Under-performance at entry creates significant challenges for the voucher scheme, as it increases the number of years during which vulnerable pupils may need support. The distribution of ABE graduates across grades does not seem to have been anticipated by Project staff.

**Social integration:** One of the main changes reported by children revolved around their social integration. Many displaced children mentioned 'feeling like the others' (i.e. children from host communities, who usually benefit from more education opportunities), more 'respected' and having created bonds with children from the host community. Noticeably, children from the host community also mentioned that

**One displaced child from Grible school said: 'I have good friendships in schools, and they respect and love me just as I do respect and love them.'**

**One child from the host community in Benderkazim school said: 'since we are from this community we are already integrated. But making friends in school meant creating a bond and spending time with displaced children, like doing homework together.'**

they had created bonds with IDP children. Altogether, interviews with vulnerable children give the impression that the Project helped assuage the sense of relative deprivation that affects their psychosocial welfare. One child, for example, said: 'there was no happiness since we saw other kids going to school.' There were also many reports of **tangible behavioral changes among vulnerable children, particularly their social skills**. Many children reported changes such as: 'I now have the ability of understanding others, not like before when I used violence to communicate.' The inclusion of 20% of non-IDP children in the targeting clearly prevented tensions between displaced and host communities around differentiated treatments, while it created concrete bridges for improved social interaction across these populations (through meetings, joint-activities etc.). This type of inclusive approach is fundamental to the generation of durable solutions that involve host communities.

**Child empowerment:** School attendance also seems to have enabled children to project themselves beyond the IDP settlement and poverty, with hopes of becoming teachers, doctors, lawyers and humanitarian workers. All clearly understood that ‘education is the absolute power’ (quote) and the importance of ‘taking the chance that was given’ (quote) to them to move out of poverty. Girls,

especially, were acutely aware that education may help them overcome the attitudes and beliefs that confine them to the domestic sphere and too often result in gender-based violence. All children understood the transformative power of education for poor communities, and many expressed the will to ‘give back’ what they had received.

Shamsa from Grible school said, for example, ‘I love it, I am happy when motivated, and that really helps me. I wouldn’t want to stop studying from any reason be it marriage, or work, or financial-related issues. Because I do not want to start cleaning homes for people or at times molested or being sexually harassed. It’s disrespectful, and therefore we find education a better alternative for the future.’

**Welfare/livelihoods spillovers:**

Children and mothers reported tangible welfare benefits from the Project, which contributed to the household’s food security. Basically, the voucher system (while it did not address the broad range of humanitarian needs of vulnerable households) created some sort of a basic ‘safety’ net for participating households. Children reported having more regular meals, wearing cleaner clothes etc. Interestingly, merchants also reported positive ‘spillovers’ on the local economy.

‘Life is a lot different because we have education, we eat more, we exchange and wear uniforms more frequently; we do not have difficult work to carry out, like searching water, firewood, over a long distance.’  
Byokulule school children

**Child Protection:** Although the Project invested in awareness-raising on children’s rights, there is little evidence of impact on ‘hard’ protection issues. Although the evaluation did not look into this issue in depth, several stakeholders reported continuous high prevalence of violence and others forms of abuse against children (including target pupils), particularly gender based violence against girls on their way to school or in the school setting. Girls are also under the constant ‘threat’ of having to discontinue schooling to marry early.

‘We need awareness campaigns in the IDP settlement camps to explain the importance of sending girls to schools, otherwise it is common for girls to be forced into early marriages’

IDP/CLT community rep Grible school

**Structural constraints:** It is clear that the voucher system is not a ‘silver bullet’ to address the broad range of supply and demand side constraints

**to equitable educational outcomes.** The quality of teaching, school management and educational achievement are conditioned by multiple factors (not in the least by the multi-dimensional nature of poverty) beyond the scope of the Project. Teacher or school management performance in Puntland's context is undermined by the lack of incentives to perform, and it is unlikely that the CCT mechanism or even the dynamics it initiated will address structural issues related to poor formation of teachers, inadequate salaries and deployment, inconsistent application of sanctions leading to absenteeism, lack of objective measurements of student performance (in a context where tests are poorly designed, poorly executed, and often involve a degree of corruption), autocratic/hierarchical culture that permeates the schooling system, and macro institutional capacity and resource constraints. Scholars of education also recognize that parents' educational levels and degree of involvement in their children's education also largely determine their educational outcomes, oftentimes more so than the quality of formal schooling. The levels of literacy in Somalia are extremely low, and probably more so in camp settlements. Adult illiteracy among IDP caretakers and the many demands of feeding a family simply preclude parenting support for homework as well as effective knowledge transfer across generations.

#### **(vi) SUSTAINABILITY**

Organizing questions include: whether the outcomes and changes brought about by the project are likely to continue after its completion; level of ownership by stakeholders; whether MoE developed supportive policies; institutional capacity of MoE and its local structures to continue project activities. **Chronic poverty as well as capacity and resource deficits on the supply-side create real constraints to future attendance but the evaluation points-out to positive spillovers on education authorities' commitment to addressing inequitable access in target communities.**

**'I will continue going to school no matter what...only the lack of fees will stop me'.**

**Burhan from Grible school**

**All stakeholders expressed valid concerns about the longevity of the voucher scheme.** The Project's initial duration (two years) does not cover the full primary education cycle, for learners, whether they entered in Grade 5 (i.e. four years total) or Grade 2 (seven years). Shall the transfers be discontinued, hard realities are likely to prevail with families reverting to pre-Project cost-benefit calculations as regards children education, leading to dropouts. This fear clearly permeates interviews with children. It is clear that discontinuing support to the first cohort of pupils would prevent a significant chunk of them to complete the primary education cycle. This could affect the 'credibility' of an incentivized approach to enrolment among communities (and therefore future enrolments) but also create distress among children, whose hopes were raised and then let down.

**'If the project stops it will create more conflict than benefit.'**

**CEC member - Shafi'i School**

Overall, interviews with both mothers and education authorities suggest that sustainability concerns still rank relatively low on their agenda, and that they prioritize short-term needs. Clearly, the Project design responds to (and is perceived as) a *transitional* strategy, which prioritizes children's rights to education, in a context that may not be ripe for other types of more long-term, developmental interventions that would place more emphasis on reforming the education sector and livelihoods enhancement.

When asked about sustainability, one MoE representative simply responded 'let's not talk about sustainability'.

The voucher scheme also presents an inherent risk of creating 'over-dependency' on outside support.

External transfers create an ongoing risk that local stakeholders equate education with assistance, thus undermining local resource mobilization for the education of vulnerable children. The multiplication of community-owned schools in Puntland in recent years shows that communities are capable, and willing to invest in education; this provides a solid foundation for sustainability.

'When talking about sustainability we have to keep in mind that 90% of the schools in Puntland are sustained by the community and this is a very strong point'

Focal point for strategic partnership-UNICEF

External support could, however, create perverse incentives for investments in education (i.e. motivate communities to reallocate part of their resources to other sectors/activities). In that perspective, ensuring that external support does not substitute for local investments in education is of paramount importance.

On a more positive note, the Project seems to have catalyzed changes in communities and among education stakeholders toward more supportive policies and practices. In that respect, some important steps were taken by stakeholders to build on the momentum created by the Project:

'Now that the school structure has improved, there is a future plan to take care of it because we have understood the importance of contributing for the school maintenance. We hope we will get support from Ministry of Planning and MoE.'

CEC Haji-Mire school

- MoE committed to include 20 teachers working in the 10 supported schools (currently paid by the community) into its payroll for two years after completion of the project. MoE also committed to provide all 1,000 children with the necessary school materials;
- A MoU was signed with merchants, who pledged to pay school fees for one children each for a two year-period;
- CECs committed to allow 650 households to pay 50% of school fees for the next two years and that fees would be waved for 247 Extremely Vulnerable Children (EVC);

- NRC committed to providing school materials, continuous training for teachers/head teachers and to enhance community mobilization.

**These commitments will need to be seen through, but do suggest a high degree of ownership over the project's objectives as well as a clear contribution to its enhancing stakeholder awareness.** CECs' pledge to reduce or waive fees, especially, is a step in the right direction, which responds to vulnerable families' primary concern.

**Ongoing commitments only target the first cohort of pupils, however, and for the next two years.** They basically aim to ensure that children who already received support can at least complete primary schooling. As such, they do not necessarily reflect a broader commitment to support the education of vulnerable children beyond the Project sphere. Besides, running commitments only partially cover the needs of the first cohort, as children who entered under Grade 5 have more than 2 years to complete, while tuition fees were only waived for a minority. The food benefits, which clearly triggered a response from parents, are not covered either. There is thus a significant risk that ongoing commitments may just not be enough, even for the first cohort.

## E. Recommendations

### (i) AT MINIMA

**See ongoing commitments from various stakeholders through:** UNICEF/NRC should continue to mobilize merchants/CECs/MoE to ensure they make good on their pledged support to the first cohort of pupils over the next two years. This is vital to generate a sense of 'responsibility' among participating communities and create a critical path towards sustainability. Although local resources may be scarce, they do exist and can be leveraged. Requiring a tangible contribution from local stakeholders may help raise their awareness on their 'obligations' vis-à-vis vulnerable children under the Government's education policy guidelines, yield more sustainable financing strategies and minimize the risks of the voucher scheme creating negative incentives for local investments in schools. In that perspective, MoE has a lead role to play in ensuring that school management delivers its commitment to reduce or waive fees for vulnerable children.

**Four-year extension to ensure that the first cohort of 1,000 pupils can complete the primary cycle:** This extension would complement pledges by local stakeholders - rather than substitute for them - and support completion of the primary education cycle for the full cohort of 1,000 pupils, whatever their entry level. Such an extension is vital from a rights-based perspective, as targeted pupils will need continuous support to complete the primary education cycle to which they are entitled. It is also critical to enhance the credibility of the CCT mechanism with MoE and local communities, as part of a long-term investment strategy in primary education. Introducing this repeater program as a 'reward' for local contributions to the pilot project may also contribute to local ownership, while creating an additional incentive for local performance in future locations. The follow-on program could incorporate some of the design improvements

discussed below. This extension should also involve **contingency planning** to anticipate and help address the impact of the current drought on vulnerable households and their communities; the voucher system could provide a foundation for a safety net mechanism.

**Upstream work to boost competencies of ABE learners:** The mixed performance of ABE graduates on the entry test suggests the need for upstream work to boost ABE learners' competencies. Underperformance of many ABE graduates may be explained by multiple factors beyond the quality of ABE implementation but it creates a significant challenge to the operation of follow-on voucher programs, as practically, it increases the number of years during which the voucher scheme may be needed. Conducting an evaluation of the ABE and APES projects may help inform design improvements.

(ii) **STRONGLY RECOMMENDED**

**Increase the number of beneficiaries in target locations, and rollout the voucher scheme in new locations:**

Given the extremely low enrollment rates in IDP settlements and their vicinity, follow-on programs should clearly be sourced. The action research on the voucher system mentioned throughout this evaluation highlights that 'the fraction of poor households who receive the transfers (relative to the general population) is as important as the size of the transfer in determining the program's impact on school enrollment, improving educational outcome and on consumption poverty.' This research also emphasizes the substantial body of evidence that 'supports the view that spillover effects of a CCT program are more significant when a large proportion of the population in a community receives the transfer.' Besides, the CCT mechanism – and complementary school improvement interventions – piloted by the Project clearly support Puntland's education policy. Two types of (complementary) follow-on programs could be envisioned:

**'NRC should enlarge the number of beneficiaries and focus not only on Bossaso area but also along the coast where the needs are high.'**

**REO-Bari Region - MoE**

- **NRC may consider focusing on supporting remaining ABE graduates (who did not transition to formal schools or had to discontinue schooling) in completing a full primary cycle.** The dropout rate for a second cohort of ABE graduates who integrated the formal school system, without receiving vouchers, was indeed 30-40% higher than average, highlighting the need for such an intervention. In the locations where NRC operates, NRC could also support the attendance of other vulnerable children who were not enrolled in the ABE program.
- **Other agencies may replicate the CCT mechanism in locations non-covered by NRC.** Such programs would not only target displaced children, but more broadly vulnerable children who discontinued schooling or at risk of doing so because of income-related constraints.

Evidence from other countries clearly shows that CCT mechanisms that support school attendance do not require preliminary interventions (such as the ABE program) to be effective. That being said, projects implemented outside of the ABE program may require more upstream community mobilization activities to raise their awareness on the importance of education.

Rather than supporting a transition to formal schooling, follow-on programs – whether NRC or other agencies implement them – should aim to support a completion of the full primary cycle for their target beneficiaries. The question of their duration is a difficult one. Taking note that long-term interventions are usually hard to source, **the evaluation would recommend four-year programs and a focus on the upper level.** Support would be provided to incentivize enrollment in Grade 5 and above. The opportunity-cost of schooling children increases indeed over time, and dropout rates are much higher in the upper-levels. The targeting should continue to emphasize girls' education, and indeed higher targets (e.g. 60%) could be set. A focus on the upper-level should not preclude programs supporting education at lower-levels (including replications of NRC's ABE program by other agencies), but would provide an extra-incentive for families with children enrolled in lower grades to keep them in school to be able to access the voucher scheme once they reach Grade 5.

**Create a path towards sustainability:** An extension of the ongoing Project or follow-on projects should not, however, reinforce local stakeholders' reliance/dependence on outside transfers, but rather seek to create a long-term path towards sustainability. As such, they could involve (and help test) digressive investment strategies, which would increasingly leverage local resources over the years. Such an approach should be discussed with local stakeholders but could look something like this:

**Table 3. Outline of a digressive investment strategy**

|                                      |                            | Project's lifetime  |  |  |  | After Project Completion  |   |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|
|                                      |                            | Year 1  | Year 2   | Year 3   | Year 4   | Year 5  | Year 6  |
| Implementing agency's contribution   | Vouchers                   | 600 children entering at Grade 5 provided with vouchers with a baseline value of 100 points       | 590 children passing to Grade 6 children provided with vouchers with a value of 110 points*  | 580 children passing to Grade 7 provided with vouchers with a value of 120 points*           | 570 children passing to Grade 8 provided with vouchers with a value of 130 points* |   |   |
|                                      |                            |   | 210 children entering at Grade 5 provided with vouchers with a baseline value of 100 points* | 205 children passing to Grade 6 provided with vouchers with a value of 110 points*           | 200 children passing to Grade 7 provided with vouchers with a value of 120 points* |   |   |
|                                      |                            |   |  | 215 children entering at Grade 5 provided with vouchers with a baseline value of 100 points* | 210 children passing to grade 6 provided with vouchers with a value of 110 points* |   |   |
|                                      | School construction        | Construction/rehabilitation of classrooms in partner schools                                      |  |  |  |   |   |
|                                      | Subsidies                  | Subsidies for operational costs with a baseline value of 100 (inc. tuition fees for 600 children) | Subsidies for operational costs with a baseline value of 70                                  | Subsidies for operational costs with a baseline value of 50                                  |  |   |   |
| Contribution from local stakeholders | Contributions from schools |   | Fees waived for targeted children  | Fees waived for targeted children  | Fees waived for targeted children  | Fees waived for 195 children passing to Grade 8 and 205 passing to Grade 7    | Fees waived for 200 children passing to Grade 8                               |
|                                      | Contribution from MoE      |   |  | Scholastic materials to 500 children   | Scholastic materials provided to 980 children<br>Teachers included in payroll      | Scholastic materials provided to 400 children<br>Teachers included in payroll | Scholastic materials provided to 200 children<br>Teachers included in payroll |
| <b>Total beneficiaries</b>           |                            | <b>600</b>  | <b>800</b>   | <b>1000</b>  | <b>980</b>   | <b>400</b>  | <b>200</b>  |

\* In real terms, i.e. adjusted for inflation.

Any long-term disengagement strategy should recognize three major constraints, and respond to these:

- a) **Poor families may not be able to cover the costs of school attendance without external support (i.e. high risk of dropout once the Project is discontinued) and the opportunity-cost is higher for adolescents and girls.** Decreasing the total value of external support over time should be attempted, but this not necessarily synonymous with reducing the value of transfers to (most) vulnerable families. Indeed, if anything the value of transfers should increase over time to reward passing to higher Grades, and retention of adolescent children. Affirmative action for girls (in the form of additional vouchers) should be maintained, and indeed higher targets for enrolment (e.g. 60%) could be considered. The strategy outlined above would aim to ensure that a *majority* of targeted children can complete the primary cycle (in the example above 570 out of

1,000 receive four years of support, accounting for potential dropouts) and minimize risks of dropout for the other children, while progressively fostering 'obligations' on the part of local stakeholders (local stakeholders commit to support children who entered Grade 5 in Year 3 for two years after Project completion). Ideally, some form of direct support to vulnerable families (beyond a waiver of tuition fees) should be maintained after Project completion.

- b) **Partner schools may not be able to afford the costs of schooling massive cohorts of vulnerable children once subsidies are discontinued.** For example, if 1,000 children are targeted, it is unlikely that school management will waive fees for all of these over two years after Project completion; they might, however, do so for a smaller group of 200. Future programs should thus aim for 'bell-shaped' contributions from local schools, which would reach their peak toward the end of the Project, and decrease progressively (for targeted children, not for vulnerable children in general) after Project completion. Commitments would be specified in MoUs signed in presence of all concerned parties, including communities, in Year 3 of the Project, and their realization followed through after Project completion.
- c) **In a context characterized by acute poverty, it might be unreasonable to expect major (pecuniary) contributions from communities themselves beyond their already not insignificant contributions to the establishment and running of community-based schools.** Rather, future Projects should seek to establish partnerships with local NGOs, humanitarian agencies or government programs for livelihoods programs, which would increase communities' self-reliance and boost the local economy.

**(iii) RECOMMENDED DESIGN IMPROVEMENTS FOR FOLLOW-ON/SIMILAR PROGRAMS**

**Ensuring that the value of vouchers covers the total costs of school attendance and that their allotment reflects the hierarchy of needs.** The 'Reaching out of school children through conditional cash transfer: A study on households schooling choices in Bossaso- Puntland, Somalia' provides a robust framework to further improve the voucher system (See its Chapter 4, Recommendations, point 4.2). Proposed actions aim both to a) ensure that the transfer amount covers adequately the total costs of sending children to school, and b) that the voucher system is tailored to the specific needs of sub-groups of children. Recommendations include: (i) higher transfers for girls to encourage mothers to keep them in school (culturally, the opportunity cost of sending girls to school is higher); (ii) higher transfers to pupils in higher levels to discourage adolescents from dropping out (adolescents face increased pressure to contribute to the family income); (iii) making the transfer conditional on school attendance for all the children in the household and avoid per family ceilings; (iv) increasing the food allocation to meet food requirements (such as the minimum consumption basket for Somalia as calculated by the FSNAU or the average WFP food basket based on a standard of 2,100 kilocalories). In addition to these actions, the evaluation recommends the conduct of a market assessment - to verify whether the items identified in the baseline survey are available, at a reasonable price and appropriate quality - but also on-going monitoring of prices in target locations to adjust

the value of vouchers to real-prices over time. The Project could introduce artificial inflation in a money-starved local economy. It would therefore be important to monitor prices for the same basket of products in control areas and to notify merchants that this is being done and that the Project will not pay beyond standard market prices. Taking stock of the coping strategy used by mothers in difficult times (i.e. trading vouchers meant for school/sanitary materials for food) bears the question of whether items essential for schooling (uniforms etc.) should be included in voucher pool (vs. direct distribution) and whether more freedom should be given to mothers as regards voucher allocation (negative list as opposed to positive list). Direct distribution of school items would however not prevent re-selling. Setting the 'right' value is thus of paramount importance.

**Strengthening the targeting process and criteria:** Although interviews with Project stakeholders highlighted their overall satisfaction with both the process and criteria used for beneficiary selection, some key informants emphasized that extremely vulnerable children had been left out. While the selection process should continue to emphasize CEC/community empowerment, improved targeting may require setting quotas for sub-groups of extremely vulnerable children (e.g. orphans, children from female-headed households etc.).

**More predictable and frequent distributions:** The frequency of distribution should be agreed-upon with the community, and while logistics constraints may prevent monthly distributions, dedicated efforts should be made to reach a bi-monthly frequency. To make sure that the value of transfer is predictable, and that mothers know from day 1 what they can expect to receive throughout the program in real-terms - i.e. number/weight/quality of specific items, although the dollar value of transfers may be adjusted to accommodate inflation - is vital to maintain the credibility of the CCT mechanism. Improving distributions would probably require training Project staff in cash programming. CECs/school management should be given a more visible role during distributions to enhance their legitimacy and ownership of the Project.

**Explicit focus on 'under-achievers':** The pilot was clearly designed with a Grade 5 entry in mind. The majority of ABE learners did not enter in Grade 5, however, as they failed to meet the basic competencies required. In addition to the upstream work mentioned above, future projects should place emphasis on providing extra-curricular support to under-achievers, who may be the most vulnerable among target beneficiaries.

**Tailoring the training program to local learning needs, accreditation and monitoring of training outcomes:** This would require conducting a pre-project participatory needs/baseline assessment with training participants, but also conducting a quick evaluation at the end of each training round to inform refresher trainings. Interviews suggest that efforts to improve the

**'Children have advanced to upper primary level but some teachers' experience is limited to the lower primary. Therefore it is important for teachers to be provided with quality training and hand-outs for future referrals since they tend to be doing well immediately after the training but then their quality deteriorates'**

**Head teacher – Daryeel school**

training program should focus on the CEC curriculum, which seemed less effective. Respondents emphasized the importance of receiving certificate of participation. Certification ceremonies could provide a ‘symbolic’ yet important reward for participation in the Project. A follow-on program would include the development of training modules/sessions that specifically target MoE staff, both at national and regional level, based on their self-proclaimed needs.

**Adoption of a more integrated approach to capacity building:** Training and capacity building are not synonymous. A stronger capacity-building component should be developed for future projects, which takes into account the demands of adult learning. This would involve more investment in hands-on on the job training, supported practice, ongoing peer-to-peer knowledge exchange, documentation and dissemination of best practices etc.

**Integration of a child protection component:**

A dedicated effort should be made to recruit more female staffs, as this might create positive role models for mothers and girls but also support the reporting of GBV cases. Recognizing the prevalence of violence and other forms of abuse against children, particularly sexual violence against girls, follow-on programs should support the establishment

**‘NRC should provide training to IDP/CLT community leaders to increase awareness on protection and human rights and help them in coordination mechanism. NGOS should be linked to tackle rape cases and child protection issues’**

**IDP/CLT community rep Biyokulule school**

community/school-based structures to report cases to the police, provide legal assistance to whistle-blowers, victims and their caretakers, and publicize sanctions. Such a component would involve broader efforts to assess potential risks and take preventative measures (e.g. parent escorts for children going to school), raise local stakeholders’ awareness on children’s rights and provide integrated support to survivors (health care, psychosocial assistance etc). NRC’s education project in Liberia, which works closely with education authorities and the Liberian Police’s Women and Child Protection unit, provides a number of good practices for replication.

**Establishment of a partnership with WFP:** MoE has requested WFP to expand its school-feeding program in Puntland. WFP’s resources are currently overstretched as this agency struggles to cope with the famine in South-Central, but opportunities for a partnership framework and prioritization of partner schools may arise. A school feeding program could effectively complement the voucher system to ensure an appropriate diet for children, a key aspect of their development.

**Linkages with - or addition of - an adult literacy and parenting skills scheme:** During the implementation of the Project, 410 participating mothers benefited from a 9-month literacy course under the APES project. Building on lessons learned from APES, future programs should either include or link with adult literacy/parenting skills interventions to reinforce positive attitudes and behaviors of parents as role models, while equipping them with basic skills to support children’s education at home. This could involve radio broadcasts. Care and Save the Children have successfully used such

programs (with messages/information targeting mother and girls) in Puntland; partnership opportunities could be explored.

**Linkages with broader supply-side interventions, particularly teacher-training programs:** The evaluation emphasized that structural capacity and resource constraints hindered both access to and the quality of primary education; most of these constraints fall, however, outside the scope of a voucher system targeting vulnerable children. Future Projects should nonetheless identify concrete entry-points to contribute to broader efforts to reform the education sector, such as the ongoing UNICEF initiative, the *'Integrated Capacity Development For Somali Education Administrations (ICDSEA)*, which supports the capacity building of the Ministries of Education in Puntland, Somaliland and Central South Somalia and reforms to the education sector. One such entry-point may be the design and implementation of standardized government-led teacher-training programs. Within the realm of their field of expertise (i.e. vulnerable children), future Projects could make meaningful contributions to the design of training modules (e.g. on child-friendly education, gender mainstreaming etc.) and their implementation. This may include active involvement in the setting-up and running of an inter-agency teacher-training task force to reinforce the coordination and standardization of training activities. The first task of this task force would be the design of a comprehensive training program, for endorsement by MoE. Future Projects could also support the accreditation/certification process, including transparent competency tests. Such processes are indeed vital to enhance the legitimacy and role of teachers in their communities. Future Projects should focus on supporting the enrolment of female teachers in government training programs. On the one hand, interviews suggest that female teacher tend to remain in their posts longer (i.e. targeting them would ensure knowledge retention). On the other, training and certification could contribute to their empowerment.

**No need for a randomized evaluation but for stronger M&E/advocacy:** The case has been made elsewhere for CCT mechanisms in education. The evaluation does not see a strong rationale to finance a costly impact evaluation. It does see the need, however, for future projects to incorporate a stronger M&E component, document lessons learned and best practices and use field evidence to inform advocacy work on the specific constraints faced by IDP/vulnerable children to access quality education. Field-based evidence generation would respond to and support UNICEF/MoE's policy work.

#### **(iv) IDEAS TO EXPLORE**

**Program targeting children living in the streets:** The presence of 4,500 to 5,500 children living in the streets in Bossasso, mostly displaced children according to the Governor's office, highlights the need for a specific intervention targeting these extremely vulnerable children, including the establishment of hosting facilities.

**Piloting of community or school centered incentives/rewards for local performance on education outcomes:** Such incentives could include the provision of grants or non pecuniary rewards to communities and/or schools that reach a set of pre-defined performance targets as regards attendance, quality of teaching and school

management and educational value-added (as opposed to achievement, to cancel-out initial differences in the level of pupils). Such a system would be based on a set of weights and points for key indicators, which would be defined with local stakeholders. The system could include both positive points and negative points (e.g. for teacher absenteeism), but would in any case require verification based on objectively verifiable indicators. Some degree of 'yardstick' competition between schools/communities with similar baseline values could be introduced, with grants provided to best performing communities/schools. Such an approach would not alter the voucher system's emphasis on attendance, but provide an extra-incentive for communities/schools to focus on broader issues of school performance and educational achievement. Approaches focusing on teacher performance – such as skills-based programs or merit-pay programs – could also be looked into.

## Annex 1: Entry levels

| School          | GRADE 5 |        | GRADE 4 |        | GRADE 3 |        | GRADE 2 |        | TOTAL |
|-----------------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|-------|
|                 | Male    | Female | Male    | Female | Male    | Female | Male    | Female |       |
| Haji Mire       | 37      | 36     | 24      | 32     | 13      | 9      | 3       | 4      | 158   |
| Shafi'i         | 28      | 14     | 19      | 8      | 3       | 4      | 4       | 13     | 93    |
| Nawawi          | 10      | 7      | 18      | 20     | 2       | 1      | -       | -      | 58    |
| Biyokulule      | 17      | 22     | 12      | 10     | 21      | 25     | 23      | 30     | 160   |
| Grible          | 20      | 6      | 10      | 16     | 22      | 16     | 11      | 10     | 111   |
| Omar Bin A/Aziz | 13      | 14     | 6       | 11     | 2       | 6      | -       | -      | 52    |
| Benderkazim     | 34      | 50     | 21      | 24     | 20      | 25     | 2       | -      | 176   |
| Daryeel         | 37      | 37     | 5       | 6      | -       | -      | -       | -      | 85    |
| Ugas-Yassin     | 3       | 13     | -       | 1      | -       | -      | -       | -      | 17    |
| Iftiin          | 24      | 14     | 13      | 20     | 7       | 11     | -       | 1      | 90    |
| TOTAL           | 223     | 213    | 128     | 148    | 90      | 97     | 43      | 58     | 1000  |
|                 | 436     |        | 276     |        | 187     |        | 101     |        |       |

## Annex 2: Participants in the Evaluation Workshops

| Name                   | Position                                       |
|------------------------|--|
| Ibrahim Omar Du'alle   | NRC Acting Project Manager-Project Coordinator |
| Mohamed Ahmed Hashi    | NRC Education Officer                          |
| Rukia Said Mohamed     | NRC Education Assistant                        |
| Mohamed Abdi Ali       | NRC Education Assistant                        |
| Asli Isse Abshir       | NRC Education Assistant                        |
| Fowsia Mohamed Ahmed   | NRC CDM  |
| Du'alle A/lahi Du'alle | NRC Construction Officer                       |
| A/Rashid Mohamud       | NRC Monitoring & Evaluation                    |
| Mohamed A/rahman Jama  | NRC Protection Officer                         |
| Faisa Said Mohamed     | Enumerator                                     |
| Salim Dahir Jama       | Enumerator                                     |
| Ibrahim Mohamed Ali    | Enumerator                                     |
| Naima Ahmed Abdi       | Enumerator                                     |
| Mohamed Ali Harbi      | CEC Chairperson                                |
| Maxed Ahmed Farah      | CEC Chairperson                                |
| Salad A. Houle         | CEC Chairperson                                |
| Abdikahim Olad Saleban | CEC Head teacher                               |
| Faduma Jama Gboli      | Teacher  |
| Menis Khaule Hamed     | Teacher  |
| Muse Hibri Mohamed     | MoE Regional Education Supervisor              |

### Annex 3: Key informants

| <b>Date/Place</b>     | <b>Name</b>            | <b>Organization/Position</b>                     |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| 22 July 2011 Nairobi  | Iftikhar Ahmad Shaheen | NRC Area Manager Puntland                        |
| 22 July 2011 Nairobi  | Eric Demers            | NRC Program Director Somalia/Kenya               |
| 22 July 2011 Nairobi  | Carol Ward             | Food Security Consultant                         |
| 22 July 2011 Nairobi  | Miresi Busana          | NRC Previous PM Education Puntland               |
| 31 July 2011 Bossaso  | Mhadi Mohamed Musse    | MoE Regional Education Officer (Bari region)     |
| 31 July 2011 Bossaso  | Musse Jibri Mohamed    | MoE Regional Education Supervisor                |
| 2 August 2011 Bossaso | Said Motore            | UNICEF Focal Point for the Strategic Partnership |
| 2 August 2011 Bossaso | Salad Dahir Aden       | UNICEF Education Specialist-Puntland             |
| 2 August 2011 Bossaso | Muna Mohamed           | MERCY CORPS Program Officer- Puntland            |
| 3 August 2011 Bossaso | Horst Indorf           | NRC Shelter Project Manager                      |
| 5 August 2011 Nairobi | Jumma Khan             | UNICEF Education Cluster Coordinator-Somalia     |
| 5 August 2011 Nairobi | Glenn Hugson           | CaLP Focal Point Kenya                           |
| 5 August 2011 Nairobi | Charles Inwani         | NRC Adviser-Cash & Voucher                       |

#### Annex 4: Evaluation Work Program

| <b>Date</b> | <b>Activity description</b>   |
|-------------|---|
| 21 July     | Travel  |
| 22 July     | Meetings with Nairobi-based key informants  |
| 23 July     | Travel  |
| 24 July     | Preparatory work and initial interviews with Project staff  |
| 25 July     | Continues   |
| 26 July     | Kick-off workshop with key project stakeholders and NRC staff: participatory evaluation design, identification of guiding questions and respondents |
| 27 July     | Interviews with Bossaso-based key informants  |
| 28 July     | Observation of voucher distribution   |
| 29 July     | Interviews with local stakeholders in targeted communities  |
| 30 July     | Continues   |
| 31 July     | Continues   |
| 1 Aug       | Continues   |
| 2 Aug       | Continues   |
| 3 Aug       | Workshop with key project stakeholders and NRC staff to discuss preliminary findings and sustainability issues                                      |
| 4 Aug       | Travel  |
| 5 Aug       | Meetings with Nairobi based key informants.   |
| 6 Aug       | Travel  |
| 7 Aug       | Continues   |
| 8 Aug       | Report writing  |
| 9 Aug       | Continues   |
| 10 Aug      | Submission of draft report  |
| 11 Aug      | Report writing  |
| 12 Aug      | Continues   |
| 13 Aug      | Continues   |
| 14 Aug      | Continues   |
| 15 Aug      | Continues   |
| 16 Aug      | Continues   |
| 17 Aug      | Continues   |
| 18 Aug      | Continues   |
| 19 Aug      | Continues   |
| 20 Aug      | Continues   |
| 21 Aug      | Submission of final report  |

## Annex 5: Secondary Sources

- NRC Project Proposal 'Support to IDP education and pupils transition from ABE to formal school in Puntland'
- NRC Extension Project Proposal 'Support to IDP education and pupils transition from ABE to formal school in Puntland'
- Oscar Milafu Onam 'Reaching out of school children through conditional cash transfer: A study on households schooling choices in Bossaso- Puntland, Somalia' 2010
- NRC Project Reports from September 2009 to May 2011
- NRC Report 'Refreshment Teacher Training' 2010
- NRC 'Baseline Assessment Report to identify participating schools, households and learners' 2009
- Jamal Hassan Musse 'Training Report on effective School Development Planning/Management' 2010
- Memorandum of Understanding between NRC and project merchants
- Memorandum of Understanding between NRC and CECs for phasing out strategy
- NRC policy paper
- NRC education policy and NRC education handbook
- NRC evaluation policy
- UNICEF Survey of primary Education in Somalia 2006-2007
- IDMC 'Somalia. Displacement and worsening humanitarian situation as a result of ongoing violence and conflict' July 2010
- FEWS NET 'Famine threshold surpassed in three new areas of Southern Somalia' Nairobi-Washington, August 2011
- UNHCR Somalia Briefing sheet September 2010
- DRC and UNHCR "Report of IDP profiling-Mogadishu" Nairobi, 2007
- Carole Welt "Somalia Food Security context with Food Security Assessments- Burao and Bosasso June/July 2011" Nairobi, 2011
- IRIN 'Somalia: Poverty pushes Bosaso Children on the streets' 2010
- Horn Relief 'Guidelines for Cash Interventions in Somalia' September 2010
- Somalia: FSNAU Technical Series Report No VI. 31 - 2009/10 Post Deyr Analysis

## Annex 6: Evaluation Terms of References

### **(A). Project Background**

After the collapse of the Somali State in 1991, Somalia has remained without a Central Government and has been the site of intense factional fighting and civil war. Widespread insecurity, famine and a return to traditional clan based governance ensued. The situation for returnees, Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and refugees is amongst the worst in the world. Chronic insecurity and humanitarian emergencies have led to massive displacement. Since 2007 the security and humanitarian situation in Somalia and in particular South Central has had an impact on Somaliland and Puntland with major spill-over effects and increased displacement. Displacement caused by insecurity and conflict continued with the IDP population reaching 1.4 million people. According to the Food Security Analysis Unit (FSAU) there are 3.2 Million people in need of humanitarian assistance in Somalia (2010) which is 43% of the population. Coping mechanisms for host families in many parts of Somalia have already been stretched to the limit over the past years, and the overall crisis facing the growing IDP population has been compounded by the effects of drought, deepening insecurity, hyperinflation (especially of food) and currency devaluation.

In Puntland, the humanitarian access is substantially hindered by lawlessness characterized by piracy, suicide bombing, carjacking and kidnapping for ransom. It is estimated that Puntland has over 104,000 IDPs<sup>1</sup> with limited access to humanitarian support. There are over 28,000 IDPs (4666 households) in Bossaso and 45,000 IDPs (7,500 households) living in Galkaiyo alone in 13 settlements. This is the highest concentration of IDPs in Puntland. Conditions in the settlements are varied including contaminated water and inadequate sanitation facilities, lack of access to basic social services, rampant diseases, and regular outbreaks of fire/arson. In all locations, about 25% of the IDP population is under 5 years, 35% aged between 6 and 18 years while 40% are above 18 years. With increasing number of IDPs and returnees, there has been a growing strain on the limited resources that are available.

A large proportion of school age children in the settlements are out of school largely due to household financial constraints some related to education financing and poor school facilities. Hence, there is limited access to education with over 75.3% of IDP school age children out of school mainly due to lack of school fees and other education related costs<sup>2</sup>.

From 2008-2010, NRC supported Education, school construction and Shelter projects in the IDP settlements of Puntland to improve living conditions for the displaced. The strategy NRC has used over the years is to strengthen operations, increase the number of targeted beneficiaries and strengthen links across projects targeting displaced persons while taking into consideration host communities for the sake of integration, acceptance

---

<sup>1</sup> UNHCR Somalia May

<sup>2</sup>According to the DRC report on profiling of IDPs in Bossaso 2007: Out of children of school age (6 -17 years), only 24.7% reportedly attended school meaning that 75.3% of IDP children are out of school. The figure could be higher given the high dropout rate among IDP community

and do no harm. Based on NRC experience with the displaced population in the region, NRC has adopted an education intervention model that will respond to challenges of accessing basic education by financing IDP households. The Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) project that was initiated in 2009 is ongoing until May 2011 aimed at supporting the pupils transiting to upper primary.

The 'Support to IDP education and pupils' transition from Accelerated Alternative Basic Education (AABE) to Formal School in Puntland' is a pilot project that explores the CCT through the distribution of vouchers in order to enroll and retain transiting students from non-formal to formal primary education. The direct beneficiaries of the project are the learners who graduated from the AABE projects in May 2009 and transited to formal education in ten schools in Bosaso, Puntland. The partnership to carry out the pilot of the project was agreed and signed between NRC and UNICEF who are the implementing organization and donor respectively. The evaluation of the project will cover the period August 2009 – May 2011.

This project is implemented in community owned or public schools within or in the vicinity of high density IDP/Returnees settlements in Puntland (Bossaso settlements). The primary beneficiaries are:

- Children residing in IDP settlements who have previously attended schooling under the non-formal ABE project but are not able continue with formal schooling due household financial limitations or livelihood demands
- Children residing in IDP settlements who have discontinued formal schooling due household financial limitations or livelihood demands
- Children residing in the neighborhood of IDP settlements who have previously attended schooling under the non-formal ABE arrangement but are not able continue with formal schooling due household financial limitations or livelihood demands
- Children residing in the neighborhood of IDP settlements who have discontinued formal schooling due household financial limitations or livelihood demands.

While secondary beneficiaries are:

- Households with the primary beneficiaries whose opportunity cost of children's schooling should be reduced
- Pupils, teachers and CECs in participating schools whose facilities and systems should be improved
- Education authorities at national and regional level whose capacity should be enhanced

## **(B). PROJECT OBJECTIVES:**

### **Overall objective**

The overall objective of NRC's interventions in Puntland is to enhance protection and promote the rights of displaced persons in humanitarian need by improving living conditions and seeking durable solutions.

### **Specific objectives**

The specific objectives for this project are:

- *To enable displaced and other vulnerable children in the IDP settlements to access quality primary education*
- *To improve the capacity and quality of learning environment in schools hosting displaced and other vulnerable children*

**(C). Purpose of the evaluation and intended use**

The evaluation is intended principally for determining the impact of the project, learning and accountability purposes. It is expected to generate relevant findings on the impact of the pilot project, lessons learnt, and recommendations which will be shared with the key stakeholders of the project and used by the implementing agencies to guide and inform future similar projects and programs in Puntland. The evaluation will also assess the performance of the project against key parameters including the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, timelines of activity implementation, and its strengths and weaknesses. The final evaluation report will also be shared with key stakeholders of the project, most importantly the donor (DFID), UNICEF, MOE, local education authorities, and other actors in Puntland.

**(D). Scope of work and methods**

The evaluation will cover the accomplishment of all the expected results as outlined in the project document and detailed in the annual work plans during the period of August, 2009 – May 2011. All the different project components and activities stated in the approved logical framework matrix will be assessed

**The methodology should include:**

**Document review:** Desk study review of all relevant Project documentation, including but not limited to:

- NRC policy Paper
- NRC Education policy and NRC education handbook
- NRC evaluation Policy
- Conditional cash transfer project proposal and logical framework matrix
- Project reports submitted to and approved by the donor
- Various terms of references and training reports.
- All presentations by NRC on the project at different forums

**Field visits:** *The evaluation team should visit majority of schools in Bosaso that the project was implemented.*

**Interviews of beneficiaries:** *This would include and not limited to focus group discussions, Semi-Structured Interviews (SSI), Observations with children at the schools (target children) and their parents.*

**Interviews with NRC staff, Ministry of Education Officials and partners in education sectors;** *The Evaluation team will interview NRC staff in Bosaso, MOE/REO Officials, Head teachers, Teachers, CEC/IDP committee on the project.*

**(E). EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

The evaluation will be guided by the following ethical rules/considerations;

- Openness – of information given , to the highest possible degree to all involved parties
- Publicity/public access- to the results when there are not special considerations against this
- Broad participation- the interest parties should be involved when relevant/possible
- Reliability and independence - the evaluation should be conducted so that findings and conclusions are correct and trustworthy.
- Triangulation of primary data

**(F). SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE COVERED;**

The Evaluation team will be guided to carry out their tasks by applying the following criteria based on the OECD/DAC and defined in the NRC Evaluation Policy. The question under each criterion is meant to guide the evaluation team in focusing on key issues for NRC.

**Relevance/appropriateness:** The main focus will be on the appropriateness of the project’s concept and design to the overall situation of Puntland Education System. In particular:

- Extent to which the stated objectives correctly address the problems and real needs of the target groups (transiting school children, school heads/teachers, parents, CECs).
- Relevance of project design within the framework of Ministry of Education program and policy guidelines.

**Efficiency:** The main focus will be on how well the project activities transferred the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality, and timeliness through sustainable and participatory processes. In particular:

- Whether similar results could have been achieved more or by other means at lower cost in the same time.
- Whether project activities were done right i.e. on time, in expected quantity and quality, and through participatory processes.
- General implementation and management of the project in terms of quantity, quality, and timeliness of inputs and activities, adherence to work-plans, action-plans, logical framework, and budgets.
- Adequacy of management arrangements as well as monitoring and evaluation
- The degree to which the project has encouraged full involvement of all the stakeholders (MOE/REO, Parents, CECs, Children, schools etc )
- Responsiveness of project management to changes in the environment in which the project operates

**Effectiveness:** The main focus will be on extent to which the project achieved its stated results and purpose in a sustainable way. In particular;

- The progress made in achieving the results of the project at all levels. The project Logical Framework will be used as the basis for analysis and assessment.
- Efforts made in capacity building of the MOE, REOs, schools head teachers , teachers’ and Community Education Committees for schools and whether the strategies are working or not working and why?

- Project's management of risks taking into views the stated risks and assumptions.

**Coordination:**

- The degree to which the project has encouraged full involvement of all the stakeholders (MOE/REO, Parents, CECs, Children, schools etc )
- The degree to which the project has involved other actors in the regions, how it has been involving partners as UNICEF among others.
- The degree has also involved other projects within NRC and other departments.

**Impact:** The main focus will be on whether the project has contributed to the overall objective, specific changes that the project has brought about in the lives of target groups (teachers, children, etc), and impacts realized or likely to be realized in relation to cross cutting issues such as gender, environment and child protection. In particular;

- Achievements of the project against the original results (outcomes), outputs, and activities specified in the project log frame.
- Level of awareness of the stakeholders, particularly the MOE, schools, parents, and children.
- Level of ownership of the project by the MOE, School community and their commitment to support the project after the expiry of the project period.
- Extent to which the project has impacted on teaching and learning.

**Sustainability:** The main focus will be on whether the outcomes and changes brought about by the project are likely to continue after the end of the project and whether they can be sustained at the sector level, in particular;

- Level of which the MOE/local Education authorities/school management own the project objectives and results
- Policy support available to the project from the MOE and governments Puntland
- Institutional capacity of the MOE and its local structures to continue the project activities after the end of the project, including good will and financial and technical capacities.

**Cross cutting issues:**

- **Gender :** How has the Voucher Project adapted a gender sensitive approach
- **Protection:** How has the Voucher project ensured that protection concerns are put

**(G). Evaluation team**

The Evaluation team will be composed of a lead consultant/or consultancy firm and a local/national consultant who understands the local context of Puntland, Somalia. The team leader (lead consultant) will lead the work of the team and will be responsible for completing the report. The team leader should have skill and proven background in humanitarian assistance, Postgraduate qualification (Masters or above) in Education or in a discipline relevant to this assignment with a minimum of 10 years experience. The National team member should also have at least a degree in education/or social science with proven experience of similar works.

**(H). Steering committee**

The steering committee will be composed of NRC Education project Manager based in the field, NRC Area Manager, NRC Education Manager in the country Office (Nairobi) and the NRC monitoring and evaluation Officer. The NRC Education Project Manager in the field is the main responsible person and will be coordinating the whole process.

The main function of the steering committee will be to select the evaluators, review preliminary findings/recommendations and establishing dissemination and a utilization strategy. The main function of the project manager based in Bossaso will be, preparing of the terms of reference (in close collaboration with the stakeholder and members of the steering committee), administration and overall coordination including monitoring progress.

#### **(I). Timeframe and budget considerations**

The whole process of the evaluation will have a time frame of 24 working days starting from 21<sup>st</sup> July 2011 and ending on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2011. The evaluation team is scheduled to start its work in Nairobi (NRC country Office) in 22<sup>nd</sup> July then will travel to Bossaso on 23<sup>rd</sup> afterward conduct field visits during the period of 27<sup>th</sup> July 2011 to 3<sup>th</sup> August 2011. The remainder of the days will be used to provide both preliminary findings and final report. Note that working days in Somalia is from Saturday to Thursday.

The stipulated budget frame is 7200 USD **excluding** air travel to the field, transport cost to sites and the cost of the national/local consultant.

#### **(J). Reporting**

At the end of the schools visits in Bosaso the evaluation team will hold a workshop with NRC management team, main stakeholders and other relevant staff of the NRC office Identified by the steering committee to discuss the preliminary findings of the evaluation exercise. **A draft report should be submitted not later 8<sup>th</sup> August 2011. The completion date for the final evaluation report will be, on 13<sup>rd</sup> August 2011, the consultant having addressed NRC's comments as appropriate. Difference of opinion between the team members regarding the conclusions/recommendations will reflected in the report.**

The evaluation report should consist of:

- Executive summary and recommendations
- Main text, to include index, emergency context, NRC mandate, evaluation methodology, commentary and analysis addressing evaluation purpose and outputs to include a section dedicated to the issue of particular lessons-learning focus, conclusions.
- Appendices, to include evaluation terms of reference , maps , sample framework and bibliography

All Materials collected in the undertaking of the evaluation process should be lodged with the NRC Area Manager prior to the termination of the contract.

#### **(K). Follow up**

The final report will make the basis for a management response and an action plan to follow up recommendations provided by the evaluation team.

For the follow up of the Evaluation the Education Project Manager is the main responsible involving the Area Manager & the program development unit where deemed relevant. The Management response, responding to the recommendations, including an action should be prepared by the project Manager not later than 2 months after receiving the final report.

It is the responsibility of the project Manager to ensure that the realizations of these plans are monitored and documented. The Area Manager will share the Evaluation report with the country head office in Nairobi, who will share with Head quarters in Oslo and be available for all NRC staff via NRC's intranet pages and on the NRC inter-net.