



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN EVALUATION REPORT OF USAID'S SUPPORTED PROGRAMS:

- **CREATING DEMOCRATIC SCHOOLS PROGRAM**
BY CHILDREN'S RESOURCE INTERNATIONAL / PACT
(UNDER LEADER AWARD No. GEG-A-00-01-00005-00)
- **RELEASING CONFIDENCE AND CREATIVITY PROGRAM**
BY AGA KHAN FOUNDATION (GRANT No. 391-G-00-04-01020-00)

December 2007

This program evaluation is made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID.) The contents of this evaluation are the sole responsibility of DevTech Systems, Inc. and its authors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN

EVALUATION REPORT OF USAID'S SUPPORTED PROGRAMS:

- **CREATING DEMOCRATIC SCHOOLS PROGRAM**
BY CHILDREN'S RESOURCE INTERNATIONAL / PACT
(UNDER LEADER AWARD NO. GEG-A-00-01-00005-00)
- **RELEASING CONFIDENCE AND CREATIVITY PROGRAM**
BY AGA KHAN FOUNDATION (GRANT NO. 391-G-00-04-01020-00)

Wendy Rich-Orloff, Team Leader
Jamshed Khan, Teacher Training Specialist
Audrey Juma, Early Childhood Education Specialist

DevTech Systems, Inc.

December 2007

This program evaluation is made possible by the support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID.) The contents of this evaluation are the sole responsibility of DevTech Systems, Inc. and its authors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
BACKGROUND STATEMENT.....	3
PURPOSE.....	3
RELEASING CONFIDENCE AND CREATIVITY PROGRAM (RCC).....	4
CREATING DEMOCRATIC SCHOOLS PROGRAM (CDS)	5
RATIONALE FOR IMPLEMENTING TWO ECD PROGRAMS	6
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	7
PROCESS	7
SITE SELECTION	8
STRENGTHS TO THE EVALUATION PROCESS	9
CHALLENGES TO THE EVALUATION PROCESS	10
OVERALL PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS	13
Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program	13
Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program	16
PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENTS/STRENGTHS	18
Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program	19
Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program	25
PROGRAM MISSING LINKS/CHALLENGES	29
Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program	29
Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program	33
Challenges Faced by Both Programs	39

COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAMS	40
Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program	40
Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program	41
CONTRIBUTION TO GOP’S ECE PROGRAM	43
Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program	45
Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program	45
RECOMMENDATIONS	47
Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program	47
Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program	48
Recommendations for Both Programs	49
GoP’s ECE Program – Future Implications.....	50
CONCLUSION.....	53
APPENDICES	54
APPENDIX A: USAID DEBRIEFING POWERPOINT PRESENTATION	54
APPENDIX B: LIST OF CONTACTS	58
APPENDIX C: LIST OF SITES VISITED	61
APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	62
APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION TOOL.....	71
APPENDIX F: LIST OF DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED.....	84

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the following people for their assistance during this evaluation:

- *To those in all levels of government within the Federal Ministry of Education, as well as Provincial, District, and local officials, who took time out of their busy schedules to meet with us, and welcomed us into the schools we visited.*
- *USAID, specifically Dr. Randy Hatfield, Mr. Muhammad Tariq Khan, and Ms. Aabira Sherafgan, for their feedback on drafts of this report.*
- *DevTech Systems, Inc., specifically Mr. Brian Bean and Mr. Nicholas Griffin for their ongoing overall support, and Ms. Daniela Wiener, for her editing support.*
- *IMGC Global (Pvt) Limited, specifically Mr. Abdul Samad Sethi, for all his logistical support, and our drivers.*
- *Aga Khan Foundation, specifically Mr. Arif Amin and Ms. Amatuz Zahra Rizvi, who provided a multitude of materials and made themselves available to answer all questions, and Ms. Amber Junaid for her assistance in obtaining materials and contacting people.*
- *Children's Resources International, Pakistan (Guarantee) Ltd., specifically Ms. Mehnaz Aziz, Mr. Muhammad Zubair, and all the training staff, who provided a multitude of materials, made themselves available to answer any and all questions, and allowed us into their classrooms.*
- *Those in the RCC partnership organizations, specifically, staff with Sindh Education Foundation, Teachers' Resource Center, Aga Khan University-Human Development Program, Aga Khan Education Services-Pakistan, Health and Nutrition Development Society, and the Society for Community Support for Primary Education in Baluchistan, for taking time to meet with us, share with us their resources, answer our questions, and allow us into their classroom programs.*
- *The teachers, parents, community members, and children we spoke with along the way.*

For a complete list of those the authors met and would like to acknowledge, see Appendix B.

We would also like to thank our respective families, who allowed us to dedicate over five weeks to this project, away from home.

On a personal note, I would like to especially thank Brian and Nick at DevTech for their assistance and support while I was in-country. In addition, thank you to Mr. Jamshed Khan and Ms. Audrey Juma, without whom this project – and report – would not have been successfully accomplished; thank you for becoming my friends. To those that welcomed me to Pakistan, thank you; I was amazed by the beauty of your country, heartened by your openness, excited by your commitment to early childhood, and the future of education and Pakistan as a whole, and humbled by your resilience in the face of adversity.

And finally, thank you to my husband, David Orloff, and family, whose support and love made this possible.

Wendy Rich-Orloff, Team Leader

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ADO	Assistant District Officer
AEO	Assistant Education Officer
AKES,P	Aga Khan Education Services, Pakistan
AKF	Aga Khan Foundation
AKU-HDP	Aga Khan University-Human Development Program
CDS	Creating Democratic Schools
CRI	Children's Resource International
DOE	District Officer Elementary
ECE	Early Childhood Education
ECD	Early Childhood Development
EDO - Education	Executive District Officer, Education
GoP	Government of Pakistan
HANDS	Health and Nutrition Development Society
LRC	Learning Resource Center
LHV	Lady Health Visitor
LHW	Lady Health Worker
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
PC1	Planning Commission Form 1
PTSMC	Parent Teacher School Management Committees
PITE	Provincial Institute of Teacher Education
RCC	Releasing Confidence and Creativity
SCSPEB/SOCIETY	Society for Community Support for Primary Education in Baluchistan
SEF	Sindh Education Foundation
SMC	School Management Committee
TRC	Teachers' Resource Center
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VEC	Village Education Committee
WVEC	Women's Village Education Committee

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The two programs requested by USAID/Pakistan to be evaluated were Aga Khan Foundation's (AKF) **Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC)** Program, which works in the rural areas of Sindh and Baluchistan provinces, and Children's Resources International's (CRI) **Creating Democratic Schools (CDS)** Program, which works in the urban areas of Islamabad, Rawalpindi, and Karachi. The evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of both programs in regards to cost as well as to stated program goals and objectives.

The evaluation process included classroom and school observations, document reviews and analysis, and in-depth and focus group interviews with children, teachers, parents, community members, program implementing staff, government officials at all levels, and other organizations working in the field of early childhood in Pakistan.

Achievements for the RCC program included such benefits as: strong classroom environments, which enhanced children's learning; enhanced community and parent involvement; technical competencies of partners and teachers either developed or enhanced; regular supervision and monitoring provided; extensive teacher training, which was successfully translated into classroom practice; dissemination of early childhood development information and resources; and increased attendance and retention rates. However, major findings for the RCC program included: the "separate classroom, separate teacher" concept created a disconnect with the government system; community teachers were not recognized by the government system, as had been hoped by RCC; advocacy with the government at the provincial and federal levels were not as successful as hoped by the program; important research which could have been used as an advocacy tool was not completed; partner coordination proved to be a challenge; and the program had a weak system in place to facilitate the program continuation when support was withdrawn, due to issues like frequent transfers and a lack of understanding/commitment to their early childhood concept.

Achievements for the CDS program included such benefits as: strong relationship and advocacy with government at all levels, as well as with other organizations; use of existing infrastructure of government schools; robust Family Literacy and Parent Involvement components, especially in Islamabad and Rawalpindi; increased attendance and retention rates; and provision of materials for classrooms. However, major findings for the CDS program included: a missing link between the training teachers received and the implementation of the methodology in the classrooms on a consistent basis; weak technical assistance weak in terms of monitoring teachers' practice; and weak parent involvement, a large component of the program, in Karachi-based schools.

Both RCC and CDS programs focused only on certain classrooms/sections in targeted schools for ECE interventions. This limitation has created disparities among classrooms and schools. In addition, both of the programs faced challenges regarding hygiene and sanitary practices in schools; CDS did not focus on these issues at all, and while RCC advocated sanitation and hygiene as part of their overall development aspect of the program, it did not necessarily translate into school practice.

The findings regarding the cost-benefit analysis of each program revealed that both programs were effective in their use of funds regarding the services they provided.

Both programs contributed to the Government of Pakistan's (GoP) commitment to early childhood education. However, while CDS was successful in creating strong links with the government at all levels, RCC's attempts at relationship building at the provincial and federal levels of government were met with many challenges.

Both programs had successful components that supported children and families, and provide the GoP with models that can be replicated in both rural and urban settings in Pakistan. However, this will be dependent on the GoP not only supporting implementation financially, but also prioritizing early childhood as a way to enhance the family unit and provide a strong foundation for children's success in their schooling.

the GoP educational system at this time. While the GoP had on paper that *katchi*¹ classes would be reintroduced, due to lack of resources implementation was slow.²

USAID/Pakistan provided support to two programs, **Releasing Confidence and Creativity** (RCC) by Aga Khan Foundation, and **Creating Democratic Schools** (CDS) by Children's Resources International, to develop and support early childhood education programs.

RELEASING CONFIDENCE AND CREATIVITY PROGRAM (RCC)

Aga Khan Foundation's RCC Program (Grant No. 391-G-00-04-01020-00) was approved September 2001 and began implementation in November 2002 after delays due to the events of September 11, 2001 and the opening of the USAID/Pakistan Mission.

The overall goal of RCC was to "improve the quality of learning and teaching during the early years in select government primary schools and their surrounding communities in Pakistan" and focused on the following major objectives:

1. Encourage community and parental involvement in ECD efforts inside and outside of the classroom;
2. Develop technical competencies for ECD in teachers, school officials, and NGOs in RCC communities;
3. Facilitate a network of concerned parties and encourage coordination, advocacy, resource mobilization, and sharing of best practices;
4. Conduct research on the cost-benefit of early childhood interventions and effective practices from RCC schools, and disseminate to audiences in Pakistan and elsewhere; and
5. Address cross-cutting issues in ECD delivery, including attention to vulnerable populations, ability to replicate as well as adaptability in different contexts, institutional development, leadership development, and government ownership in program interventions.³

RCC partnered with six local non-governmental agencies (NGOs) in the provinces of Sindh and Baluchistan in order to develop and implement early childhood methodologies in over 100 girls' schools. RCC has been implemented in three different phases; Phase I covered the periods of implementation in 2002 to May 2004; Phase II covered May 2004 – May 2006; and Phase III began in May 2006 and continues to date, under different funding. While this evaluation focuses on Phases I and II specifically, Phase III was included in the evaluation in order to discuss adaptations made to the program as well as sustainability.

RCC's partner approach was said to be unique in Pakistan, and utilized both technical and implementing partners. The following chart summarizes the participating partners, geographical areas served, and their specific focus.

¹ The literal translation for *katchi* means a program for preschool aged children, commonly defined as ages 3-5.

² National Plan of Action on Education for All, Draft, August 2001.

³ RCC Detailed Implementation Plan, May 2004.

Technical Partners		
Responsible for providing training and technical assistance to the implementing partners.		
Name	Geographical Areas Served	Focus
SEF	Sindh Province; technical support at the national level	Research, publications, advocacy
TRC	National	Teacher training on implementing the National Curriculum for ECE; capacity building with implementing partners to train and monitor teachers. Continue to work with MOE for curriculum workshops and capacity building.
AKU-HDP	National	Research and monitoring with data analysis; teacher training; community mobilization; development of assessment tools in health, hygiene, sanitation, and child development.

Implementing Partners		
Responsible for implementation at the school and community level; includes teacher training, community mobilization, working with School Management Committees, and creating awareness and fostering program ownership within the community.		
Name	Geographical Areas Served	Focus
HANDS	Sindh Province	Health, nutrition, sanitation education
AKES,P	Sindh Province	School improvement (quality), access to education in remote areas, female focus.
SOCIETY	Baluchistan	Education, community mobilization

RCC supported activities in schools that aimed to develop teacher capacity and improve administration by teaching a broad understanding of ECD concepts and the use of appropriate teaching techniques within individual classrooms, school communities, local government structures, and their implementing partners. Implementing partners worked in government schools while advocating for a designated classroom and teacher; RCC worked in partnership with communities to either build a *katchi* classroom or provide facility repair if needed for an existing classroom, and trained a community-based teacher to work in the *katchi* classroom.

CREATING DEMOCRATIC SCHOOLS PROGRAM (CDS)

Creative Resources International's CDS Program (Under Leader Award No. GEG-A-00-01-00005-00) was implemented through a sub-grant from PACT and began in February 2002. The program worked in approximately 120 government schools in Islamabad, Rawalpindi, and Karachi, trained over 1,100 teachers and administrators, and worked with approximately 20,000 children. The goals of the program focused on the following:

1. Increased use of child-centered methods in the education of preschool and primary school children.
2. Increased participation of families in pre- and primary school activities.

3. Increased attendance and retention rates of pre- and primary school children.
4. Increased literacy among parents of pre- and primary school children.
5. Increased quality of preparation for teachers-in-training.⁴

CDS focused services and training and technical assistance around the following areas: family and community involvement; individualized teaching and learning; equal opportunities and access to education; and the development of critical thinking skills. In addition, other activities included the introduction of early childhood education courses at the university level. CDS' goal of improving the quality of education through teacher training addressed the Government of Pakistan's Education Sector Reforms (approved May 2001) objectives of quality improvement, sector-wide reform, and resource mobilization.⁵

CDS implemented all programs directly within government schools, utilizing existing classroom space and government teachers.

RATIONALE FOR IMPLEMENTING TWO ECD PROGRAMS

The GoP's Education for All - National Plan of Action 2000-2015, which describes actions for attainment of the GoP's stated commitment to the Education for All priority, devoted a complete chapter on ECE. However, implementation of ECE was slow as no separate funding was allocated for early childhood classrooms. With a total population of 18.6 million of under- five-year-old children⁶ in the ECE category, the GoP had a Herculean task ahead of it in providing education to children within this category.⁷ There was no model available with the government that could be used to institute early childhood in the country. USAID's decision to fund two different programs in early childhood proved beneficial and provided the GoP two examples of how early childhood could be implemented.

The two programs' unique approaches to early childhood were an experiment in what could work in Pakistan. Both programs began implementation in very different geographical areas. CDS' intervention was in the urban and semi-urban areas of Islamabad, Rawalpindi, and Karachi, which they chose for ease in implementation and monitoring; whereas RCC's focus areas were in the rural areas of Sindh and Baluchistan, in underserved girls' schools. This in itself, helped determine what could be successful in urban and rural settings of Pakistan, thus creating models of early childhood education and development that could be tested for effectiveness and sustainability.

While the two programs advocated similar philosophical orientations of focusing on the child's needs and ensuring active learning through the provision of materials, the methodologies differed

⁴ While the initial CRI Program Description states objective #4 as "increased access to education among pre- and primary school boys and girls, and objective #5 as "increased literacy among parents..."; the CRI Quarterly Program Report Jan-March 2006 and Final Program Report has moved the objective on increased parent literacy to #4, and changed objective #5 to state "increased quality of preparation for teachers-in-training".

⁵ CRI Final Report.

⁶ This information is according to the Census report of 1998.

⁷ The Federal Bureau of Statistics survey, 2005, reports 6.6 million children of pre-primary age in all public and private schools.

in their implementation. CDS' focus was on early childhood education with a strong emphasis on parental involvement and a family literacy program. RCC's program concentrated on education and community involvement, as well as on development (health, nutrition, sanitation, and hygiene) aspects. The two programs demonstrate the need to include significant others in children's lives, shifting the focus from the child in isolation in the classroom to the child as a whole, as part of a community.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

PROCESS

In 2007, USAID/Pakistan contracted DevTech Systems, Inc. (DevTech), to evaluate the RCC and CDS programs, and to determine their effectiveness in regards to cost as well as to stated program goals and objectives. The key strategic and priority questions tasked to the evaluation team to consider included:

1. Did the ECD programs complete the activities in the original and cooperative agreement and in the annual work plans?
2. What, if any, is the value-added of having two different models in early childhood development?
3. Was one approach more effective than the other? If so, what evidence is there for this and what made it more effective?
4. Was one approach more cost-effective than the other?
5. Did the programs have an impact on learning outcomes and teaching methods in the areas in which they operated?
6. Did this program contribute to the GoP's ECD program? How and are those contributions likely to have an impact even after the program's end?

The process used for this evaluation included:

- Document reviews: an extensive review of both briefing materials and documents provided by USAID/Pakistan, AKF, and CRI, as well as the Government of Pakistan's Ministry of Education resources (see Appendix F for complete list of documents reviewed).
- Site visits: school classroom observations of both RCC and CDS programs (10% of schools per program, for a total of 31 sites observed), as well as visits to observe non-program *katchi* classes for purposes of comparison.
- Interviews and focus group discussions, including the following:
 - RCC and CDS staff, as well as RCC program partners;
 - Government officials of the Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education; Offices of Provincial Education Departments; and District Offices.
 - Focus group and/or in-depth interviews of parents, community members, PTAs/PTSMC/SMC, VECs/WVECs, Education Councils, teachers, and children in the observed *katchi* classes.
 - Written interview with CRI-Washington staff.

- Interviews with other agencies providing early childhood-related programming in Pakistan.

See Appendix B for a detailed list of people met, Appendix C for a list of schools visited, and Appendix D for the Interview Protocol followed for both interviews and focus groups.

The Evaluation Team decided to use a classroom observation tool completely independent of those used by either program, in order to achieve an unbiased review of classroom functioning. Two tools chosen, “Score Sheet – Expanded Version, Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale-Revised”, and “Score Sheet – Expanded Version, Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised”,⁸ were adapted by combining components of the two as well as adding components that were specific to the Pakistani context, for example, evaluating whether *darris* (mats) were in the classroom, and whether bathrooms had *ayahs* (attendants). While using these tools for field work observations, it was deemed that some questions were not relevant and/or not valid (for example, meal time/snack was not practiced,⁹ lack of facilities/resources impacted sanitary conditions) and adjustments were made as noted in the comments section of the tool. Please see Appendix E for the Classroom Observation Tool used.

SITE SELECTION

In total, 275 schools were supported under the RCC and CDS programs. Of these, 10% of schools – 27 in total – were deemed to be the targeted observation rate. Each program provided a list containing participating districts and schools. Districts to be included in the sample for observation were determined based on the following criteria:

- Geography – areas were selected based on accessibility for the evaluation team to reach from Karachi, Quetta, Islamabad, and Hyderabad. Maximum travel time allowed between location of lodging and district was three hours travel by car, each way.
- Safety – Regions that were safe for the team to travel were chosen, in consultation with USAID/Pakistan, US Embassy and Consulate Staff, and IMGC Global, LLC, which was providing the evaluation team with logistics support.

The need to use safety and geographical criteria in determining site selection introduced potential evaluation bias, since a true random sample was not available, and certain whole districts were perforce neglected. In order to minimize bias, the evaluation team identified those districts that met the criteria that could also provide a similar representation of those districts not included (for example, a representation of rural vs. urban schools, as well as sites in both Sindh and Baluchistan, were included).

⁸ Both tools are by Thelma Harms, Debby Cryer, and Richard M. Clifford with the University of North Carolina, USA, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute (1998).

⁹ In many schools in Pakistan, children go out for break and snack unsupervised and may not be eating together in the classroom, or they may go home (especially in the rural areas). However, the National Curriculum advocates for snack/meal time together in the classroom so as to provide additional learning opportunities.

Within each identified district, every tenth school in the list was randomly chosen for a visit. As requested by USAID/Pakistan, all site visits were conducted unannounced. Provincial/district government officials were contacted for interviews, at which time permission was requested (per Pakistani protocol) to visit all schools within the district. Because of time constraints, the closure of schools due to events, closure of classrooms for repair work, and/or various security concerns, some sites selected in the random sampling were substituted by others within the districts visited. However, schools supported by different implementing partners were given appropriate representation.

The below chart summarizes the distribution of schools in relation to implementing program/partner, geographical area, and sample number selected:

	Geographical Area/District	Number of schools Supported	Sample	Actual covered
CRI				
	Islamabad	39	3	2
	Rawalpindi	39	4	6
	Karachi	40	4	5
Sub-total for CRI		118	11	13
AKF				
Sindh (total = 77)				
AKES,P	Sindh	27 (total)	3	7
	Hyderabad	10	2	3
	Tando Muhammad Khan	7	1	3
	Khairpur	10	2	-
HANDS	Matiari, Sindh	50 (total)	5	4
Baluchistan (Total = 80)				
Society	Baluchistan	80 (total)	8	8
	Pishin	18	2	2
	Ziarat	7	1	3
	Lasbela	11	2	3
	Mastung	9	-	-
	Nushki	16	2	-
	Lorali	9	1	-
	Killa Abdullah	5	-	-
Sub-total for AKF		157	16	18
Total		275	27	31

For a complete list of schools visited, please refer to Appendix C, “List of Sites Visited”.

STRENGTHS TO THE EVALUATION PROCESS

During the field work, it was noted that local government education officers were very helpful and supportive of our task, and staff was available to meet with the team early in the mornings

for school visits. School heads called parents and community members in for focus groups with little/no advanced notice, and parents and community members were very responsive to coming in and speaking with the team.

CHALLENGES TO THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation team met with a variety of challenges during the entire evaluation process. Challenges included:

- **Political Challenges:** political situations affected the team's ability to move around freely as well as the sites that could be visited, impacted who was available for interviews (while USAID/Pakistan requested the team to meet with certain Ministry of Education officials, most were unavailable), and generally made the evaluation assignment more difficult. Political protocol also could have potentially impacted observation results. Specific challenges included:
 - The political situation became precarious due to an announced State of Emergency on November 3rd. The American Team Leader was requested to stay in the hotel for the first few days of the Emergency, which caused the Team Leader to miss all CDS observations in Karachi, and RCC observations in Lasbella, Baluchistan. The Team Leader was also instructed by the US Consulate not to travel to Baluchistan province at all, thereby missing all observations of RCC schools in Pishin and Ziarat, as well as meetings with RCC partners based in Quetta (SOCIETY) and Baluchistan provincial government education staff.
 - Prior to the State of Emergency, instability and safety concerns already impacted site selection in the province of Baluchistan: the districts of Loralai, Killa Abdullah, and Mastung were ruled out in the beginning of the site selection process due to safety issues, and the original site selection of Noshki was cancelled.
 - Following protocol, the team was required to seek permission from EDOs and DOEs to visit government schools; this had the potential of impacting the unannounced nature of observations. While the team followed protocol and sought permission to visit specific regions, the team did not announce the name of the specific schools to be visited until the morning of the school visit.
 - Due to the State of Emergency, the US Consulate contacted Hyderabad officials to alert them to our presence and travel schedule; in response, the evaluation team was provided full police escort during travels to meetings and schools. This drew more attention than usual, especially in the rural areas. In addition, 10 different government/military agencies contacted the guest house where the team was staying in Hyderabad to determine the identity of team members and work being conducted. While this did not have a direct impact on the evaluation project, it did impact the communities visited.

- Another major challenge, and one that will be discussed further later in this report, was the number of staff and government transfers; in some cases the team met with people who had been in their posts for only a few months, and in one case (the Sindh Secretary of Education) just a week. Therefore, some interviews were mere introductions to the programs themselves for those being interviewed.
- Logistical Challenges: while the team approached the evaluation with careful planning, there were still logistical issues that were either unintentional or unavoidable. These challenges included:
 - Schools were not observed for the entire school day (arrival to dismissal) due to travel times, which ranged from 1-3 hours, as well as the necessity of meeting with district officials and/or waiting for ADOs to meet the team in order to provide escorts to the schools.
 - Community members/parents were contacted and invited by the schools themselves to participate in the focus groups, which could impart bias depending on who the school contacted.
 - Not all questions on the Interview Protocol were asked, for a variety of reasons, including: some questions were deemed not practical, because the person was too new in their position; some questions could not be asked on a one-on-one basis, due to the presence of other people in the room (and their status).
 - Language was at times a challenge, not only for the American team member, but for the local Pakistanis as well. For example, one mother understood Urdu but spoke Punjabi, while the team member understood Punjabi but spoke Urdu. Therefore, questions were asked in one language and answered in another. In the Sind Interior, parents and children spoke only Sindhi while in Baluchistan, Baluchi and Pushto were spoken. In such situations, either a teacher or the evaluation team's logistics person acted as interpreter (possibly impacting interview results).
 - Due to the last-minute cancellation of the PIA (Pakistan International Airlines) flight from Islamabad to Quetta at the start of field work, the team decided, while stranded at the airport, to travel to Karachi. Once there, the field work schedule was completely re-organized; some meetings originally scheduled in Quetta were affected when rescheduled.¹⁰ In addition, due to the change in schedule, schools in Ziarat and Pishin were visited on a Friday, a short school day, which impacted the length of time available for observation as well as the activities observed.
 - Logistics in Quetta proved to be a challenge; transportation was inconsistent, impacting a scheduled meeting.

¹⁰ The team met with the Additional Secretary, Administration as both the Secretary Education and Additional Secretary Education were unable to meet with the team due to various reasons.

- While it was requested by USAID that a representative of UNESCO be interviewed to assess the overall contribution of both programs to ECE in Pakistan, staff were unavailable to meet due to travel and vacation schedules.
 - While the team was able to meet with a representative of UNICEF in Islamabad, the team attempted to meet, conduct phone interviews, and provided emails to UNICEF field staff, which all went unanswered.
 - Requests were made to both RCC and CDS programs for quantitative data according to specific formats (such as enrollment and drop-out rates per section; budget line items per component) in order to do a more in-depth analysis; however, information was either insufficient or unavailable.
- Field Work Challenges: challenges arose related to site visits, including school location, school schedules, and staff behaviors. For example:
 - The first school observed was visited completely unannounced; however, due to difficulty in locating the schools, it was decided that ADOs or AEOs would accompany the team to future sites to help locate schools. For example, schools were often located down alleys and small streets, which only locals to the area would know. The challenge of having district staff accompany the team, however, arose when staff insisted the team visit other schools as well; for example one district insisted the team visit a government school instead of the private school selected to visit (the team visited both); in another district, a team member was taken to visit a total of four schools (all four were observed, but only the school originally selected was included in the sample).
 - Challenges arose when visiting individual schools unannounced; one school was having a special day so classes were not in session; in one school, the *katchi* teacher was absent so the class was merged with Grade 7; in one private school the methodology of the program had been dropped, so only interviews with school officials were conducted. In Lasbella, one school was substituted due to a funeral. However, these challenges provided the evaluation team with the ability to observe the “reality” that programs and schools are working with, and provided for realistic evaluation outcomes. In addition, during some observations, the evaluation team felt that teachers were “staging” what they thought the team wanted to see, rather than what they might have planned. For example, after one activity it was clear children went to their desks for written work, because most of the children brought their exercise books out as two girls rolled up the mat to store away; but the teacher yelled at the children to put the mat back, and told the others to sit back on the mat. Team members had to continuously tell teachers to go about their day as usual. These “staged” observations, as well as teachers’ ability to adapt, impacted evaluation results. Overall, the evaluation process was completed on time and met all methodology components.

OVERALL PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

When discussing the overall effectiveness of programs, the evaluation team first looked at the original stated goals and objectives, compared them to the USAID interests, and subsequently determined overall results.

Both programs were in direct alignment with USAID’s SO 3 objective, to “*increase knowledge, training, and infrastructure to develop high quality education programs for girls and boys throughout Pakistan*”, as well as the Government of Pakistan’s stated interest in reintroducing early childhood into the educational system. While each program used a different approach, both programs strived to work within the larger Pakistani culture and in partnership with the communities where they worked.

Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program

The overall stated goal of the RCC program was to “improve the quality of learning and teaching during the early years in selected government primary schools and their surrounding communities in Pakistan.” The core to RCC’s approach was to provide a dedicated classroom and teacher for *katchi* using a community-based approach, and to train the teacher in ECD-appropriate methodology; this approach addressed the needs of communities in the rural areas of Sindh and Baluchistan in which they functioned, which were often lacking the facilities as well as staff to address the needs of a *katchi* class. In addition, the concept of “ECD vs. ECE” was highlighted in every partner-related interview. This approach was described as a focus on ECD, *Early Childhood Development*, including health, hygiene, sanitation, nutrition, and parental care and involvement, as compared to ECE, *Early Childhood Education*, which focuses on the child’s education only. It was summarized as “D comes before E”, and AKF’s RCC program encompasses this holistic view of the child and family.

The following tables are adapted from AKF’s Final Report to USAID for their RCC Program.

Objective 1: *Encourage community and parental involvement inside and outside the classroom.*

Activity	Means of verification	Source of reporting	Responsible organization	Baseline	Targets and achievements
Parents and community visits to schools	Observation, interviews and school record, visitors’ books	RCC Phase II final report, Dec. 31, 2006	AKES, P HANDS, Society	5	Monthly visits of parents and community. More than the expected visits.
SMC Meetings	Frequency of SMCs meetings	Minutes of the meetings		Irregular	Regular meetings at least once a month
Increased percent of children entering Grade 1	Class 1 enrollment, Child assessment forms			40	More than 80% increase overall

Community and parents are actively involved in school activities right from the onset of the program with the construction or renovation of rooms for the *katchi* class. Their visits are regularized due to frequent meetings for construction work and as a result, increasing ownership of the program components. In some schools where there was a delay for a few months from the project in the payment of salaries for the RCC community teachers, the community helped by making loans to the teachers (interviews).

Objective 2: *Develop technical competencies for ECD in teachers, school officials and NGOs in RCC communities.*

Activity	Means of verification	Source of reporting	Responsible organizations	Baseline	Targets and achievements
Use of active learning techniques	Also recorded through observation tools by the evaluation team	RCC final report and evaluation team observation	AKES, P HANDS, Society	70	90 (Average of AKES, HANDS, Society)
Courses offered	Course contents	Final report and course contents seen by evaluation team		20	Above 92%

Many training courses are conducted for teachers at Class *katchi*, 1 and 2 levels, and also for heads of schools. A heterogeneous group of trainees, including DOEs, ADOs, heads of high schools, head teachers and the other teachers of primary schools with different educational backgrounds, are invited to the same courses. The level of participation and contribution of participants in such cases, however, might be affected.¹¹

Objective 3: *Facilitate a network of concerned parties in which policy dialogue and coordination, advocacy, resource mobilization and sharing of best practices can occur.*

Activity	Means of verification	Sources of reporting	Responsible organizations	Baseline	Targets and achievements
Increase in new govt. sponsored efforts in target provinces	Govt. of Sindh and Baluchistan support the activities carried out by RCC	RCC final report, Evaluation team meetings with the govt.	All partners	-	The support initiated from the grass root level has been incorporated at the national level policy
Subscription for ECD websites and magazines	Subscription list	RCC final report	Partners with a major role of SEF	100	Subscribers: Nurture - 1569 Parwarish - 448

At the district government level there was a commitment of not transferring the trained teachers of Class 1 and 2 to other schools where RCC classes did not exist, but still some political

¹¹ In a teacher interview, it was noted that her training contained all the above said participants, and some teachers felt inhibited in sharing and participating.

interference affected the system. At the provincial and federal level there is a little or no awareness of the RCC program. An important forum for raising the awareness of this group of stakeholders is through continued invitations to seminars and conferences.

Objective 4: *Conduct research on the cost benefit of early childhood interventions and effective practices from RCC schools and disseminate to audience in Pakistan*

Activity	Means of verification	Sources of information	Responsible organizations	Baseline	Targets and achievements
Information availability for researchers, evaluators and planners	Number of information users	RCC final report and evaluation team interviews	SEF major role and all other partners	-	Variety of research data processed.
Increased number of users of the information	Record of requests for information			-	No report prepared

The cost-benefit analysis of the project components has not been done. It would have been a very useful document for the researchers, planners, decision makers and managers involved in early childhood in Pakistan. While the data by implementing partners has been collected by SEF, the analysis and report writing has not yet been completed; the delay in producing such reports will reduce its usefulness with the passage of time.

Objective 5: *Address cross cutting issues in ECD delivery, including attention to vulnerable populations, replicability, adaptability, institutional development, leadership development and government ownership in program interventions*

Activity	Means of verification	Sources of information	Responsible organizations	Baseline	Targets and achievements
Decrease in dropout rate for girls between <i>Katchi</i> and Class 2	EMIS data, RCC schools data, interviews with teachers, communities and supervisors	RCC final report and evaluation team interviews	All partners	40 % dropout	A decrease to 20% dropout was the initial target but the actual achievement is above 95% as seen and reported by teachers and community during interviews
Demand from the other community for inclusion of their areas in under RCC coverage	Interviews with community and teachers	RCC report final and evaluation teams interviews with teachers and community		Initially 102 schools were included in the scope of RCC in Phase I	Scope of coverage increased to 157 in Phase II. Increased benefits received by children, performance and change in the children interest and behavior observed

The government does not seem to take ownership of the program at the provincial and federal levels, however, at the district and community levels it is more effective. In some schools where

the project was withdrawn, the classroom teaching-learning processes were reverting to the traditional system of rote drill instruction (teaching through the use of lecturing and memorization only, with little or no teacher-child interaction or use of materials as teaching aids). The contribution of the program in developing leadership, skill and confidence in teachers of rural areas is a great achievement. These qualities have been immeasurable for children of the RCC classes.

Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program

The overall goal of CDS was to “engender democratic ideals and principles within young children, their families, teachers, school administrators, and faculty who train teachers.” Teaching methods used were to encourage children to make choices, take responsibility for their decisions, express their ideas with creativity, respect differing styles and abilities of their classmates, and develop critical and independent thinking skills.¹² CDS focused services and training and technical assistance around the following areas: family and community involvement; individualized teaching and learning; equal opportunities and access to education; and the development of critical thinking skills.

The following tables are adapted from CRI’s Final Programmatic Report to USAID for their CDS Program.

Objective 1: *Increased use of child centered methods in the education of pre-school and primary school children.*

Activity	Clientele	Duration of training	Targets	Achievements
1. Training workshop for teachers	Primary school teachers Principals	35 hours	150 36	1199 190
2. Develop/ translate /adapt materials			50	506
3. Dissemination of translated materials to classrooms			50	411
4. Classroom with active learning materials			100%	100%

The teachers of *katchi* classes and other staff were trained in the use of interactive activities-based techniques of teaching learning methods. While the program was initially started for the *katchi* class teachers, the scope of the program was extended to other classes of the same schools. Training courses were conducted for teachers, materials were provided, and technical assistance provided during the project life. The achievement totals for the development, translation, and/or

¹² “Program Description: Supporting Democratic Reforms to Basic Education in Pakistan”, CRI.

adaptation of materials reflected the total number of titles including all materials for training (for trainers and participants), all materials for the literacy program (for trainers, teachers, and parents), all newsletters and other publications, and other resources. Many resources were provided by CRI-Washington and adapted/translated for use by CRI-Pakistan for their CDS program. The total number of materials disseminated reflected all items disseminated to all classrooms, including child classrooms, parent literacy classrooms, and teacher training, and significantly exceeds the target number.

Objective 2: *Increased participation of families in school activities.*

Activity	Means of verification	Targets	Achievements
Parents help in school	Frequency of visits of parents	At least once a month for all the parents	Occurred as verified from interviews
Family literacy sessions		2,184 hours	6,055 hours
Train family involvement coordinators		91 trained	70 trained

CDS used a similar approach with their adult literacy program as with their classroom approach – using available space, materials, and human resources for implementation. The enthusiasm seen in the group was enormous and they continued coming on their own to the program. Their participation is ensured and absence from the program is minimized through their children’s involvement in the school. It is mainly on account of this program that family members are attracted to schools and involved in school activities. (N.B. In some instances, CDS did not explain discrepancies between targets and achievements, such as in Family Literacy session hours.)

Objective 3: *Increased attendance and retention rates of pre and primary school children.*

Activity	targets	Achievements
Attendance at school	100 %	Around 70% in the observed schools
Retention in the academic year	100 %	Interviews revealed 100 % retention

Because of the teacher training and additional supplies to the classrooms, the classrooms have been made attractive for the children in comparison to non-CDS “typical” government classrooms¹³. Most of the children reported that they are happier in the schools rather than in their homes because of playing facilities inside and outside the classroom. The absenteeism has been reduced and the retention rate and consequently the promotion rate have increased (interviews with head teachers).

Objective 4: *Increased literacy among parents of pre and primary school children.*

Activity	Targets	Achievement
1. Number of parents attended literacy lessons	0	2,300

¹³ Observations of both CDS and non-CDS classrooms.

2. Percent of parents attending	60%	73.5%
3. Number of teachers trained and using skills	40	160

While it is a program of literacy for the family, it in fact has attracted parents and family members to school activities as well. The parents' confidence level has been raised by involving them in the activities (parents and staff interviews).

Objective 5: Increased quality of preparation for teachers-in-training.

Activity	Beneficiaries	Source of reporting	Targets	Achievements
Early childhood faculty training seminar	CRI staff	CRI final program report (Jan-March 2006)	50	71
	Teachers training institutions		8	30

The seminars, though focused for CDS staff, were also attended by staff of teachers' training institutions. At the higher level such seminars for Secretariat staff, Directorate staff and local government staff like EDOs, DOEs, ADOs and others would be helpful as, in some areas, the officers working at these levels were not aware of the activities and interventions of these projects.

PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENTS/STRENGTHS

Both programs demonstrated strong program components and contributed to the area of early childhood in Pakistan, which can be continued and used as models for future programs. The learning environment established as a result of the two programs impacted teaching and learning. Both programs advocated colorful, vibrant classrooms with the use of materials and manipulatives, kept within the reach of children. Learning areas under the RCC program and activity centers under CDS were established to facilitate children's learning. Both programs advocated displaying children's work in the classroom.

With both programs, children were observed to have high levels of confidence, and they moved around the classroom freely, interacting with the teacher, children, and other adults. Children reported that they liked coming to school and parents revealed that children attend regularly, unless unwell. Children seemed engaged with materials when provided by the teacher, and in many cases children were seen going to the areas/shelves to play with materials when allowed.

Both programs devoted considerable time and energy in teacher training activities. Teachers were trained in interactive and child centered methodology and in active learning methodology. The number of days allocated for training varied in both programs. CDS had a five-day initial training package of approximately 35 hours and another, three-to-five day training for follow up, six months later. RCC's partners held initial trainings for 10to14 days and additional trainings on a variety of topics, the duration of which ranged from 7 to 15 days. They also had cluster meetings as follow up on a monthly basis.

Teachers who attended both programs were able to talk about what they had learned as a result of the training. They reported that the trainings had been interactive and practical and had given them insights of how to work effectively in the classroom.

Both programs engaged the community in which they worked and impacted them in positive ways. CDS had a strong adult literacy and parental involvement program, whereas RCC had unprecedented support of the communities where the partners worked.

Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program

In comparison to USAID's stated Intermediate Results that relate directly to their early childhood program, RCC has "improved the capacity of teachers and education administrators"¹⁴ through their training as well as their strong technical assistance and follow-up. In addition, RCC has "improved access to and delivery of education services"¹⁵ through not only their direct involvement in the classrooms, but in their many resources that have been developed for the general public's use on early childhood education.

RCC's program strengths were in the areas of classroom environments, community and parent involvement, technical competencies, regular supervision and monitoring, teacher capacity development, dissemination of early childhood development information, a consortium of partners, and increased retention rates.

RCC proved to have a very strong system of follow-up technical assistance, and monitoring of the program components. The classroom environment was child-friendly, and in line with the National Curriculum's definition of active learning.¹⁶ Teachers appeared to internalize the training they received, not only evident by their planning and implementation in the classroom, but in the materials produced as well as the dedication of some teachers to continue their work with little or no pay. Communities were actively engaged and supportive of the RCC program in a variety of ways.

Classroom Environments

RCC classrooms were encouraged to utilize learning areas, and not only did the program provide a designated *katchi* classroom, they also provided the classroom with rectangle- and circle-shaped tables and child-sized chairs (as opposed to individual desks/benches commonly found in government schools) to facilitate learning areas and group work. Teachers were trained and supported in making materials for use in the classroom, and community members/parents were also engaged in making low-cost, indigenous materials for use in the classroom.

¹⁴ IR 3.2

¹⁵ IR 3.4

¹⁶ National Curriculum, "Learning Environment for ECE", pg. 45-46; and "Guidelines for the Teacher Guide", pg. 53-54.

The chart below provides a summary of indicators used during site observations and how RCC sites compared.

Indicator	RCC: 18 schools total visited	%
Separate room available*	18 (1 = separate classroom being painted) (1 = combined, teacher not present)	100%
Learning Areas/Activity Centers	16 (1 = materials closed for painting)	89%
Provisions/ Materials	15 1 = none due to the classroom painting 2 = not observed using; classroom merged with another grade; materials in cupboards	83%
Children's Displays	15	83%
Parental involvement charts**	N/A	---
Health charts***	7	39%
Teaching and learning materials displayed	17 1 = not displayed; room being painted	94%
Activities observed in class	12 6 = schools only visited, observation record not filled	67%
Washrooms sanitary****	4	22%
Routines advocated during training used	11 6 = schools only visited, complete observation record not witnessed by evaluator.	61%

* RCC provided a designated classroom for *katchi*.

**Parent Involvement Charts were not used by the RCC program.

*** While health charts for children were not observed to be maintained in the classroom, the evaluators could not assume that this was due to implementing partner neglect; health charts might have been housed elsewhere in the school, or maintained by the parents themselves.

**** Discussed in the Challenges section.

Child learning outcomes reported and observed:

- Children stated that they liked coming “to work and to play”; one child said she liked to go to the science area; another liked the creativity area. Children said they liked to play with each other (children’s interviews).
- Monitoring results for Phase I of the RCC program demonstrated an increase in hand-eye coordination, short-term memory, picture



RCC program in Hyderabad District, Sindh Province. Children are sitting on the mat in small groups, working together while using local materials to form alphabet shapes.

comprehension, color identification, and shape recognition, as well as some improvement in sight reading, writing own name, and drawing a person when compared to baseline data.¹⁷ Data monitoring Phase II of the RCC program was not available for review.

Community and Parent Involvement

RCC demonstrated very strong community and parent involvement; which was strongly facilitated by the implementing partners' relationships with the local communities. Within every community in which RCC functioned, the community was expected to provide an in-kind match (whether funds or labor – assistance with the building of a classroom, creating materials for use in the class – what was feasible for the community to afford); this investment helped build a sense of ownership for the community.¹⁸

RCC partner programs worked very closely with their local community councils (such as VECs, WVECs, PTSMCs, and an Education Council in Baluchistan; VECs in Sindh), which supported their local RCC programs in a variety of ways, including: visiting homes of children who were absent; visiting classrooms; taking the RCC message to parents in the community to support and build awareness for ECD in the homes; assisting in generating in-kind support; and monitoring absenteeism. The education council in Lasbella got 450,000 PKR (\$7,377.00 at an exchange rate of 1 US\$ = 61 PKR) this year from district government funds for repairs in 11 schools.¹⁹

Community members are 'demanding' RCC programs in all schools;²⁰ RCC increased from 102 participating schools in Phase I to 157 schools in Phase II.

Community learning outcomes reveal:

- The WVEC functioning in one community had empowered women to take 'the RCC message' to parents and ensure that objectives of the program were achieved. They participated by visiting classrooms and creating materials for the school. They visited homes to reduce absenteeism and increase enrollment, and they sometimes taught in the classroom; volunteer charts were visible in the classroom.
- The Education Council had been formed within each district of Baluchistan. These councils were comprised of a representative from each of the PTSMCs within a certain cluster. They were responsible for strengthening activities of SMCs, and for working at the district administration level to solve issues that



RCC program in Hyderabad District, Sindh Province. As the older children sat in small groups and used local materials to form their letters, this teacher then called the younger children over to the table for a lesson on colors.

¹⁷ "RCC.....Draft Monitoring Report", by Sindh Education Foundation, August 2004.

¹⁸ Based on interviews with AKF staff, parents, and community members.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Interviews with education councils, community members, and district education officers.

arose. They also generated funds from the community and made efforts to install water tanks and make minor school repairs. They visited schools frequently, sometimes alone/unannounced, and checked student/teacher absenteeism. School competitions were organized between RCC schools.

- The communities showed an awareness of what early childhood entails. They stated that RCC schools provided a friendly environment for children where there was no punishment and no pressure of books and where children learned through play. There was no rote memorization and the creative capability of children was enhanced and therefore there was a “demand” from parents that RCC be introduced in all schools (interview with Education Council members).
- Regular SMC meetings were held and minutes were recorded.

Technical Competencies

Technical competencies of all partners were developed and enhanced through trainings, seminars, and the development of Advanced Diplomas. Technical partners supported implementing partners with additional trainings. Examples include:

- Trainings were provided for all players involved, including teachers, school heads, EDOs, parents, and community members. Topics, depending on the audience, included child development, professional development skills, teaching strategies, health, sanitation/hygiene, and roles and responsibility of community involvement in the schools.
- All partners gained greater capacity for supervision and monitoring, statistical analysis and data management, and computer skills by learning from each other. In addition, each partner strengthened their own program by learning about and adding early childhood development and education into their own organizational scheme, or by enhancing their ability to provide outreach to all involved (implementing partners, families and communities).
- The support of the RCC partnership facilitated one partner (AKU-HDP) to enhance its technical competency for the greater ECD/ECE community in Pakistan through the development of graduate seminars; an Advanced Diploma in human development (early childhood development); and training of trainers programs.
- SEF provided baseline survey trainings to 118 RCC partner staff/teachers, and refresher training for 49. In addition, SEF provided database training for 22 RCC partner staff/teachers, and refresher training for five.

Regular Supervision and Monitoring

RCC provided direct, ongoing supervision and monitoring of all program components. Supervision and monitoring of teachers and classrooms included:

- Joint visits of lead teachers/ECE facilitators and DEO’s were observed in some districts of Baluchistan; in the province of Sindh, ADO’s did joint visits with partners.
- In Baluchistan, lead teachers mentored classroom teachers.
- District coordinators provided professional guidance to schools.
- RCC partners completed various research studies to monitor child and program outcomes, including:

- Studies on baseline data of RCC Phase II and RCC Phase II baseline analysis provided information on child outcomes prior to RCC program participation, and analysis supported program planning and implementation.
- SEF research supporting RCC included “Understanding ECD Through Practice” (completed and disseminated to all partners in April 2005); “Perceptions of Non-RCC Teachers and Children about RCC Impact”; and “Exploring Parents’ Perceptions vis-à-vis ECD and Impact of RCC Program on Children and Communities”; Phase II data collection was almost completed, and analysis had begun for Sindh. This project is currently ongoing.
- AKU-HDP created “The Record of Early Childhood Growth and Development and Suggestions for Caregivers”, which enables regular observations of children’s growth and development, for use by community workers. Field testing had been completed and they are currently in the process of validating the tool.



RCC program in Tando Muhammad Khan District, Sindh Province. This classroom had a very rich environment, full of teacher-made and indigenous materials. Note the round tables and chairs provided to every RCC classroom.

Teacher Capacity Development

RCC’s strong teacher-training, follow up, and monitoring maintained an extensive focus on the continued capacity development of teachers, which contributed to better classroom practice.

Teacher training outcomes included:

- In 11 out of the 12 classrooms where full observations were completed, teachers were observed using routines such as small group and large group time, outdoor time, and song and rhyme, and activities were planned accordingly. In most cases teachers had incorporated routines into their day-to-day planning; teachers had weekly plans in accordance with the theme and daily routines, which were planned along with the lead teacher. Teachers engaged children in small groups and were observed to work individually with children, and choice time was available for children to go to the learning areas and work/play (teacher report, observations). Three EDOs and one DOE reported that the capacity of teachers had increased.
- Community teachers in Sindh and Baluchistan reported that they had continued the methodology even when funding stopped. In many cases they volunteered for two to four months with no salary. In some cases the head teachers paid the community teachers out of SMC funds or their own pockets. In other cases they encouraged teachers to apply for vacant positions since they felt that these teachers were better teachers and more dedicated than government teachers.
- 15 out of the 18 classrooms visited had children’s work displayed.

- All children reported that they liked their teacher; in most cases teacher-child interactions were positive.²¹

Dissemination of Early Childhood Development Information

RCC partners participated in a variety of avenues in order to advocate for RCC and their message of ECD. These included participating in exhibits where created resources were displayed. RCC partner, SEF hosted the “Re-Discovering Childhood” Symposium and Conference, “ECD: Challenges and Opportunities in Pakistan,” on April 3-5, 2006. A conference hosted by AKF on “Raising Capable Children,” was held May 22-24, 2006. RCC partner, AKU-HDP, ran a seminar on “Evidence-Based Research in Early Childhood,” in conjunction with its Advanced Diploma in Human Development. In addition, staff participated in international conferences and meetings.

RCC supported their partners in the creation of a variety of resources. Some resources benefited the ECD professional community, such as the “ECD Mapping Survey,” which defined all the public and private ECD-related programs and projects currently in Pakistan. Some resources benefited the RCC communities directly²². In addition to RCC community teachers, other government teachers had access to the resources as well. Other resources, while created by and for the use of RCC partners, are available for the general public, such as *Nurture Magazine*, the first ECD-related magazine in Pakistan; *Parwarish Magazine* (*Nurture* translated in Urdu); ECD Booklets; an ECD Resource Book; and an ECD Planner. The ECDPAK website, www.ecdpak.com, not only provides information on the RCC program and its partners, but it contains appropriate development and education information that both teachers and parents can use.

Forums which RCC participated with included:

- Policy Seminar on ECE on November 29-30, 2004.
- National Education Conference, May 30-31, 2006.
- National Education Policy review (1998-2010) – Roundtable on Early Childhood Education, June 10, 2006.
- Policy Seminar on ECE in Sindh.
- Review of the revised Early Childhood National Curriculum policy.

Increased Retention Rates

RCC data reported that retention was increased to 95%; this was substantiated in all DOE interviews. In addition, three EDOs and one DOE reported that enrollment as well as children’s interest in school increased.

²¹ Out of the 12 schools where full observations occurred, only 1 teacher was observed raising her voice to tell children to be quiet.

²² It was understood that five Learning Resource Centers (LRCs) were established using USAID funding, and a total of 24 LRCs were established by RCC partners, Society, AKES,P, and HANDS overall. The locations of these LRCs were determined by the implementing partners; one LRC was observed at a school visited in the Matiari district.

Teachers reported that children from RCC *katchi* who are currently in Grades 1 and 2 are performing better than Grades 1 and 2 children who had not had RCC – they are “smarter”; one teacher interviewed expected that in the next few years, as RCC children get to Grade 5 and take the exam, they will perform well.

Parents reported that children engaged in regular hands washing at home, learned manners in school, greeted parents, and at home they taught other siblings songs that they had learned in the classroom and talked about what they had learned. While these parent reports conflicted with the poor sanitary conditions observed at the schools, it should be noted that sanitary conditions of the homes were not observed. The evaluation team was unable to determine how resources differed between home and school, and what impact that might have on sanitation practices.

Consortium of Partners

A strength cited by all RCC partners, which is evident in all the above mentioned achievements, was that the consortium created increased and enhanced the knowledge about early childhood. Technical partners – SEF, TRC, and AKU-HDP – worked to boost their own knowledge, skills, and attitudes around early childhood development and education, while supporting implementing partners in enriching their direct program performance. Implementing partners – HANDS, SOCIETY, and AKESP – incorporated all aspects of early childhood issues (education, development, health, sanitation and hygiene, parenting education) into their program delivery to benefit young children and families in the communities they work with. All partners developed resources to enhance program delivery.

Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program

In comparison to USAID’s stated Intermediate Results that relate directly to early childhood, CDS has “improved the capacity of teachers and education administrators”²³. However, the effectiveness of the ongoing capacity of these professionals appears to be reliant on ongoing monitoring and technical assistance. CDS was successful in providing “improved access to and delivery of education services”²⁴ by working directly with government schools, within the governmental framework.

The CDS program strengths included: a strong relationship as well as advocacy with the government; the use of existing infrastructure; Family Literacy and Parent Involvement components; materials provided to classrooms; and increased retention rates.

Relationship Building and Advocacy: Government and Organizations

CDS has a very strong relationship with the government schools they work with; signed memoranda of understanding with concerned district and city governments not only address the use of government school space for their classroom interventions as well as space and time for their literacy program, they also provide for an understanding between CDS and government

²³ IR 3.2

²⁴ IR 3.4

officials that in return for training government teachers and working with them, teachers will not be transferred for a period of three years (as possible). This is important because CDS is able to maintain support for the teachers and program and CDS-trained teachers are provided the consistent opportunity to continue using the methods they have been trained in (whereas without the non-transfer MOU, a teacher might be moved to a school without CDS program involvement, and therefore lose the support and ability to use the methodology).

As a culmination of this strong relationship between CDS and the government, and demonstrating program sustainability, CDS has been asked by the federal education ministry to increase its program into 30 schools in the northern regions of Pakistan affected by the 2005 earthquake, as well as to extend it to all government primary schools in the Islamabad Capital Territory (approximately 400 schools). An interview with the Sindh provincial government, in which the CDS Karachi sites are located, proved to be unreliable in determining the success of the CDS advocacy with this office because the Minister interviewed was newly transferred to his position.

As part of their relationship building and advocacy efforts, CDS participated in the following:

- Round table/policy seminars on review of national education policy, specifically on teachers training and early childhood education.
- Review of the revised Early Childhood National Curriculum policy.
- Final meeting of the National Curriculum Revision Committee of Higher Education Commission, constituted to review Bachelor of Education and Master of Education curriculum.
- Policy seminar on early childhood education, Lahore, which CDS conducted in collaboration with the Provincial Department of Literacy and Non-Formal Basic Education, Government of Punjab, and UNESCO.

The CDS website by CRI, <http://www.cripk.org/>, provides detailed information about program outreach.

Family Literacy

The CDS Family Literacy component was found to be one of the strongest components of the program. Through teacher, parent, and community interviews, it was clearly evident that Family Literacy sessions have been very successful in increasing the well-being of the families involved.

Activity	Indicator	Outcome
Literacy	# parents attend literacy lessons	2,300
	% gains in math and literacy skills	367%
	% parents attending	73.5%
	# teachers trained and using skills	160
	# staff/instructors able to replicate training	11

CRI data²⁵

²⁵ “Creating Democratic Schools Program – Pakistan, Quarterly Programmatic Report January – March 2006 and Final Programmatic Report”, submitted to USAID by PACT on behalf of CRI, Inc., January 2006-March 2006.

The Family Literacy component is composed of two sessions, with the first session including lessons one through 50, and the second session including lessons 51 to 100. The family literacy program is led by government school teachers who are trained by CDS staff.

Family learning outcomes reveal:

- Not only parents, but other family members, including grandmothers, aunts, and siblings, were able to participate.
- Parents reported that the program had impacted their lives, it had enhanced their confidence, and as a result of enrolling in the program they were able to read currency, medicine bottles, bills, write their names, and to learned to make things (arts and crafts).
- Some parents had started their own small businesses as a result of the skills and confidence they gained from participating in the Family Literacy component.

Parent Involvement

CDS Parent Involvement in Islamabad and Rawalpindi was found to be another strength of the program. Through teacher, parent, and community interviews, it was clearly evident that parents have become more involved in their children’s learning and the school community. Parents reported that they were involved in what their children were doing in class, and were interested in being shown the homework children were assigned.

Activity	Indicator	Outcome
Parents help at school & in classroom	Frequency	times/week
	% parents participating	79%
	% classrooms with parents participating	100%
	Average # types of activities involving parents	Not available; 3.2 (self-administered survey)
Family Literacy Sessions	% parents attending sessions	73.5%
	# schools with family literacy program	80
Train family involvement coordinators	# trained	70
	# participant hours	6,055

Source: CRI data²⁶

Community learning outcomes reveal:

- In a majority of schools, parents were involved in activities, and were invited to the classroom to conduct activities with the children. One mother was observed teaching children a math lesson.
- Five of eight classrooms visited in Islamabad and Rawalpindi had parental involvement charts displayed in the classroom.
- In one school the SMC created water storage for the school.

²⁶ Ibid

- Teachers were very accepting of parents coming into the classroom and working with them.

Use of Existing Infrastructure

The CDS emphasis on the use of existing government classrooms and trained government teachers provides the Ministry of Education with a model they can easily incorporate into the existing school structure. This model cuts down operational costs, as well as initial implementation planning (compared to the RCC program, which might need to plan the building of a separate classroom as well as the hiring and training of a community teacher.)



CDS program in Rawalpindi. The woman who is leading the class is a mother, who is using small blocks to teach a math lesson, counting #1-5.

Provision of Materials to Classrooms

CDS provides every participating classroom with a two-shelf, two-cabinet folding set, which they fill with non-consumable supplies (see cost-effectiveness of program section for chart with list of materials) provided at program expense, as well as consumable materials such as paper and crayons/markers. Eighty-five percent of classrooms observed

had the shelves with materials, and open for use. While the majority of sites were observed only using paper/writing utensils for drawing activities, this was an improvement over non-CDS government classrooms observed only using notebooks/writing utensils to write words.

- In one school when a parent moved the child to a private non-CRI school, the child complained that she missed the materials, so the parent moved her back to the government CRI school (teacher report).

Increased Retention Rates

CDS-provided data demonstrated an increase in both attendance and retention rates.

Activity	Indicator	Outcome
Quality learning experiences	% increase student attendance	5-15%; 91-99% (teacher survey)
	% increase in attendance by gender	Boys 10%; girls 9-11%; 89-99% (questionnaires)
	% increase in retention	18%; 99% (teacher survey)

DOEs interviewed in two of the three districts in which CDS functions spoke highly of the positive change in attendance and retention they witnessed. However, an independent study by the Lahore University of Management Systems (LUMS)²⁷, which looked at a period of three

²⁷ “Interim Draft Report on the Impact Evaluation of CRI-Pakistan - Phase Zero”, LUMS, September 25, 2007. See Appendix A for complete citation.

months, determined that results on attendance were mixed. During an interview, they reported that girls were attending regularly but there was no change in boys' attendance.

In addition, other results included:

- Children observed to clap for each other and appreciate each others' work.
- A positive impact on children's learning achievement in Urdu, English and Math, with 'relatively higher impact on richer children'.²⁸ A report on learning achievement concluded, "Disaggregation of results by gender and wealth indicate a slight advantage in the favor of boys relative to girls and a larger advantage for children of higher income households".²⁹

PROGRAM MISSING LINKS/CHALLENGES

While both programs achieved a great deal within their program components, each faced issues that impeded success.

Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program

The challenges faced by the RCC program included: the "branding" of the program; government advocacy at the provincial and federal level had limited effect; disconnect between proposed research and outcomes, as well as within partner coordination; and sustainability. In addition, other unique challenges were associated with their rural setting, and their program focus on the philosophy of "development" vs. "education," which impacted issues related to children's age as well as advocacy.

"Branding"; Isolation of RCC Classroom

It was noted in two interviews (one a partner, one a former RCC program affiliate) that the RCC program appeared to have "branded" itself, and as such, it had isolated itself from the larger government system. While RCC was working in partnership with district governments in government schools, there was little or no government "ownership" of any program component. Everything was "RCC," rather than an approach within the schools. This issue was observed during an interview with a leading organization based in Islamabad that works with early childhood issues in Pakistan. During the



CDS program in Taxila. The teacher is conducting a morning meeting, using flashcards for a letters activity. In her hand is a block, which has letters hand-written on the side.

²⁸ Ibid, page 19.

²⁹ Ibid, page 21.

interview, the emphasis was on AKF as a capacity-building institution rather than as implementers of the RCC program. While the person interviewed knew of the technical partners involved with RCC, very little was known about the RCC programmatic interventions, or of the collaborative partnership that each technical partner was involved with.

The RCC approach to the *katchi* class, with a separate room (either rehabilitated or built by RCC), separate teacher (salary paid for by RCC partner funds), and wealth of materials to use, appeared to others as “privileged” in comparison to the rest of the school, which caused *katchi* to be seen as segregated. Some government teachers appeared to feel threatened by the RCC community teachers, because they were viewed as working harder yet for less pay. The government did not recognize the community teachers, who had not gone through the same training as government teachers, which also caused some conflict among staff. In order to address this, RCC is now including Classes 1 and 2 during their current Phase III of the program.

Government Advocacy, Resource Mobilization

RCC held a variety of meetings and activities in which RCC partners tried to encourage government ownership of the program activities, including:

- Meeting with PITE
- Formation of a Steering Committee, to which provincial and federal government representatives were invited
- Meetings and discussions with Ministry of Education and government education officials on all levels of government.

However, while relationship-building and ownership were more successful at the local government levels, challenges remained at the provincial and federal government levels.

Challenges included:

- Transfers of government officials – while RCC partners contributed time and effort for advocacy and awareness of early childhood issues, the transfer of district- and provincial-level officials meant that long-term planning and awareness building were not possible, and required partners to re-do advocacy efforts with each new transfer. Partners also found themselves dealing with changing priorities with each transfer; in some cases, early childhood was not seen as a priority at all. Recognition of RCC and partner intervention was inconsistent. Advocacy to get community teachers recognized by the government was also affected.
- Transfers of government teachers – RCC obtained MOUs with government officials to not transfer government teachers partnered with community teachers and working with RCC schools; however, these MOUs were not honored.
- Status of community teachers - Seven community teachers interviewed reported getting lower salaries than government teachers. They also reported that they did not have the same status as government teachers and were often seen as separate from the education system (interview with community teachers). This affected morale, with some community teachers saying they did more work, and spent more time in the *katchi* classrooms than the government teachers while being paid less. While some partners said that in some provinces

the RCC teacher is given preference during recruitment and generally obtain government jobs when they apply, there is no mechanism in place to ensure community teachers that they will be inducted into the system, which affects the sustainability of these teachers ability to continue in the classroom.

In addition to the challenges of working with government, challenges also occurred when other donor agencies and programs worked in the same schools as RCC. For example, all implementing and technical partners in Sindh complained about the USAID-funded ESRA program, which worked in many of the same districts – and schools – as RCC. While ESRA’s focus was on ages 5-10, there was significant overlap with government teachers; this impacted RCC because teachers became confused over which resources to use,³⁰ teachers were taken out of the classrooms for trainings, and in some cases RCC and ESRA training schedules conflicted with each other.

Disconnects: Lack of Partner Coordination, Completion of All Tasks

While coordination amongst partners was strong during Phase I program planning and implementation, during Phase II, coordination among partners proved to be a challenge. Four of the six RCC partners interviewed said that coordination both among the partners and with outside agencies was a challenge during Phase II, with occasional meetings to discuss achievements but no future strategic planning. However, they all reported that the AKF staff was taking a greater role in coordination of RCC activities in the current Phase III, and quarterly partner meetings are now being implemented as a result of lessons learned.

During partner interviews, implementing partners shared frustrations that they had provided multiple data to SEF, and yet “nothing was done”.³¹ The Cost-Benefit Study (to be done by SEF) was not completed, and the Multi-Grade Teaching Manual (to be done by TRC) was developed but not finalized during Phase II.



*School in Tando Muhammed Khan, which the **RCC** program no longer supported. The community teacher was lost, and there was no designated katchi classroom. A government teacher from Class 3 was teaching, using “typical” government-style teaching instruction of direct lecture. All While the classroom still had RCC furniture, most materials were gone.*

³⁰ Commonly heard by partners, and reported to the evaluation team, was the teacher complaint, “Where is my red bag?”, an ESRA resource.

³¹ Direct quote from implementing partner interview.

Sustainability a Challenge When RCC Partnership Withdrawn

Due to the lack of government ownership, sustainability was an issue when RCC no longer directly supported schools, as was evident in schools which had been dropped after Phase II. In schools where the head was supportive, the methodology continued. In some cases the head teacher continued paying the community teacher's salary from the SMC fund, and in other cases community teachers continued working without salary as they awaited notification of their status from the SMC. Where funds were not available, the community teacher had to discontinue. For a variety of reasons - government teacher transfers and/or reliance on the community teacher to do the work so that the government teacher never practiced or "internalized" the early childhood methodology - government teachers were ill-prepared to continue program activities. Some examples include:

- In one school where AKES,P had dropped partnership after the completion of Phase II, a child reported that he was hit by the teacher when he did not complete his homework. (The teacher was a government teacher). In addition, where AKES,P was no longer supporting the schools in Phase III of the program, the remaining government teachers were observed to be unprepared in class. Children also reported that the methodology was not used daily; materials had either been lost or misplaced.
- In one case, RCC stopped working with a school, which then lost its community teacher. The government teacher who had originally been placed with the community teacher had, during the duration of the program, been transferred to Grades 1, 2, and then 3; when she was moved back to the *katchi* class after the community teacher left, she was ill-prepared. The RCC implementing partner is now providing technical assistance to this school again in the current Phase III of the program.
- In schools where RCC stopped support, some teachers were observed using drill instruction, especially to teach the alphabet.

Rural School Settings – One-, Two-Teacher/Classroom Schools

The challenges faced by RCC when working with rural schools include multi-age situations, when there are only one or two government teachers for all the children, and the size of the schools, which might have only one or two classrooms. This situation directly impacts RCC's designated teacher/designated classroom for *katchi* philosophy, and led the program to decide to provide the classroom and community teacher. However, this decision affects sustainability, when program support is terminated and the community teacher is let go, there is no one to be designated the *katchi* teacher. In addition, the designated space for one class, while all other grades are combined into one or two rooms, contributes to a feeling of "privilege" and RCC vs. non-RCC mentality.

"Development" vs. "Education" – the "Age Issue"

The RCC program philosophy is about the holistic development of the child as compared to an education-only perspective, and includes the commonly defined view of pre-school as covering ages three to five. However, the government only recognizes one year of *katchi*, specifically age 4, and does not allow promotion to Class 1 until age 5. In addition, the National Curriculum for

early childhood is designed for one-year. Therefore, teachers are faced with the challenge of children repeating *katchi* with the same curriculum for a second year.

Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program

CDS program challenges were evident in the field, especially the weak connection between training and implementation. Lack of monitoring affected this. In addition, while parent involvement was strong in Islamabad and Rawalpindi, it was ineffective in Karachi. Partnerships with private schools were withdrawn by CDS.

Training and Implementation Disconnect - Weak Classroom Environments

While the classroom environment was a strength of the RCC program, it proved to be a challenge for CDS. CDS has developed a variety of training materials, curriculum guides, and a newsletter (*Laddu*), which have been translated. In addition, CDS has provided training for many teachers, master trainers, principals, as well as follow-up technical assistance.

Activity	Indicator	Outcome
Training workshop	# new teachers trained	1199
	# new principals	190
	# participant training hours	95,668
	# trainers trained – Master Trainers	71
Sign MOUs	# schools using child-centered practice	118
Develop/adapt/translate materials	# new/adapted/translated materials	506
Disseminate translated materials	# new materials distributed to CRI teachers, parents, principals	411
Early Childhood Faculty Training Seminar	# faculty trained	71
	# teacher training institutions using new courses	30

CRI data³²

During the training, teachers were provided teacher guides from CDS that they could keep as a reference in the classroom; one teacher had the CDS book readily accessible in the classroom, and discussed reading and using it. However, the overall effectiveness of the training and technical assistance was found to be questionable by the evaluation team; observations found many teachers still using rote drill instruction, and teacher interviews demonstrated a lack of understanding that CDS methodology could be used to teach the government syllabus.. Many teachers interviewed discussed the CDS methodology as something “separate” from the syllabus, and therefore as something that took time away from addressing the syllabus in the classroom.

The chart below provides a summary of indicators used during site observations and how CDS sites ranked.

³² “Creating Democratic Schools Program – Pakistan, Quarterly Programmatic Report January – March 2006 and Final Programmatic Report”, submitted to USAID by PACT on behalf of CRI, Inc., January 2006-March 2006.

Indicator	CDS: 13 schools visited	%
Separate room available*	11 2 rooms had <i>katchi</i> combined with other classes	85%
Learning Areas/Activity Centers	11 had CDS provided shelves; Only 1 had additional learning areas 1 Adopter school shelf locked 1 Private school had dropped CDS methodology	85%
Provisions/ materials	10 2 = locked in shelves	77%
Children's Displays	7	54%
Parental involvement charts	5	38%
Health charts**	N/A	--
Teaching and learning materials displayed	11	85%
Activities observed in class	5	38%
Washrooms sanitary***	7	54%
Routines advocated during training used	7 morning meetings subject wise classes	54%

*CDS used existing government classrooms.

** Health charts were not used with CDS.

*** Discussed in the challenges section.

Individual teachers were observed using elements of interactive methodology, such as: seven rooms had children's work displayed; one teacher used her physical body as well as a student's to teach a math lesson; opportunities were provided to children to go up to the board and write or lead (very cultural, and very teacher-directed); and one teacher grouped children, so assignments and lessons were well managed.

However, inconsistencies were found between training and implementation of program methodology in the following areas:

- Classroom Environment
 - Active learning³³ was mainly absent; while some use of materials was



CDS program in Islamabad; this is an example of the activity corner. Materials looked rarely used; children that went over to the area were yelled at to sit down. Note the misspelled sign.

³³ As defined by CRI and the "National Curriculum: Early Childhood Education", March 2002, page 11.

observed in a few cases, choice, use of language, and support of and by the teacher were missing.

- The program methodology strongly advocated democratic practices and decision making; however, these were not observed in the classroom. Limited choice was provided to children. The evaluation team only observed children being given a choice between the use of color pencils and crayons.
 - Activity centers, meaning the shelf and materials provided by CDS, were observed to be used mainly by teachers during lessons; children were observed using paper and writing materials from the activity center when directed by teachers to do so. The evaluation team observed cases where children freely went to the shelf to use materials, only to be yelled at by teachers to stop and sit down. These were used more as storage shelves than as activity centers, when compared to their description and use mentioned in CRI's curriculum training guide³⁴.
 - Teachers were under the impression that charts on the walls of the classroom would be acceptable as an activity center and the trainers seemed to endorse this viewpoint (teacher's interview; teacher trainer interview).
 - Three *katchi* teachers had long wait times between activities when they were giving individual students written assignments while other children waited their turn with nothing to do. This created many unnecessary discipline issues.
 - Five teachers were observed using materials during their lessons, but this varied depending on when an activity had been planned. Teachers interviewed said they only use materials once a week, sometimes twice or thrice. Six *katchi* teachers observed used no materials and only written work.
- Use of Materials
 - Children reported inconsistency in the use of materials and activities in CDS classrooms. Some children revealed that they used materials occasionally, some reported use every other day, and others said they used the materials once a week. One mentioned that because the observer/evaluation team was present in the classroom students were allowed to use material.
 - Teacher-Child Interaction
 - Teachers could talk about CDS methodology; one teacher said it helps us teach with love. However, during the observation this same teacher was observed yelling at children; "if you make a noise, you won't go out for break". One child chose a wrong color – the same teacher yelled the correct color name to the child.
 - Some children reported corporal punishment when they did not do homework or when they misbehaved in class. This was reported more in CDS schools and of government teachers in RCC schools.

During interviews, teachers reported that materials provided during training were useful, methodology was simple and helped the students' interactive process, and parents were involved

³⁴ CRI's training guides outline the following learning areas: art, outdoors, dramatic play, literacy, math/manipulative; blocks, sand and water play, music and science, the team said that they encouraged teachers to use at least four learning centers i.e. art, math, literacy and blocks. In some cases they reported teachers also added a dramatic center. In higher classes science and social studies was also added.

to prepare materials. In addition, teachers reported that every child was encouraged to speak, and children were reported to have learned manners, and were given responsibilities for certain activities. However, what the teachers said was not observed in the classroom. While teachers were able to speak about the trainings received, attitudinal change was not evident based on their actions.

Weak Technical Assistance

A possible reason for this inconsistency between training and implementation might be that technical assistance was evaluated to be weak in the CDS program. CDS, in their “Final Programmatic Report” to USAID, reported the following:

Activity	Indicator	Outcome
Provide Ongoing TA	% change in classroom practice	100%
	% children in classrooms using child-centered methods	100%

However, upon noting the discrepancy between training and implementation, the evaluation team requested CDS to provide additional training information; the following charts were provided:

Basic Education Component					
No. of Participants in Initial Trainings					
	Islamabad/Rawalpindi		Karachi		Total
Year	Teachers	Heads/Supervisors	Teachers	Heads/Supervisors	
2003	138	64	53	37	292
2004	150	113	38	2	303
2005	163	81	37	28	309
2006	852	341	36	31	1260
Total	1303	599	164	98	2164

The basic education training is a five-day initial training program for the teachers in the use of interactive teaching learning process followed by three to five days of follow-up training.

No. of Participants in Follow-up/Orientation Training					
	Islamabad/Rawalpindi		Karachi		Total
Year	Teachers	Heads/Supervisors	Teachers	Heads/Supervisors	
2003	281	147	161	67	656
2004	146	72	71	21	310
2005					0
2006					0
Total	427	219	232	88	966

The follow-up training was imparted to only 45% of the teachers who attended the initial training. Fifty-five percent were not included in follow up training, which would have an impact on performance.

Specific results observed from poor technical assistance included:

- All thirteen CDS teachers interviewed said that they could not use the methodology daily since they needed to complete the syllabus, and spoke as if the methodology was separate and time consuming. In most cases the teacher said that she could use the ‘morning meeting’; however, teachers did not appear to understand that the methodology was to be used to complement and teach the curriculum rather than to be used separately.
- Teachers reported that activities were used occasionally depending on the topic they were teaching and the time available to the teacher.
- The activities seemed more of an “add-on” than a part of the methodology; in some schools in Islamabad, activities were being done once a week on Friday. This shows that teachers have not internalized how the methodology facilitates children’s learning. When not using the methodology, classrooms observed seemed very teacher directed; the majority of teachers observed used rote drill instruction.
- Teachers did not document plans; curriculum was defined as the topics in the given textbook, which had been divided into monthly segments at the beginning of the year. There were no daily/weekly plans (teacher interview - they were in their minds, not written).
- Although CDS staff reported that they train teachers on the ECE National Curriculum, components of the curriculum were not observed.
- Technical assistance provided to teachers was reported to be ‘weak’ by an officer in the federal Ministry of Education. He opined that CDS needed a very strong follow up program and that technical assistance for teachers was not effective since the team had a very big network to cover.

While ongoing technical assistance, supervision, and monitoring ensure program quality, it was noted in CDS trainer interviews that due to program expansion, technical assistance to existing schools had been reduced. It was implied that with program expansion (for example, adding all 400 schools in the Islamabad Capital Territory) it might be further compromised.

In addition, the technical assistance that is being provided is inadequate; while the CDS methodology is such that it can – and should – be used to support the syllabus on a daily basis, in line with the ECE National Curriculum, the training team had told teachers that they could use the methodology daily, twice a week or three times a week (not necessarily all the time), as they chose – thus furthering this feeling that the CDS methodology is separate from, or an “add-on” to the government syllabus. CDS staff also



CDS program in Taxila. The evaluation team was told the katchi teacher was absent, so the children were combined with the Class 7 boys (katchi on the floor, Class 7 at the desks); however, the teacher then showed us katchi children's drawings on the wall, suggesting a more permanent accommodation...

admitted during interviews that they play a “facilitating” role rather than a “monitoring” role – and monitoring of program implementation in the classroom appeared to suffer.

Reliability on Program-Provided Materials

One outcome of the program, as reported by CDS, was the provision of 100% of classrooms with active learning materials. The materials that most teachers were observed to use frequently were blocks for building, and this was provided to children generally when they had finished their written work or during break time. Other materials observed to be in use in most classes were the pattern blocks and Quisenaire rods for teaching counting, and/or colors, in a very teacher-directed manner.

However, teachers seemed to be very dependent solely on CDS-provided materials. While the CDS training team said when interviewed they encouraged teachers to collect indigenous materials such as blocks and beads, and make other low-cost materials for use in the classroom, this was not observed. Out of the 13 classrooms visited, only one classroom had materials other than what CDS directly provided. In addition, teacher interviews revealed that when CDS replenished materials, teachers waited, sometimes for months, for training before using the materials in the classrooms. Teachers said they did not know what to do with them. Teachers did not appear to take initiative in thinking how materials might be used; rather they waited until they were told.

Ineffective Parent Involvement in Karachi

While parent involvement in Islamabad and Rawalpindi was strong, it was not as successful in Karachi, as exhibited by the lack of parent involvement charts as well as limited parent interaction and involvement in schools (teacher report). While interviewees in Karachi stated that this is due to families working and the urban setting, it could be argued that Islamabad and Rawalpindi, also urban settings with working families, had very successful parent involvement components.

Private School Partnerships Dropped

CDS interviews noted that partnerships with private schools had been dropped due to frustration over the high amount of teacher turnover. However, during interviews in the private schools, officials said they were informed that they were being dropped from the program but provided no reason. They expressed frustration with the abrupt ending of the program and lack of support. While one private school visited continued to attempt to use certain program components, another private school interviewed no longer used any aspect of the program.



RCC program with non- functioning bathrooms. Behind the corner of the school, to the left of the picture, was an area of human waste – some fresh, some old – on the ground outside. Imagine how close that area is to the windows, the classroom, and the outside play equipment.

Challenges Faced by Both Programs

Poor Sanitary Conditions

Poor sanitary conditions were observed by the evaluation team in most of the schools supported under the RCC and CDS. This led to the dropout of children in some of the schools. Washrooms were built as part of the RCC program intervention; however most of these facilities are not in working condition due to no/little maintenance and non-availability of water. In many schools, non-availability of water (a common challenge for many rural schools) and lack of an *ayah* (bathroom attendant) lead to unhygienic and unsanitary conditions. Only 22% of RCC schools had sanitary bathroom facilities. Children would go home during breaks to use the facilities and this disrupted classroom time, since some children did not return after break. (While this was beyond the team’s scope, it may be that girl students are disproportionately affected.)

CDS’ mandate was to work with government schools, utilizing the facilities available within the government infrastructure, and as such did not directly work to improve sanitation since that was the government’s responsibility. However, only 54% of CDS program schools had sanitary bathroom conditions, which impact the overall health and wellbeing of children.

Disparity Between Classes, Between Schools

Both programs only worked with certain classrooms within schools, and certain schools within districts during the timeframe evaluated (since 2006, both programs have expanded). The disparity caused by the RCC program has already been discussed in regards to their designated classroom/designated teacher philosophy.



In a rural RCC program in Matiari District, limited, teacher-made materials, of perishable, poor quality are used; the classroom next door, however, was bare by comparison.

Schools with the CDS program also demonstrated disparity; in one school, one teacher had 2 “groups” in the same classroom – a CDS group, and what she described as “ECE”, which were children using the government curriculum. This “ECE” group was labeled as not knowing anything and was given written work rather than being allowed to engage in the CDS methodology. In other words, this classroom contained two groups of children, of which one group could use the materials on the CDS-provided shelf, while the other group was asked to sit and write in their notebooks all day, while watching the other children “play”. The

teacher saw these two groups as separate and did not appear to understand the disparity this created (this disparity relates to the challenges cited earlier regarding the disconnect between training and implementation, and the effect of weak technical assistance found in the classroom).

COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAMS

The Evaluation Team requested supplementary data on program performance. However, baseline data was not available from one program, which impeded our ability to compare the two. Additionally, annual work plans and other data on indicators (such as enrollment in the project schools by year, flow of the targeted students to the next grades, training of teachers for the different programs and associated per teacher costs) were not readily available from these organizations. Ultimately, the data was insufficient to show a complete picture of the situation. For the RCC program, SEF was asked to carry out a cost benefit analysis of the program. Thus far the data sent by different partners have not been processed and analyzed for report writing. Similarly, the analysis conducted by CRI-Washington for the CRI-Pakistan CDS program emphasized program benefits rather than the costs.



An urban CDS program in Taxila. Children are using CDS-provided blocks; the shelves can be seen in the background.

Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program

Cost in US Dollars, for three years:

Partner	Salary	Non-salary	Total	Salary as percent of total	Percent allocation of the total budget
Society	201,849	385,101	586,950	34%	17%
HANDS	97,136	288,852	385,988	25%	11.2%
AKES,P	236,762	193,710	430,472	55%	12.5%
SEF	142,686	289,544	432,230	33%	12.6%
TRC	15,683	51,257	66,940	23%	2%
AKU-HDP	434,012	171,292	605,304	72%	17.6%
AKF-P	346,087	146,028	492,115	70%	14.3%
AKF USA	125,252	316,496	441,748	28%	12.8%
Total	1,599,467	1,842,280	3,441,747	46%	100%

Adapted from RCC Final Report

The total cost on the recurring salary expenditure is high; only 54 % of the budget is allocated for project operational cost. AKU-HDP and AKF-P salaries and fringe benefits are 72% and 70% respectively of the budgeted amount leaving 28% and 30% for operational costs. Of the implementing partners, AKES-P spends 55% on salaries and allowances and 45% on other operations. The higher salary costs include the cost of hiring community teachers for the classrooms.

While AKU-HDP is raising the capacity of their own staff and that of the partners in addition to providing technical support, the direct benefit to the implementing and technical partners does not correspond to expenses incurred. For example, while AKU-HDP stated that the majority of funds went toward internal capacity building and the development of early childhood development courses; by the end of Phase 2, only seven total staff from implementing partners had participated in such courses. Nevertheless, there is a long-term investment value course development in terms of future availability. As shown in the above table, AKU-HDP receives the largest percentage of the allocated budget (17.6%). Society is the second largest recipient at 17%. The contribution of Society in difficult areas of Baluchistan and the balanced ratio of salary and non-salary justifies their higher budget allocation.

RCC's program did include an in-kind component from each community, in which community members contributed to the RCC program through either direct funds for renovation/building, supplies, labor, and/or classroom materials. No calculation for community donations (in-kind or monetary). However its value cannot be dismissed.

Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program

Cost in US dollars

Year	Salary exp.	Non-salary exp.	Total	Salary as percent of total
2003	192,129	752,790	944,919	20%
2004	530,730	930,575	843,102 +618203= 1,461,305	36%
2005	477,469	571,878	1,049,347	46%
2006			No cost extension	
Total	1,200,328	2,255,243	3,455,571	35%

Source: Adapted from CRI-supplied budget details

- ✓ Average unit cost per trainee = \$31
- ✓ Average cost of classroom materials supplies per year per classroom = \$206 (Range \$172.80-\$235)

As the implementer of the CDS program, CRI has a balanced ratio of the salary and non-salary expenses. Of the allocated amount, 35% went to salaries and 65% to operational costs. CDS is working primarily in the urban areas of Islamabad, Rawalpindi and Karachi where rooms for *Katchi* classes are available, government trained teachers are present and general conditions and sanitation are better than those found in rural area schools; therefore, operational costs are sometimes lower than those of RCC.



CDS program, Rawalpindi, with CDS-provided activity shelf and pocket charts; desks are government-issued.

The average number of students per CDS class is 20 and the average life of the material is three years (without using other indigenous materials), which can be used for 60 students total over a period of three years, in addition to the six monthly supplies of consumable items. The cost of a *Katchi* class is US \$235 and the technical assistance cost for an ECE classroom is US \$ 90 per year, while the cost of consumables is US \$ 10 per year per classroom. The unit cost per ECE student is therefore estimated as US\$ 8.90. The unit cost for Class 1 is the same. The unit cost at Class 2 is US \$ 7.90 and for Class 3 & 4 is US \$ 8.20 each.

Classroom Materials (US \$)	Quantity per	K-G1	G2	G3	G4
Quisenaire rods	4 sets	\$ 36.52	\$ 36.52	\$ 36.52	\$ 36.52
Children's books	15	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00
Pattern blocks	3 sets	\$ 60.90	\$ 60.90	\$ 60.90	\$ 60.90
Unit blocks	2 sets	\$ 61.75	\$ -	\$ -	0
Geoboards	7 sets	\$ 21.28	\$ 21.28	\$ 21.28	\$ 21.28
Dominos	5 sets	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19.35	\$ 19.35
Dice	24	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1.20
Calendars/pocket charts	4	\$ 15.28	\$ 15.28	\$ 15.28	\$ 15.28
Easel	15	\$ 7.50	\$ 7.50	\$ 7.50	\$ 7.50
Rug	1	\$ 10.15	\$ 10.15	\$ 10.15	\$ 10.15
Bookcase	1				
Science materials					
magnifying glass	4	\$ 3.36	\$ 3.36	\$ 3.36	\$ 3.36
magnets	6	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00
prism	1	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.81	\$ 0.81
Total		\$ 234.55	\$ 172.80	\$ 192.15	\$ 193.35

Source: CRI Washington Cost Benefit Analysis Report Dec 2005

Comparisons

A true cost effectiveness analysis of and between both programs was not determined by the evaluation team due to a lack of data. For example, data requested on the number of children benefitted by year, the flow of children in the school system and associated costs, the number of teachers trained and associated costs, individual course contents, duration, and resource persons and costs associated with each, were not provided by the programs. Additionally, cost of materials provided by RCC was unavailable. In general, it is unclear how cost-effective the trainings were for both programs.



CDS program, Islamabad. This picture is deceiving; the teacher had been walking around the room checking notebooks for 20 minutes at the time this picture was taken; the children had been given NOTHING to do, and by this time, they were wandering around the room, talking, hitting each other, and 2 children were witnessed spitting at each other. The teacher finally noticed, and turned around and yelled at them to sit down; yet she still gave them nothing to do.

	RCC		CDS	
	\$	%	\$	%
Salary	\$1,599,467	46%	\$1,200,328	35%
Operational	\$1,842,280	54%	\$2,255,243	65%
Total	\$3,441,747		\$3,455,571	

Even though we were unable to determine the cost-effectiveness of either program, our interpretation of the data concludes that RCC allocated a greater percentage of money to salaries versus operational costs than CDS. RCC’s higher percentage of salaries might be due to the greater number of partners involved. The cost of teachers, and the work they are doing toward this project. By comparison, as the sole implementer of the program, CDS has fewer staff. CDS’ higher percentage of operational costs might be due to the materials provided, compared to RCC’s use of low-cost, indigenous materials. Unfortunately, we were unable to effectively compare the two programs as RCC could not provide information regarding their material costs. In general, both programs appear to be cost-effective for the work they are doing.

CONTRIBUTION TO GOP’S ECE PROGRAM

Historical Background

Early childhood education had been well established in Pakistan until the 70’s, after which it was virtually discontinued. As signatories of Education for All³⁵, the early childhood sector in Pakistan has regained significance in the education arena. The National Plan of Action³⁶ on the Education Sector Reforms highlighted the significance of early childhood, and demonstrated a commitment towards its achievement. The National Education Policy (1998-2010) committed to re-introduce and strengthen early childhood and make it a part of the formal education system, increasing the number of primary schooling from five to six years. The rationale behind this reform was that it would “reduce the social and economic disparities and race and gender inequalities that divide our society”.³⁷

- Exploration of ECE as a Component of the Formal Schooling System

The two programs were initiated when the government of Pakistan was just beginning to recognize early childhood education as a part of the formal schooling system. The age group that the government highlighted as ‘ECE’ and where it would concentrate its efforts was children

³⁵ Education for All, UNESCO’s global movement to meet the learning needs of all children, youth, and adults by 2015, includes an internationally-agreed upon goal of expanding early childhood care and education. When signing, countries agree to develop and implement strategies that address these goals.

³⁶ “Education for All –National Plan of Action 2001-2015”

³⁷ Background paper written for ESR by Dr. Muhammad Saleem and Shahid Ali Khan (material provided at interview with Dr. Saleem)

between the ages of three and five. The National Plan of Action stated that the total population of children who were within this age range of 3-5 years was 8.1 million in the year 2000, with 5.6 million rural and 2.5 million urban. It was at this same time that the Teachers' Resource Center developed the first National Curriculum Framework in ECE³⁸.

- System on Paper, Not in Practice

At the time, very little expertise was available in the country in early childhood, and capacity building was vital for increasing the momentum of the sector. Also, while the government made a commitment to institutionalize early childhood into the formal schooling system and to open *katchi*/ECE classes in public sector primary schools, this could not be achieved due to the lack of resources and finance constraints for early childhood. According to an interview with the Ministry of Education, the government's priorities for education were in order of importance to achieve universal primary education, adult literacy and the nearly childhood education.

Current Political Context

It was within this setting that the two programs began their work in early childhood and began realizing the goals that had been laid down in the National Plan of Action. Both programs reported that the government's early childhood program was virtually non-existent, with funding being a major issue.

- Both programs provided a model for ECE implementation in government schools.

RCC's work in rural settings of Pakistan using a community based approach and CDS' program in urban and semi-urban settings with early childhood education and parental involvement provided models for the government to adopt and replicate. Since there was limited work in the area prior to the interventions of the two programs, the programs became a prototype of what the government could adopt and reproduce in the early childhood sector.

- Both programs built capacity in the public and private sectors.

Both programs built and strengthened capacity of a number of key players in the field of early childhood and in the public sector. It brought about an awareness of the concept of early childhood within the public sector, and stamped it as an area of priority. District, provincial and federal government officials' capacity was built as a result of the trainings they attended and the work they did in implementing the programs. Additionally, both programs' work on advocacy brought early childhood into the educational arena of Pakistan. RCC's work contributed to capacity building by supporting many different institutional partners to incorporate early childhood into the work they were already doing.

Large numbers of government head teachers, teachers, and local district officers' capacity was strengthened as a result of both programs. Both programs reported that they had contributed to realizing the Government of Pakistan's commitment to early childhood, since the models they

³⁸ the National Curriculum for Early Childhood Education was revised by TRC in 2007

had developed could be successfully replicated due to their practical designs and implementation in government schools.

- Both programs advocated the use of the ECE National Curriculum.

Both RCC and CDS reported that at the beginning of the programs, most people in the field were unaware that there existed a national curriculum for early childhood and if they were aware, they had neither seen it nor knew how it was to be implemented. Both programs, through their training and advocacy, worked to increase the use of the ECE National Curriculum within their own methodologies.

Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program

RCC called its model ‘comprehensible’. They stated that there were not many programs with as holistic an approach as theirs. The model had been conceptualized to be implemented in government schools, incorporating aspects of health and nutrition and care. They demonstrated to the government the vision of early childhood as development vs. education, and how this could be integrated by bringing together different services to work for early childhood, through both community and parental involvement. They felt that the government would probably be able to replicate the ‘education’ model of the program, but not the entire program due to financial constraints and the lack of coordination among different ministries and departments.

A defining aspect of the RCC program was to provide a separate class and separate teacher. In some schools *katchi* class was not even enrolled (they were part of the un-admitted register). This approach provided greater opportunities for *katchi* children to be enrolled in school. As a result of RCC’s work through the partners, the government was now allocating funds for early childhood, especially in Sindh province.

The creation of the first early childhood website and the magazines in early childhood also contributed to disseminating information regarding early childhood to teachers, head teachers, parents, and educational leaders, as well as the general public. RCC felt this was a major contribution toward the GoP’s goal of early childhood.

Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program

CDS’ program not only built the capacity of the government, it allowed the government to “own” the program and the methodology. All decisions made regarding selection of schools within each of the target areas were made in consultation with government officials at the local level. Meetings were held with the federal government to facilitate ownership of the program by the government. CDS’ mandate from the very onset was not to run a parallel system of early childhood with the government; rather it was to work within the existing government structures and partner with the government to ensure program sustainability. They collaborated closely with the government, following all government directives.

As a result, the government is now willing to take forward their work and has invited the CDS country director to participate in policy level decisions regarding early childhood. CDS also worked on teacher training materials and guides which would be introduced into teacher education programs beginning in 2008. CDS opined that they were now viewed as a capacity building institution for the government.³⁹

In addition to the government's decision to expand the program and implement the methodology in all 400 public schools in Islamabad Capital Territory, CDS has also been asked to extend the program to other areas of Pakistan, including implementing the program in rural settings of Pakistan to test the model there.

Challenges Working With the GoP for ECE

While both programs contributed to achieving the overall goals of the Government of Pakistan with regard to spreading early childhood in select provinces, there were many challenges reported by RCC in partnering with the government to implement the program in rural settings of Pakistan. CDS, in comparison, had complete support of the government in implementing their program in ICT, Rawalpindi and Karachi. This might be due to the proximity of CDS programs to the capital, and greater ability of Federal Ministry staff to hear about and observe CDS classrooms, consequently increasing CDS's advocacy efforts.

Most RCC partners commented that policies in the government are 'personality driven' and therefore initiatives taken by government are dictated more by interests of the person in office than by policy. Partners discussed one Education Minister who was pro early childhood, and therefore major developments occurred during this time. However, with a transfer of minister, the priorities changed, and early childhood was no longer a priority, which slowed advocacy and awareness around the issue. RCC partners also discussed constant transfers of provincial and district government officers. They would orient government officials to ECD and the RCC program, and these officials would then be transferred. These frequent transfers, especially in the education department in the province of Sindh⁴⁰, adversely affected the sustainability of the program and advocacy as it required partners to continually re-engage government officials in conversations regarding the importance of early childhood, community teachers, and the transfers of government teachers. SEF tried setting up an ECE technical committee in Sindh and proposed to take the agenda of ECD to the provincial level. They brought partners face to face with the Education Secretary of the province to talk about challenges in the field. However, because the Secretary was transferred, little was achieved.

At the time of RCC program conceptualization, devolution was in process, and the hope was that a lot of power would be vested in the local governments and would ultimately take up the RCC project after it ended. Memoranda of Understanding were signed with each district government; however, the local governments did not use the powers envisaged and were unable to make decisions such as inducting teachers into the system. Partners stated that they continued working to liaise with the government by meeting with government officials and inviting them to conferences and seminars.

³⁹ Interview with CDS.

⁴⁰ The Education Secretary position had 4 transfers between 2004 and 2006.

Another challenge faced concerns the enrollment policy. Children between the ages of three and five years who would come to government schools, were not officially registered in school since the government did not have any provisions for early childhood. SMC funds are not allocated to this age group and their names were registered in the ‘un-admitted register’ of the school.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Both RCC and CDS showed strengths and challenges in their early childhood programs. Both RCC and CDS achieved 2 of their 5 stated objectives successfully, while 3 objectives were determined to be only partially achieved. While RCC improved the quality of learning and teaching, developed technical competencies for a variety of players, created a wealth of resources available to the public, and supported research and training development in the area of early childhood, coordination among partners and advocacy with the government had mixed results. CDS was very successful in their Family Literacy program and parent involvement focus, and had strong relationships with government and other organizations working in early childhood; however, the training was not often translated into practice by the teachers in the classroom despite being practical and ‘hands on’

Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program

RCC demonstrated strength in establishing classroom environments, routines and in teacher training. Its challenges include improving the sustainability of its program in terms of strengthening the development aspect of the program, enhancing sanitary conditions within the schools, working on the absorption of the community teacher into the government educational system and advocating for the integration of the RCC classroom into the government system.

Greater Focused Advocacy with Government

RCC’s influence on policy regarding development vs. education might be too broad for the government to be able to sustain at this time; it will require an increase effort and focus on advocacy to show the government the possibilities available should multiple ministry departments (education, health, social services) work together. RCC’s vision of incorporating community teachers and the RCC program into the greater government school framework will also require more advocacy and cooperation with the government schools on all political levels. The evaluation also uncovered that while higher level government officials and other organizations knew of AKF as an organization, they did not necessarily know of RCC as a program of AKF. This might be a result of having so many partners involved, and people knowing of the partners’ accomplishments but not necessarily that they are functioning under the RCC “umbrella”.

- Incorporate community teachers and the RCC program into the greater government framework.

At the provincial education department level, an officer stated that while the RCC program could be replicated, there additional measures were required before carrying out this intervention. He

mentioned that all programs should be approached in a systematic manner by getting approval from a ‘competent forum’. In MOUs with the government, there should be a provision to ‘absorb’ teachers once the program ends. He stated that this would ensure that the teachers were hired in accordance to government criteria. He also stated that because of devolution, it was thought that the local governments would have more powers, and agreements had been signed directly with local governments. However, approval for recruitment and the like are still given by provincial governments (interview with department of education, provincial government).

Transition Process Away From RCC Support

An additional area that RCC can continue to work on is encouraging the sustainability of the program when schools are no longer supported, especially in relation to the community teacher. A stronger transition process needs to be developed to continue the community empowerment process where the RCC program might be leaving. Not only is it an issue whether that community teacher remains, but whether the government teacher is capable and willing to maintain the methodology? Another component that RCC should address with communities is building significance to the resources created, so that if a school is no longer partnered with a RCC program, the community will continue to see value in the materials created so that they remain in the classrooms in good condition for continued use.

Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Program

With CDS’ program, the family literacy program and the parental involvement program emerged as strengths. However in order to sustain the program, issues such as technical assistance and monitoring to bring about sustained attitudinal changes among teachers, emphasis on linking the methodology with the syllabus, and reducing dependency on materials provided must be addressed as the program expands.

Technical Assistance

Teachers’ interviews revealed that while they could talk about the contents covered in the training, this had not translated in their work with children. Teachers were observed to continue using traditional methods of teaching and learning; activities appeared to be sporadic and many teachers reported that they could not use the methodology daily. The only aspect of the methodology that could be used was the morning meetings and these too, were not reported as being carried out daily. Teachers in Islamabad Capital Territory reported that a separate day had been allocated for activities. Every Friday children did activities since this was a half day in most schools. CDS’ focus on democratizing the learning environment, encouraging children to take initiative and make active choices was not observed to have been internalized by the teachers evaluated, since many children reported that the teachers used corporal punishment to discipline them.

- Stronger technical assistance and direct monitoring will ensure that teachers are learning how to apply what they were trained in.

CDS needs to change the emphasis of technical assistance from “facilitation” to one which includes classroom monitoring and supervising. Teachers need to be encouraged and monitored to use the methodology and be shown how to apply it, rather than be provided with “permission” to downplay the use of the methodology.

Linking Methodology to the Classroom; Material Usage and Dependency

CDS faces the challenge of maintaining quality in the classrooms as they expand. The evaluation uncovered a disconnect between the training received and the impact it makes in the classroom; teachers need to be further supported in how to use the materials and methodology as a method of supporting the syllabus.

- CDS needs to strengthen the link between their methodology and how it can be used – consistently – to support teachers in teaching the syllabus.

Once this gap is bridged, teachers should feel more comfortable with and more competent in using materials in the classroom on a more constant basis. Stronger technical assistance in the area of monitoring performance, combined with the encouragement and monitoring of teachers in planning their day/week and how activities will fit into the lessons, will help teachers not only conceptualize this, but put it into practice.

Teachers also need greater encouragement on how to utilize indigenous materials to support their lessons, and monitoring to ensure that they do so.

Recommendations for Both Programs

Both programs had challenges with disparity and sanitation.

Amplification

In order to address the issues of disparity, both programs need to take an “*area/talukah/tehsil*” approach, which is to work with all classes; including when there are multiple sessions per class level in a school, and schools within a certain area. Both programs are expanding laterally – into higher elementary grade levels (for RCC, up to Class 3; for CDS, up to Class 5) – as well as horizontally – into more schools.⁴¹ Both programs should ensure that as they work in schools, they work with ALL sessions of each grade they focus on, per school. In addition, both programs should ensure they work with all schools within a targeted district, as possible, to ensure equal opportunity. Conversely, both programs should have a plan in place when ending a relationship with a school, which will provide encouragement of program continuation without the direct support of monitoring and technical assistance.

⁴¹ This difference in the approach to the lateral expansion stems from the difference in methodological philosophy; **RCC** is focused on early childhood development as defined up to age 8, whereas **CDS** is focused on education only, and can easily integrate into higher classroom levels.

Sanitation

No school observed, urban or rural, had soap available for use, nor was any teacher or child observed to wash their hands. No government schools – except for those with “adopters” (one that had adopted the school and privately supports it) – had *ayahs* to ensure sanitation. This was an issue for both programs.

While the urban schools CDS work with had water, their bathrooms were very unsanitary, not only for the lack of soap, but also the lack of an *ayah* to ensure cleanliness. While CDS does not address sanitation in their program’s goals and objectives, their partnership with the government can be used to influence them and make sanitation a priority. Their work in family literacy has been expanding job opportunities for family members, and becoming *ayahs* is one way families can be encouraged to further support themselves. This issue will also become greater as CDS expands to rural settings and the northern areas of the country.

This is an issue of greater concern for RCC programs, given that sanitation is a component of RCC’s development approach. Sanitation is more challenging in the rural areas due to the unavailability of water (in addition to a lack of an *ayah* in the schools).

Continual monitoring of school sites in regards to sanitation is needed, and follow-up with SMCs and other community groups is needed to ensure that challenges-- such as the one school where the water pump was stolen--can be addressed in a timely manner. Advocacy on sanitation is needed to ensure that communities see sanitation as a priority to support the health, wellbeing, and learning potential of the children.

Because the communities lack the funds to address this, it is imperative that the government intervene. One DOE interviewee defended the water situation, saying all schools have water; it was unclear whether this official truly was unaware of the situation, or if he was in denial. Greater advocacy is needed to obtain funds for the set-up and maintenance of water access.

GoP’s ECE Program – Future Implications

Subsequent to the work done by the two institutions and the governments’ own plan to further early childhood in the country, a positive enrollment trend is now being reported by government data. A report shared by the Federal Ministry of Education shows that the Gross Enrollment Rate in pre-primary populations has increased from 36.3% in 2001-2002 to 56.2% in 2005-2006. However, for sustainability of early childhood in the country a lot more may be needed per the opinion of program heads and others working in this field.

In January 2005, the Ministry of Education began a series of exercises to envision what the educational system could look like in the year 2025. This process is to include 3 stages, with a discussion document generated after each stage; “Vision 2025: Discussion Document 1” has been published.⁴² The ultimate goal is to generate attainable, financially feasible strategic plans.

⁴² A final vision document was scheduled for March 2006; this document was unavailable for review.

Values stated in Vision 2025 include: improving classroom learning; efficiency and use of valuable resources; and affordability. What follows are bulleted points raised in the Vision 2025 document and the manner in which RCC and CDS support those points.

- The expectation is that “teachers keep themselves updated with their subjects and with new ways of teaching it. To provide children and teachers with an environment in which their learning is maximized, the head teacher must learn how to do his/her job well. To ensure such schools within the districts, the concerned district officials need to learn how best they can use the resources at the district level to provide assistance to the schools. In sum, learning needs to take place across the system at the same level, and up and down the system at various levels.”⁴³

Both RCC and CDS programs work in line with this vision. They work with teachers to enhance their teaching abilities and improve the classroom environment. Both programs seek to include all levels of the system – teachers, head teachers, district officials – in the interventions they provide.

- “Frequent transfer of education personnel is a practice that introduces a great deal of inefficiency into the system,”⁴⁴ and “politically motivated transfers will be eliminated.”⁴⁵

Both programs advocate the maintenance of stability in the system, and have noted how transfers have affected their program achievements both positively, as in CDS’ ability to obtain MOUs that limit transfers, and negatively, as when RCC has faced ongoing challenges with teacher and government official transfers.

- “All classrooms will support ‘genuine learning’,” and will be led by a “professional educationist skilled in a number of modern pedagogical techniques that foster inquiry, interaction, and problem solving among all students regardless of their learning styles. Teachers will assess their pupils on a continuous basis, helping them to reflect on what they did right, what they did wrong, and how they could best learn from their mistakes.”⁴⁶

Both program methodologies utilize strategies that support the above desired outcomes.

- The need for ongoing, need-based professional development, which is then applied in practice, was noted to ensure quality.

The RCC program demonstrated on-going, supportive monitoring and technical assistance, as well as professional development opportunities within their partnership; this was successfully translated into classroom practice.

- The cost implications of a pupil-teacher ratio of 25:1 and the need to hire new teachers, and to well-equip classrooms, were mentioned.

It should be noted that from a development perspective of early childhood, classrooms for four- and five-year-olds should have no more than 20 children per class, and the pupil-teacher ratio

⁴³ “Vision 2025: DD 1”. Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education. Pg. 10.

⁴⁴ Ibid. Pg. 10.

⁴⁵ Ibid. Pg. 14.

⁴⁶ Ibid. pg. 11.

should be 20:2.⁴⁷ RCC supports this ratio, and hopes to achieve it with the inclusion of community teachers.

As the government looks to hire new teachers, incorporating RCC community teachers into the government's recognized education system would be a way to increase the available workforce. Additionally, the government would know that they are getting staff trained in early childhood who were being provided strong mentoring and monitoring support.

RCC has proven that, through the use of low-cost, indigenous materials provided by teachers and the communities, a well-equipped classroom does not have to cost much. Their partnership with communities to provide additional classroom space can be used as a model to expand to other schools to build additional classroom space.

It is recommended that the government supports and assumes the cost of ensuring that every school has an adequate water supply, as well as an *ayah* in attendance.

- Vision 2025 discussed the possibility of an official career ladder, and need for professional development infrastructure.

One possible way the GoP could address this issue and bring *katchi* community teachers into the system, is to provide a separate *katchi* certification. This certification would allow teachers to teach early childhood, but would not allow the teacher to teach the higher elementary classes; this would require additional training. Differentiated certification might also decrease the transfers of teachers between class levels, and would ensure that only those trained in early childhood are teaching the *katchi* children.

This is very similar to what is currently in place in the United States of America. Currently, teachers working in child care centers/pre-schools, and family care settings have two levels of certification they can achieve – Child Development Associate (CDA), which indicates a teacher has achieved a certain number of training hours and training topics, and an Associates of Arts (AA), which indicates that a teacher has received additional topics and training hours in early childhood, similar to two years in university. Four years at a university level would earn a Bachelor's in Early Childhood, which could provide additional movement up a career ladder. RCC partners like AKU-HDP have training for early childhood, including Advanced Diplomas. CDS provides training as well. The GoP could work with both programs to evaluate their training (hours, topics, etc) and determine how certifications might be included into the greater GoP's Education framework.

⁴⁷ National Association for the Education of Young Children.

CONCLUSION

The evaluation team determined that it was valuable for USAID to support the implementation of these two different programs. Considering the difference in areas served, approach, and methodology used, each model proved to have strengths and the possibility for expansion. The Government of Pakistan now has two models that demonstrate how early childhood might be addressed, and components of both could be incorporated into the Government of Pakistan's education model to support school readiness as well as overall family health and opportunity.

While the ownership of early childhood must be placed in the hands of the government, and no single funder can provide ongoing support indefinitely, the two programs' strengths have shown how early childhood could be replicated in government schools. The evaluation team sees value in USAID continuing to advocate early childhood education to the Government of Pakistan and fund both programs in order to continue strengthening the opportunities available for young children, their families, and teachers.

Encouraging both programs to complete a cost-benefit analysis, as well as longitudinal studies of how children in their programs do in future schooling (such as retention in school, cognitive gains, social-emotional skills) could provide effective support for the Government of Pakistan's continued and increased investment.

Ideally, what is needed is a combination from each program's strengths:

*RCC's classroom environment, teacher training and follow-up,
community involvement, and focus on development*
+
*CDS' philosophy of democratic classrooms, parent
involvement, family literacy, and advocacy*
=
*a holistic early childhood development and education model
that benefits children and their families, and can be replicated
by the government for both urban and rural areas successfully.*



RCC program in Hyderabad. An example of early childhood principles; young children playing together, using hands on materials to learn about concepts relevant to them.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: USAID DEBRIEFING POWERPOINT PRESENTATION



Early Childhood Education Program Evaluation
Presentation of Findings

DevTech Systems, Inc.
Wendy Rich-Orloff, Team Leader
Jamshed Khan, Teacher Training Specialist
Audrey Jama, Early Childhood Education Specialist

[27 November 2007]

Purpose

- To evaluate the impact and effectiveness of USAID's supported early childhood education programs during 2002-2006.
- The evaluation covered the following 2 programs:
 - **Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC)** by Aga Khan Foundation
 - **Creating Democratic Schools (CDS)** by Children's Resources International –



Background

- **Aga Khan Foundation Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Project (Grant Number 391-G-00-04-01020-00)**
- **The program was approved in September 2001** and began implementation in November 2002 after delays due to the events of September 11, 2001 and the opening of the USAID/Pakistan Mission.
- **AKF partnered with six local NGOs** in the provinces of Sindh and Balochistan in developing and implementing indigenous early childhood models and methodologies in 100 girls' schools.
- **AKF supported activities in schools that aimed to develop teacher capacity and improve administration** by teaching a broad understanding of ECE concepts and the use of appropriate teaching techniques within individual classrooms, school communities, local government structures and implementing NGO partners.

Background

- **CRI Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) Project (Under Leader Award No. GEG-A-00-01-00005-00)**
- The Creating Democratic Schools (CDS) project was implemented by CRI, through a sub-grant from PACT, and began in February 2002.
- The project worked in approximately 120 public schools in Rawalpindi, Islamabad and Karachi. The project aimed to increase:
 - Use of child-centered methods in pre-school and primary grades;
 - Family participation in the schools through a family literacy program;
 - Attendance and retention rates, and access to education.
- Activities under this project included: teacher training, provision of resource materials, family literacy, and introduction of early childhood education courses at the university level.

The Evaluation Methodology

- **Background document review**
 - Publications, reports, etc
- **Site visits**
 - 10% schools per program (total 31 observed)
- **Interviews and Focus group discussions**
 - Parents, teachers, head teachers, children, government officials, community members, partners, etc.



Key Strategic and Priority Questions

- Did the ECD programs complete the activities in the original grant and cooperative agreement and in the annual work plans?
- What, if any, is the value added of having two different program models in early childhood development?
- Was one approach more effective than the other? If so, what evidence is there for this and what made it more effective?

Key Strategic and Priority Questions cont.

- Was one approach more cost-effective than the other?
- Did the programs have an impact on learning outcomes and teaching methods in the areas in which they operated?
- Did this program contribute to the GOP's ECD program? How and are those contributions likely to have an impact even after the program's end?

Achievements/Strengths: RCC

- **Strong classroom environment** which enhances children's learning
 - 89% of schools observed demonstrated use of learning areas
- **Encouraged community and parent involvement**
- **Technical competencies** were developed/enhanced through:
 - Trainings, seminars, Advanced Diploma development
- **Regular supervision** and monitoring



Achievements/Strengths: RCC

- **Extensive focus on continued capacity development of teachers** (teacher training, follow-up, monitoring, etc), which contributed to better classroom practices
- **Dissemination of early childhood development information** and resources available for all (website, publications, etc)
- **Consortium of partners**
- **Increase retention rate 95%** (program report)



Achievements/Strengths: CDS

- **Strong relationship and advocacy with government**, at all levels, as well as other organizations
 - Obtained commitment through MOUs for no teacher transfers after 3 years of being trained
 - Asked to extend program to all public schools in ICT
- **Used existing infrastructure** of government schools



Achievements/Strengths: CDS

- Family Literacy Program
- Parent Involvement – Islamabad and Rawalpindi
- Increased retention rates 100% (program report)
- Equipped classrooms with materials (85% classrooms observed)



Missing Links: RCC

- **Isolation of RCC classroom from rest of school – “branding”**
 - Separate room, separate teacher
 - Challenge with government recognition of community teachers
- **Advocacy with government was not successful**
 - Community teachers not recognized
 - MOUs not honored
 - Recognition of AKF's RCC program was inconsistent

Missing Links: RCC cont.

- All research proposed not completed
 - Cost-benefit analysis
- Lack of partner coordination
- Sustainability a challenge when RCC partnership withdrawn
- Did not work with all *katchi* classes per school where implementation was taking place, leading to feelings of disparity
- **Poor sanitary conditions**

Challenges: RCC

- “Age issue” – because GoP Policy created a *katchi* class with a 3-5 age range, children aged 4 must repeat *katchi* because they are not yet eligible for promotion to class 1.
- Frequent government official transfers – affected advocacy and long-term awareness
- Working with single-, two-teacher rural schools

Missing Links: CDS

- Missing link between training and implementation
 - Use of materials and methodology
 - Dependent on materials, teachers
 - Philosophy of “democratic classrooms” observed to be weak
- Weak technical assistance regarding monitoring of classrooms
- Parent involvement in Karachi – ineffective
- Did not work with all *katchi* classes per school where implementation was taking place
- **Poor sanitation conditions**

Cost-Benefit Analysis

- | | | |
|---|-----|--|
| | RCC | CDS |
| • Higher % salary to operational cost ratio (46% salary, 54% operational) | | • Lower % salary to operational cost ratio (35% salary, 65% operational) |
| • More partners in play | | • Fewer staff, as sole implementers |
| • Lower % operational costs as compared to CRI; Greater use of low-cost, indigenous materials | | • Greater % operational costs as compared to AKF; Greater dependence on CRI-provided materials |

Cost-Benefit Analysis

	RCC		CDS	
	\$	%	\$	%
Salary	\$1,599,467	46%	\$1,200,328	35%
Operational	\$1,842,280	54%	\$2,255,243	65%
Total	\$3,441,747		\$3,455,571	

Contribution to GoP’s ECE Program

- **RCC**
 - Provided a holistic model approach, demonstrating how different services can be integrated.
 - Provided the concept of a separate class and separate teacher, giving greater opportunities for *katchi* children to be enrolled.
- **CDS**
 - Showed government how program could be implemented within existing government infrastructure
 - Ownership with the government from program onset
 - (ie, site selection)
 - Strong government relationship on all levels

Contribution to GoP’s ECE Program

- GoP exploring ECE as a component of the formal schooling system
- System on paper but not in practice
- BOTH programs provided a model for ECE implementation in government schools
- BOTH programs built capacity in the public and private sectors



Recommendations - RCC

- Greater focused advocacy with government
 - Integrate development into the discussion
 - Incorporate community teachers and RCC program into the greater government framework
- Address continued sanitation issues consistently, with follow-up and monitoring



Recommendations – RCC cont.

- Create a stronger transition process with communities when RCC discontinues support – government teacher training, community and government ownership, maintenance of materials



Recommendations - CDS

- Strengthen technical assistance, and enhance monitoring of classroom integration:
 - Material use
 - Teacher attitudinal change
 - Linking syllabus with methodology; planning



Conclusion by Evaluation Team

- Both programs have added value to the concept of how ECE can be implemented in the country.
- While the ownership must be in the hands of the government and no single funder can provide ongoing support indefinitely, **the 2 programs' strengths have shown how the program can be replicated in government schools.**
- Both programs should do cost-benefit analysis and longitudinal studies to build the knowledge base in ECE.

Combine each program's strengths

- AKF's classroom environment, teacher training and follow-up, community involvement, and focus on development
- +
- CRI's philosophy of democratic classrooms, parent involvement, family literacy, and advocacy
- =
- Quality ECD programming for the benefit of children and families

APPENDIX B: LIST OF CONTACTS

Islamabad/Rawalpindi

1. Muhammad Tariq Khan, USAID
2. Dr. Randy Hatfield, USAID
3. Mehnaz Aziz, Chief Executive, CRI
4. Muhammad Zubair, Program Coordinator, CRI
5. Shehzad, CRI
6. Seema, CRI
7. Nazakat, CRI
8. Fakhira, CRI
9. Samina Anjum, MT, CRI
10. Tasleem, CRI
11. Prof. Rafiq Tahir, Director Training and Colleges, Federal Directorate of Education
12. Dr. Muhammad Saleem, Deputy Educational Advisor, Projects, Ministry of Education
13. Dr. Muhammad Hanif, Assistant Educational Advisor, Focal Person for ECE, Ministry of Education
14. Raja Gulzar, DEO, Rawalpindi
15. M. Nasir Kiayani, AEO, Rawalpindi
16. Ms. Shahida Iqbal, Head Teacher, FGMS I-8/1
17. Mrs. Amina Tariq, ECE Teacher FGMS I-8/1
18. Zafar Iqbal Satti, Parent FGMS I-8/1
19. Mrs. Yasin, Parent, FGMS I-8/1
20. Saadia Zulfiqar, Parent, FGMS I-8/1
21. Shaista Iqbal, Parent, FGMS I-8/1
22. Muhammad Rahman, Parent, FGMS I-8/1
23. Aneeqa, Parent, FGMS I-8/1
24. Muhammad Riaz, AEO Taxila
25. Raja Zulfiqar, AEO, Murree
26. Fauzia Ghafoor, Class 1 Teacher, Govt. Elementary School, Khayaban, IV
27. Arif Amin, Program Manager Education, AKF
28. Amatuz Zahra Rizvi, AKF
29. Akbar Jawad, AKF
30. Dr. Reehana Raza of LUMS and her team on evaluation of CRI interventions
31. Khalida Ahmad, UNICEF, Islamabad
32. Malik Akhta Ali, DEO, Taxila
33. Shagufta Yasee, Head Teacher, Dhok Hassu
34. Atau Rehman Chaudhry, Jinnah School Taxila

Karachi

1. Dr. Muhammad Ali, Secretary Education, Govt. Of Sindh, Karachi
2. Saqib Soomro, Additional Secretary Schools, Karachi
3. Ms. Fakhre karim, EDO Karachi
4. M. Arshad, AD 1, EDO Office Karachi
5. Kashif, AD 2, EDO Office Karachi
6. Aftab, Focal person, CRI Programs, EDO Karachi

7. Marina Moris, ECE Teacher, CDGS No. 1 Agra Taj Colony
8. Head Teacher CDGS No. 1 Agra Taj Colony
9. Nishat Naeem, ADO, Ch. Rahmat Ali Boys School, Afternoon Shift, North Nazimabad
10. Family Literacy participants of Ch. Rahmat Ali School
11. Ishrat Agha, Head Teacher, GGPS Eck Eck Colony
12. Rukhsana Munir, Class 1 Teacher
13. Humaira Amin, Class 2 Teacher
14. Sumayya Ayoob, senior Manager, SEF, Karachi
15. Aziz Kabani, Director SEF
16. Shukri, SEF, Karachi
17. Dr Ghazala, Director AKU-HDP
18. Seema, Rizwana and two other staff members AKU-HDP
19. Sughra Chaudhry Khan, CEO, AKES,P
20. Shahzad, AKES,P
21. Mansoor Tufeyl, National Coordinator, AKES,P
22. Mujeeb Rahu, Senior Manager HANDS
23. Director, HANDS
24. Mehnaz Mahmood, Director Program Development, TRC, Karachi
25. Amima Sayeed, Senior Manager, TRC
26. Saadia Shakeel, CRI Coordinator
27. Masooma, Documentation Officer, CRI
28. Tasleem, Head Teacher, GGPS Chanessar Ghot
29. Nizah Ali, Teacher GGPS Chanessar Ghot
30. M. Shamsul Haq Siddiqui, Shaheen Public School

Hyderabad, Matiari and Tando Muhammad Khan

1. Dr. Siddiqui, EDO Education, Hyderabad
2. Ehsan Ilahi, DO, SEMIS, Hyderabad
3. Afroz, EDO Education, Tando Muhammad Khan
4. Iqbal A. Memon, DO Headquarters, Hyderabad
5. Farah ADO, Hyderabad
6. Hameeda, Teacher GGPS Dhita
7. Habib Zadi and five other mothers in Dhita
8. Ghulam Muhammad Memon, EDO Office, Hyderabad
9. Noor Ali, Teacher GBPS Bhakar Jamali
10. Afshan, Gulabi, Ali Raza and Arshad, students of kachi class with no RCC support
11. Ali Akbar chairman and 8 members of the community, SMC Bhakar Jamali
12. Haji Abdul Wahab, ADO Tando Muhammad Khan
13. Head Teacher, GGPS Pattar, Tando Muhammad Khan
14. Teacher, Katchi Class, GGPS, Tando Muhammad Khan
15. ADO Hala, Matiari
16. Head Teacher and other teachers of GGPS Talibul Maula Colony, Hala

Quetta

1. Saleem Sadiq, Additional Secretary Education, Govt. of Baluchistan, Quetta

2. Waheed Khan, Under Secretary, Department of Education, Quetta
3. Hamid Mahmood, Focal Person for ESR/EFA, Project Director IT, Education Department
4. Muhammad Anwar Training Coordinator, Society
5. Ms. Hina , Society
6. Muhammad Amir, Society
7. Haji Jan Muhammad, Chairman, VEC, GGPS Mamozai Kawas, Ziarat
8. Nusrat Din, Member VEC,
9. Jan Bibi, Teacher , GGPS Mamozai Kawas, Ziarat
10. ECE Teacher, GGHS Killi Gharbi Kawas, Ziarat
11. Naheeda, ECE Teacher GGPS, Quba Kawas, Ziarat
12. Shamim Aziz, DEO Lasbela
13. Shahnaz Kanwal, Teacher RCC , GGMS Notani, Lasbela
14. Khair Muhammad, Member PTSMC, Notani
15. Rafiq Ahmad, Member, PTSMC, Notani
16. Seeda Bibi, RCC trained teacher, Notani
17. Tahira Noor, RCC trained teacher , Notani
18. Teachers of GGMS Balochi Ghot, Lasbela
19. M. Qasim, Chairman and 10 members of Education Council, RCC Schools, Bela, Lasbela
20. Fayyaz Shah, District Coordinator Society, Lasbele, Baluchistan
21. Khadija Bibi Head Teacher, GGHS Bela,
22. Ishrat Sultana, Teacher, GGHS Bela
23. Yasmeen Khan, ECE Facilitator
24. Muhammad Saleem, Society

In addition, other teachers, parents, community members and children were interviewed whose names were not noted.

APPENDIX C: LIST OF SITES VISITED

Children's Resources International

Islamabad	FGGMS I-8/1, Islamabad
	FGJMS G-8/1, Islamabad
Rawalpindi	Govt. Girls Primary School Carriage Factory, Dhok Hassu, Rawalpindi
	Govt. Boys Elementary School, Khayaban, Sector IV, Rawalpindi
	Govt. Girls Elementary School Sangseri, Murree, District Rawalpindi
	The Founders Boys Secondary School, Ahata (formerly called Jinnah Ideal, Ahata) Taxila, District Rawalpindi
	GGPS, Ahata, Taxila
	GCBHS Anwar Abad, Taxila
Karachi	CDGK No.1 Agra Taj Colony, Karachi
	GGPS Chanessar Goth Karachi
	GGPS Eck Eck Colony, Karachi
	Ch. Rahmat Ali Boys School, North Nazimabad
	Shaheen Public School, Orangi Karachi

Aga Khan Foundation

Hyderabad	GGPS Detha, Mirpur Khas Road Rahimabad, District Hyderabad
	GGPS Tando Hyder, Distt. Hyderabad
	GGPS Mori Manger, District Hyderabad
Tando Muhammad Khan	GGPS Paliyo Ghurmani, Tando Muhammad Khan
	GGPS Yar Muhammad Kandra
	GGPS Pattar, Matli Road, Tando Muhammad Khan
Matiari	GBPS Lukman Koreja, Bagh Jamali, Hala, Matiari
	GBPS Bakher Jamali, Saeedabad, Matiari
	GGPS Talibul Maula Colony, Hala, Matiari
	GGPMS Bhanuth, Hala Matiari
Pishin	GBPS Balawari, District Pishin
	GGMS Killi Muchan
Ziarat	GGPS Mamozai Kawas, District Ziarat
	GGPS Quba Kawas, District Ziarat
	GGHS Killi Gharbi Kawas, district Ziarat
Lasbela	GGHS Bela, district Lasbela
	GGMS Notani, district Lasbela
	GGMS Balochi Goth

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Aga Khan Foundation

Introductory questions

1. How would you describe your model of early childhood?
2. What was your rationale for selection of partners for the program?
 - a. Was urban-rural distribution of schools kept in mind?
 - b. Why were certain provinces chosen and not others?
3. What would you say were the main/unique features of the program that would be different from other early childhood programs/projects being implemented in the country?
4. What curriculum approach/ philosophy did you use in implementing the early childhood program? Why?
5. What are some of the main successes of your program? What are some of the challenges that you encountered?
6. Were there differences in implementation within the different provinces?
7. How did the provinces/districts own sub-culture effect program implementation?
8. Were there any changes that you observed in the beneficiaries as a result of participating in the program?
9. How were the socio-cultural and religious context incorporated in the design of the program?
10. What kind of impact did the program have on its beneficiaries? Were there changes in learning outcomes/ teaching methods/ attitudes of beneficiaries?
11. How did the program contribute to the GoP's ECD program?
12. How would you describe working with the public sector schools?
13. What mechanisms were put in place to ensure the sustainability of the program?
14. What kind of impact would you say is visible even after program has ended?
15. What is the current situation of the early childhood program that was implemented, now that the USAID funding has ended?
16. What impact have you had on the policy of ECD in Pakistan?

Organization

1. What was the organizational structure for the RCC program under phase II?
2. What was the time allocation for each of your staff members working on this specific program?

Community

1. What was the rationale for choosing the communities in the provinces of Sindh and Baluchistan?
2. Why was the community model used as an approach for implementing the early childhood program?
3. How many communities benefited from the program?
4. What impact would you say the program had on the communities it worked with?
 - a. What were the positive outcomes?
 - b. What were negative outcomes?
5. What kind of relationships developed with the communities as a result of this program?

Teachers

1. How many teachers benefited from this program?
2. What changes, if any, were observed in teachers as a result of participating in this program?
3. How were the government teachers and community teachers recruited for the program?

4. What were the benefits of working with government and community teachers under the RCC program?
5. What were some challenges of working with government and community teachers?
6. Did CRI ever sponsor teachers to get future credentials in ECE such as BAs, MAs, etc?
7. How do you train your teachers to use gosha/materials?

Children

1. How many children have benefited from this program?
2. What positive impacts have you seen in children who have participated in this program?
3. What impact has the program had on children's learning outcomes?

Budget

1. What was the cost of the program?
2. In your opinion how cost effective was the program?
3. What were the components of the program and what percentage of the budget was allocated to each component of the program?

Children's Resources International

Introductory questions

1. Describe the work that CRI does in early childhood?
How would you describe your model of early childhood?
2. What was your rationale for selection of schools for your program?
Why did you decide to work in urban settings vs. rural settings?
3. How would you describe working with public sector schools?
4. What curriculum approach/philosophy did you use in implementing the early childhood program? Why?
5. What would you say were the main/unique features of the program that would be different from other early childhood program /projects being implemented in the country?
6. What are some of the main successes of your program? What are some of the challenges that you encountered?
7. Were there any changes that you observed in the beneficiaries as a result of participating in the program?
8. How were the socio-cultural and religious context incorporated in the design of the program?
9. How did the program contribute to the GoP's ECD program?
10. What mechanisms were put in place to ensure the sustainability of the program?
11. What kind of impact would you say is visible even after program has ended?
12. What is the current situation of the early childhood program that was implemented, now that the USAID funding has ended?
13. What impact have you had on the policy of ECD in Pakistan?
14. Describe the work PACT does?
15. What was the relationship between PACT and CRI?
16. Were certain physical targets given to CRI by PACT during the project life?
17. Is PTA training included in the charter? If yes, what areas?
18. What was your rationale in site selection:
 - a. Why was Karachi specifically selected instead of more rural Sindh and Baluchistan areas?
 - b. Why was Rawalpindi included in the scope of the project, considering it is part of Punjab?
19. Given that CRI is planning to expand to FATA, how do you plan that expansion?

CRI-Washington

1. Describe the work PACT did?

2. Describe the work you did?
3. What was the relationship between CRI and PACT on this project?
4. Did CRI share annual work plans with PACT and Pakistan office prior to implementation of the work plan?
5. Regarding the budget, did PACT have any instructions for allocating funds to different components of the program?
6. Were certain physical targets given to CRI by PACT and Pakistan office during the project life?
7. How did CRI operationalize the ECE program in Pakistan?
8. Was baseline data collected on the schools chosen to participate prior to implementation?

Organization

1. What was the organizational structure of the early childhood program funded by USAID?
2. What was the time allocation for each of your staff member working on this specific program?

Teachers/ Teacher training

1. How many teachers have you trained through your program?
 - a. How many teachers would be enrolled in each of the training program?
2. What curriculum do you have for teacher training?
3. What impact have you had in classrooms as a result of your teacher training component?
4. What is the qualification of your trainers? Are they trained in early childhood?
5. Who trains the faculty of different early childhood institutions?
6. What is the duration of teacher training program?
7. Did CRI ever sponsor teachers to get future credentials in ECE such as BAs, MAs, etc?
8. How do you train your teachers to use gosha/materials?
9. How do you tell teachers to use morning meetings, activities in the classroom (probe)?
10. What was the rationale between 3-days vs. 5-days training? What is the content in each?

Community

1. Describe how you involve community members with your early childhood program?
2. How has your adult literacy program contributed to impacting the overall early childhood program?
3. From where do you recruit staff to teach on the adult literacy program / other program?
4. Describe the training program for community members?

Children

1. How many children have benefited from this program?
2. What positive impacts have you seen in children who have participated in this program?
3. What impact has the program had on children's learning outcomes?
4. What impact does this have on reducing drop-out rate at the primary level?

Budget

1. What was the cost of the program?
2. In your opinion how cost effective was the program?
3. What were the components of the program and what percentage of the budget was allocated to each component of the program?

Government (federal government representative, provincial government representative)

1. How does the government of Pakistan support early childhood education?
(for federal government: Is there any provision in the current/upcoming five year plan for early childhood education?)
2. How would you describe the models of early childhood implemented by AKF and CRI?
(for local government: What do you know about the RCC program and CRI's early childhood education program)
3. How would you describe the models of early childhood implemented by AKF and CRI?
4. In your opinion, how did it compliment/ not compliment the government's early childhood program?
5. Which model do you think was more compatible to Pakistan's socio-cultural and religious context?
6. How did the program contribute to the overall GoP's ECD program?
7. If you were to highlight positive impacts of both programs what would these be? What would you say were the negative impacts of the program?
8. What impact did the program have on enrollment and retention trends in the country, especially the provinces where the program was implemented?
9. How was the drop out rate impacted as a result of these programs being implemented?
10. What is the government's future plan for ECD?
11. Will ECD be included in the government's educational prospective plan?
12. Do you think the models used by CRI and AKF could be replicated by the government? Why and why not? Which model would be a better model for the government to adopt? Which program model would you say is more successful?
13. In what ways were government officials capacity built as a result of these programs being implemented?
14. How has the government benefited from these programs?
15. Is there any plan to extend this program to other provinces of the country?
16. Who do you plan/hope to partner with to achieve that? Why?

Sindh only:

1. If the government adopts different ECE teacher guides, would you work with the TRC guide or use the CRI guide?

Partners – AKF

1. Describe your role as a partner with AKF in RCC phase II?
2. What would you say were the strengths of the RCC phase II program?
3. What were the challenges you encountered during RCC phase II?
4. How did this program compliment/ not compliment the GoP's ECD program?
5. How did this program contribute towards building your own institutional capacity/ capacity of other stake holders?
6. Did you achieve the outcomes that you had initially planned at the beginning of the program?
(if not, why was this not possible to achieve?)
7. What was the learning that accrued from this phase of the program?
8. In your opinion was it feasible for AKF to partner with a range of organizations? How was this beneficial? How was it not beneficial?
 - a. In your opinion were synergies developed between partners? Give examples?
9. To what extent did the program incorporate the socio-cultural and the religious context?

10. The RCC programs' success (as recorded in the report) is attributed to it using a 'consultative and experimental approach to development and ECD intervention', how far would you agree with this? Give examples.
11. What measures were taken to ensure sustainability of the program?
12. How did your role change from phase II to III, if at all?

For technical partners (TRC, Sindh Education Center, AKUHDP)

1. What kind of support did you provide to partners during phase II of the program?
2. How did this support impact the overall program?
3. What were the challenges working with implementing partners?
4. What kind of working relationship was established between the partners and AKF?

TRC only:

1. If the government sponsors a CRI teacher guide, would you take it up?
2. Would you be preparing a teacher guide based on the curriculum?
3. How do you train the teachers to use gosha/materials?

For implementing partners (AKSP, HANDS, Society)

1. What was your rationale for selecting the communities/ schools for this phase of the program?
2. Considering that the core focus of the project was to, 'enhance ownership and sustainability of activities carried out under RCC I', do you think this was achieved? How would you say this was done?
3. What was your learning from working with the government? What were the benefits? What were the challenges?
4. What kind of relationships transpired with the government as a result of the program?
5. How did changes in local government affect the implementation of the program?
6. How did you select the sites for the LRC's? How many LRC's were established?
7. How did the establishment of LRC's and other ECD publications contribute to realizing the goals of the program? How many of the LRC's are functional at the moment?
8. What was the role of Academic Leaders in program implementation? (for AKES,P)
9. What was your process for selecting mentor teachers?
10. While you provide teacher training through the technical partners, do you sponsor teachers to get BAs/advanced degrees in ECE?

Questions for Teachers

1. What is your perspective of what ECE is?
2. What are your basic academic and professional qualifications?
3. What in-service courses have you attended during the last five years, their duration, methodologies, contents and year of attending the courses?
4. Mention in particular the training courses you have attended on the subject of ECE and their relevance to the present job?
5. Which areas you consider required more focus and high concentration in the training program?
6. What areas do you consider were given more focus in the training program but are not being practiced currently?
7. Was the overall training duration sufficient? If not what should have been the total duration?
8. What were the weaknesses and strengths of the training course you attended for ECE?

9. Were the resource persons for the training program competent enough to impart knowledge and skill to the participants of the program? If not which areas needed further qualified staff to teach?
10. What difficulties have you overcome as a result of the training course? How did the training change your approach in ECE?
11. Was your participation in the training program at your consent or without consent simply ordered by the seniors? If ordered from above, what would have been your option if asked before sending for the training?
12. What difficulties are you facing now could be included in the next training courses?
13. Is there any difference of status of teachers teaching *Katchi* compared to others at primary level?
14. What other classes you teach apart from the *Katchi* classes?
15. How many students do you have in your *Katchi* Class? How many enrolled in the beginning of the academic session? How many dropped out? Reasons for dropping out?
16. How many parents of these children you personally know (%age), interact with you on weekly, monthly or quarterly basis?
17. Does your school provide the same facilities (space, furniture etc.) to the ECE children as to other children in your school?
18. On checking from Attendance Register, could you tell us the retention level of the ECE students in higher grades compared to others who were enrolled directly in Class 1?
19. State the possible reasons for the parents to get their children admitted in the ECE. Why others are not attracted to get admitted?
20. How many visits the school supervisors do in an academic year? What aspects of performance are reported? Do you get feedback or professional guidance from the supervisors after the visit?
21. Do you think the teaching methodologies you are using for the ECE are more effective and useful for the children to learn?
22. What problems are you facing to achieve higher performance and better results?
23. What impact do you see in case the current technical and financial assistance are withdrawn now or after 4/5 years?

Questions for Students

1. How do you come to the school? Dropped by your parents, come alone or with other students?
2. What would you like to be after getting education?
3. Are you happier in school or in home? Why?
4. Do you play in school? What game do you normally play?
5. Do you play at home? If yes, what game do you normally play?
6. Do you get homework? If yes, what happens if you do not complete the homework?
7. Who helps in your home work?
8. Does the teacher know your name? Does he know your father/mother?
9. Which learning area (Gosha) do you like most? What is your favorite toy?
10. Which learning area (Gosha) you do not like and why?
11. Which teacher in the school you like most? Why?
12. Does your teacher call your name or roll number for marking your attendance daily?

Questions for PTAs

1. For how long the PTA/PTC/SMC/VEC in your school is in operation? If yes, how many members are there in this organization?
2. How often the meeting takes place? Is there any record system for recording minutes of the meeting?
3. What activities the school committees are supposed to carry out?
4. Do they come regularly to the school and meet the teachers and students to see the teachers and students attendance and that the classes are taken regularly?
5. Do they have some funds for the development of the school/educational activities? If yes what projects they have completed? How much funds were made available during the current academic session or last session?
6. Are they getting direct or indirect contribution from the community for the promotion of educational activities? What activities they have accomplished so far?
7. How are the community members responding to your requests for financial or labor inputs?
8. Have you ever generated school funds by involving community members? If yes to what extent? How do you motivate other members of the community to participate in the school development activities?
9. What actions so far have you taken on reducing absenteeism, drop outs and enhancing participation rate?
10. How do you persuade the parents of those out of school and those absenting themselves from schools to attend to schools?
11. Do you have school gardens? If yes how was it developed? If no why? In developing school garden what actions you have taken so far?
12. Do you have good working relationship with school teachers and supervisors? Do the supervisors consult you when they visit the school?
13. Did you get any training from the Department of Education on familiarization of your duties, functions and accounts maintenance? If yes for how much duration, with what contents, when and where?
14. If you did not attend the training, do you need any training? If yes in which areas? If no why?

Questions for Parents/Community members

1. How many children (sons and daughters) do you have?
2. How many (of the primary school age group) are not going to school? Why?
3. Do you have your some of the children in this school? If yes how many?
4. For how many days you child in *Katchi* remained absent or took leave from the school during the current academic year? Why?
5. What is your education level —Primary, Middle, Matric or above?
6. What is the education level of your spouse—Primary, Middle, Matric or above?
7. Do you participate in school development activities? If yes to what extent?
8. Does your child discuss school matters with you? If yes, give examples of particular issues of their concern.
9. Do you ask your child about the progress regarding educational attainment?
10. Do you think the progress made so by your child in ECE is good?

Questions for School Managers (At operational levels; ECO/EDO)

1. What do you know about ECD?

2. How many schools have the *Katchi* classes in the areas of your supervisory jurisdictions? What is the total enrolment in *Katchi* classes in these schools?
3. How many schools under your supervision are getting financial and technical assistance for the ECE program? What is the total enrolment of *Katchi* class in these schools?
4. In what respects the schools getting financial and technical assistance differ from those not getting assistance? (Probe)
5. Is there any difference in curriculum of the schools getting assistance and of those not getting assistance?
6. How many times do the supervisors visit a school in an academic year? Do you prepare a calendar for the visits to schools? How many visits are announced and how many unannounced?
7. What are the things the supervisors are particularly interested in looking for during the visits to schools? Do they have some checklists for carrying out such visits to record their observation? Do they share their observation with the school administration, PTAs and community members interested in educational development?
8. How do you keep your liaison with the ECE implementing partners?
9. What problems do you face with the implementing partners in implementation, supervision and monitoring the project?
10. Do they keep some joint visits to the school for supervision?
11. How do you nominate the teachers for the ECE training program? Do you keep them at their respective schools till completion of the project or transfer them any time? What are major reasons if transferred before completing the project?
12. Have you transferred any ECE trained teacher from their schools to other schools? If yes the other school was also the technical and financial assisted school? If no why?
13. If you are required to implement the ECE in the existing system, would you be able to do it the way the implementing partners are doing? (Probe)
14. If the technical and financial assistance is withdrawn from ECE, do you think the system will sustain?
15. Do you share freely and frequently the education related information with your implementing partners? (Probe)
16. How often do you transfer teachers? What would be some of the reasons teachers would be transferred? How does that impact the ECE program?

Questions for General Early Childhood Community in Pakistan

(example, UNESCO, UNICEF, PAIMAN, LEAD)

1. What work do you do in Pakistan, and how do you support young children and families?
2. What do you know about the existing early childhood education programs in Pakistan?
3. How does your work support early childhood education? Do you work with any programs/projects specifically related to early childhood education?
 - a. If yes, please share examples of who is funding some of your programs that include work related to ECE – funding numbers not required, just names, % if possible).
4. What do you know about the early childhood education work the Aga Khan Foundation and Children's Resources International are doing in Pakistan?
5. How do you feel AKF and CRI's early childhood education work is contributing to the Government of Pakistan's Early Childhood Education Program? (Or, if they are not aware of AKF and CRI work, briefly describe, and ask: how might you see AKF and CRI work contributing to GOP's ECE Program?)
6. Do you feel early childhood education in Pakistan could be improved? Yes or No?

- a. If yes, please share why...
- b. Please share how...
7. Where would you like to see the future of early childhood education in Pakistan go?
8. What mechanisms do you feel need to be put in place to ensure the sustainability of early childhood programming in Pakistan?
9. What are the strengths/challenges of how early childhood education is run on a policy level?

Additional questions for field work staff of early childhood organizations working in Pakistan:

1. What work are you doing with (name of community) in your province?
2. What do you know about what CRI or AKF's RCC or AKF's partner name program is doing in your area?
3. Is there any collaboration? If so, how?
4. Are there any schools in which you are both providing intervention, and if so, describe the coordination?
5. How do you feel AKF and CRI's early childhood education work is contributing to the Government of Pakistan's Early Childhood Education Program? (Or, if they are not aware of AKF and CRI work, briefly describe, and ask: how might you see AKF and CRI work contributing to GOP's ECE Program?)
6. What steps are you taking at the local level to advocate for early childhood?
7. What mechanisms do you feel need to be put in place to ensure the sustainability of early childhood programming in Pakistan?

APPENDIX E: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION TOOL

Observer: _____ Date of Observation: ___ / ___ / ___
 Center/School: _____ Teacher(s): _____ Room: _____
 Number of children enrolled in class: ___ Ages of Children: _____
 Highest number center allows in class at one time: ___
 Number of staff present: ___ Name of School/District/Program _____
 Highest number of children present during observation: ___ Number of children with identified disabilities: ___
 Check type(s) of disability: physical/sensory cognitive/language social/emotional other: _____
 Time observation began: ___ : ___ AM PM Time observation ended: ___ : ___ AM PM

Adapted for this Evaluation Project from "Score Sheet -Expanded Version, Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale-Revised", and "Score Sheet – Expanded Version, Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised", by Thelma Harms, Debby Cryer, and Richard M. Clifford (1998). University of North Carolina, USA, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute.

<u>Space and Furnishings</u>		
	Items to Consider	Comments
Indoor Space	Accessibility of space for all children? Are the materials within the reach of children? Learning areas clearly defined? Are materials clearly labeled? Is the space clean and tidy? (Y/N) How are the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting: • Ventilation 	
Furniture for	Are the following available (Y/N; if Y, how many?)	

<p>Routine Care and Play</p>	<p>What is the condition of materials?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tables • Chairs • Darris (mats) • Others _____ <p>What kinds of storage facilities are available in the classroom (for example, cupboards, shelves, trunks, other, none):</p>	
<p>Provision for Relaxation and Comfort</p>	<p>Are furnishings cozy? (Y/N)</p> <p>Is there sufficient space to move around?</p> <p>Are children comfortable?</p>	
<p>Room Arrangement</p>	<p>How is visual supervision? Any problems?</p> <p>List of defined learning areas/goshas:</p>	
<p>Child-Related Display</p>	<p>Do staff talk about displays with children? (observe 1 example)</p>	
<p>Space for Gross Motor (equipment, space used)</p>	<p>Safety hazards (for example, broken equipment; running inside where there is no room to run): (Give examples)</p> <p>Outdoor:</p> <p>Indoor:</p>	

	Any equipment/materials inappropriate/unsafe?																												
Gross Motor Equipment	List 5-8 observed skills:																												
<u>Personal Care Routines</u>																													
	Items to Consider	Comments																											
Greeting/Departing	Greetings observed between teacher and child (√ = yes, X = no, W = warm)																												
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Teacher</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>child</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Teacher									child								
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8																			
Teacher																													
child																													
How does the day begin?																													
Meals/Snacks	Handwashing: (√ = yes, X = no)																												
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before eating: Children ____ Adults ____																												
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After eating: Children ____ Adults ____																												
	Is there soap available? (Y/N)																												
Is there a prayer before eating?																													

	<p>Are children encouraged to self-feed?</p> <p>How do children eat (for example, together in a circle, during play time?)</p> <p>Are conditions sanitary?</p> <p>Is there clean water to drink?</p>		
<p>Health/Toileting Practices</p>	<p>Hand washing observations: (√ = yes, X = no)</p>		
		<p>Child</p>	<p>Adult</p>
	<p>Upon arrival in class or re-entry from outside</p>		
	<p>Before water; after sand, water, messy play</p>		
	<p>After dealing with bodily fluids</p>		
	<p>After touching contaminated objects</p>		
<p>Adult handwashing Completed ____ out of ____ times Percentage completed = ____ %</p> <p>Child handwashing Completed ____ out of ____ times Percentage completed = ____ %</p> <p>Do children wash hands after using the toilet?</p> <p>Is there soap available?</p> <p>Were toilets flushed?</p>			

	<p>Is there an ayah (health attendant) to help?</p> <p>Were toilet areas sanitary?</p> <p>Is there water in the bathroom?</p>										
<p>Safety Practices (General safety)</p>	<p>Safety hazards (for example, sharp objects):</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Major</td> <td>Minor</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indoor</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outdoor</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		Major	Minor	Indoor			Outdoor			
	Major	Minor									
Indoor											
Outdoor											
<u>Listening and Talking</u>											
	Items to Consider	Comments									
<p>Helping Children Understand Language</p>	<p>During routines:</p> <p>During play:</p> <p>Examples of descriptive words used:</p> <p>Examples of observed verbal play:</p> <p>Examples of staff expanding on children's ideas:</p> <p>Examples of staff questioning for longer answers:</p> <p>Communication activities:</p> <p>Examples during free play:</p> <p>Examples during group time:</p> <p>Examples of written communication:</p>										

Helping Children Use Language	<p>Staff add words/ideas to what children say (observe 2 examples):</p> <p>Staff ask simple questions (observe 2 examples):</p> <p>Examples of logical relationships:</p> <p>Examples of child's explanations:</p>	
Using Books	<p>Are books available in the classroom? How many?</p> <p>Number of books in disrepair:</p> <p>Any inappropriate books: {y / n} (violent, frightening)</p> <p>Staff read to individuals/small groups: {y / n} (observed at least 1 example)</p> <p>Wide selection of books</p> <p>Races:</p> <p>Ages:</p> <p>Abilities:</p> <p>Animals :</p> <p>Familiar routines:</p> <p>Familiar objects:</p> <p>Nature science books for Item 22:</p> <p>Informal reading/book play observed? (Y/N)</p>	
<u>Activities</u>		
	Items to Consider	Comments
Fine Motor	<p>Materials for preschoolers_____</p> <p>Types of fine motor material (list 3 to 5 of each):</p>	

	<p>Small building materials</p> <p>Art</p> <p>Manipulatives</p> <p>Puzzles</p> <p>Condition of materials?</p>	
Sand/Water Play	<p>Are there opportunities to play with sand/water?</p> <p>Indoor/Outdoor?</p> <p>Are accessories provided (for example, cups, spoons, etc to pour; items to bury and find; items that sink and float)?</p>	
Nature/Science	<p>Example of science/nature observed in daily events:</p> <p>Types of nature/science materials (list 3 to 5 of each):</p> <p>Collections of natural objects</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Living things</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Books, games, toys</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Activities</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Condition of materials?</p>	
Promoting Acceptance of Diversity	<p>Diversity in materials (10 examples, all types of categories):</p>	

	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Books</th> <th>Pictures</th> <th>Materials</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Races/ Cultures</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ages</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Abilities</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gender</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Dolls/images/pictures of people (3 different skin tones/facial features):</p> <p>Non-sexist images:</p> <p>Variety of activities:</p>		Books	Pictures	Materials	Races/ Cultures				Ages				Abilities				Gender				
	Books	Pictures	Materials																			
Races/ Cultures																						
Ages																						
Abilities																						
Gender																						
Active Physical Play	Appropriate indoor/outdoor space:																					
Art	<p>Types of art materials (list 3 to 5 of each):</p> <p>drawing _____ (required)</p> <p>paints _____</p> <p>3-D _____</p> <p>collage _____</p> <p>tools _____</p> <p>Condition of materials?</p>																					
Music and Movement*	List number of musical toys/instruments:																					

<p>(determined based on cultural sensitivity in the different regions; some schools do not permit singing with music, or dancing)</p>	<p>Informal singing observed? {y / n}</p> <p>Types of music materials/condition: instruments _____ music to listen to, and for older children to play: _____ dance props with music: _____ Music available as a free choice? _____ As a group activity? _____</p>	
<p>Blocks</p>	<p>Sets/types of blocks (what kinds of blocks are available?): 1) 2) 3) Accessories (what materials are available to expand block play – for example, cars and trucks, dolls/animal figures, etc): Condition of materials?</p>	
<p>Dramatic Play</p>	<p>Dress-ups _____ Child-sized play furniture _____ Play foods _____ Dishes/eating utensils _____ Doll furniture _____ Small play buildings & accessories _____</p>	

	Others (please describe) _____ Condition of materials?	
Math/number	Types of math/number materials (list 3 to 5 of each): Counting _____ Written _____ numbers _____ Measuring _____ Comparing _____ quantities _____ Shapes _____ Condition of materials?	
<u>Interaction</u>		
	Items to Consider	Comments
Supervision of Play and Learning	Supervision of gross motor activities General discipline of children	
Peer Interaction	Staff explain actions/intensions/feelings (observe 2 examples): Positive social interaction talked about (observe 1 example):	
Staff-Child Interaction	Positive and strengths-based?	

	Does the interaction support the child's learning? Does it respect the child as an individual?	
Discipline	Is it positive and strengths-based? Does the staff use fear and punishment, or use the discipline as a teaching tool and teach the child what to do instead?	
<u>Program Structure</u>		
	Items to Consider	Comments
Schedule	Was there a clear schedule? When do children get to use the goshas? Did staff tell children what to expect next? Are there clear transitions from activity to activity? Is there a routine chart visible for children? Was there time for both indoor/outdoor play? Gross motor play?	
Free Play	Supervision as educational interaction (observe 2 examples):	
Group Play Activities	Was there teacher-led instruction such as circle, story, music and movement time? Were children encouraged to play together?	
Provision for Children with	Were children with disabilities included in all aspects of the classroom?	

Disabilities		
Supporting Citizenry	How are Pakistani ideals, religious ideals, incorporated into the classroom?	
<u>Parents and Staff</u>		
	Items to Consider	Comments
Provisions for Parents	<p>Are parents involved in the classroom:</p> <p>Volunteer?</p> <p>Learning opportunities for parents about child development?</p> <p>Structure for staff/parent communication (for example, parent-staff conferences; daily communication – give examples)</p>	
Provision for Personal Needs for Staff	<p>Staff: child ratio?</p> <p>Are staff provided breaks throughout the day to meet personal needs, with other adult coverage in the classroom?</p>	
Provision for Professional Needs of Staff	<p>Are there staff meetings that support staff needs?</p> <p>Are staff provided training opportunities?</p> <p>Are staff given time during the day to plan for the week/day?</p>	
Staff Interaction and Cooperation	<p>Do staff plan together?</p> <p>Do staff from different classrooms have the</p>	

	<p>opportunity to plan and share ideas together?</p> <p>Observe – how do all staff in the classroom interact with each other?</p>	
Staff Continuity	<p>How long have staff been at this school?</p> <p>What, if anything, is in place to support staff retention?</p>	
Supervision and Evaluation of Staff	<p>How are staff monitored and evaluated?</p> <p>Who provides daily supervision to staff?</p> <p>How are good teachers rewarded?</p>	
Opportunities for Professional Growth	<p>What opportunities do staff have for professional growth?</p>	

Overall: Has the AKF/CRI *katchi* class impacted the rest of the school? If so, how?

APPENDIX F: LIST OF DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED

USAID

“USAID/Pakistan – Interim Strategic Plan, May 2003-Sept 2006”. Islamabad, Pakistan. May 2003.

“USAID/Pakistan Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP)”. USAID. January 2006.

Government of Pakistan

“Early Childhood Education in Pakistan: (Challenges and Issues)”, by Dr. Muhammad Saleem and Shalid Ali Khan, National Education Policy Review (1998-2010). 2006.

“Education in Pakistan: A White Paper – Revised: Document to Debate and Finalize the National Education Policy”, Prepared by Javed Hasan Aly, National Education Policy Review Team. February 2007.

“National Curriculum: Early Childhood Education - Revised, 2007” Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education, (Curriculum Wing), Islamabad. 2007.

“National Curriculum: Early Childhood Education”. Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education, (Curriculum Wing), Islamabad. March 2002.

“Early Childhood” in “National Plan of Action on Education for All (2000-2015)”, pg. 47- 71. Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education, Islamabad. Draft, August 14, 2001.

“Vision 2025: Discussion Document 1 (DD1)”, Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education, Islamabad.

“Pre-Primary Statistics”, Source: Pakistan Education Statistics, AEPAM & for populations Statistics (NIPS)

Teachers’ Resource Centre

“Strong Foundations: A Guide for ECE Teachers”, by Mahenaz Mahmud. Teachers’ Resource Centre

Aga Khan Foundation - Releasing Confidence and Creativity (RCC) Program

“RCC: Releasing Confidence and Creativity: Building Sound Foundations For Early Learning in Pakistan, Phase II Final Report”, Submitted to USAID by The Aga Khan Foundation. December 31, 2006.

“RCC: Releasing Confidence and Creativity: Building Sound Foundations for Early Learning in Pakistan, Phase II, Program Partners Terms of Reference. March 2004-September 2006”. Submitted to RCC Partners, by Aga Khan Foundation. April 2005.

“RCC: Releasing Confidence and Creativity: Building Sound Foundations For Early Learning in Pakistan, Phase II, Detailed Implementation Plan.” Submitted to USAID/Islamabad by Aga Khan Foundation, USA, May 2004.

“RCC: Releasing Confidence and Creativity: Building Sound Foundations For Early Learning in Pakistan, Phase II: A Proposal.” Submitted to USAID/Islamabad, by Aga Khan Foundation. October 2003.

“Final Draft: RCC: Releasing Confidence and Creativity: Building Sound Foundations for Early Learning in Pakistan, Implementation Plan.” Submitted to USAID/ANE Bureau, by Aga Khan Foundation. May 31, 2002.

“RCC: Releasing Confidence and Creativity: Building Sound Foundations For Early Learning in Pakistan” Draft Monitoring Report Prepared by the Sindh Education Foundation. August 2004.

“RCC: Releasing Confidence and Creativity: Building Sound Foundations For Early Learning in Pakistan, Baseline Survey Report.” Prepared by the Sindh Education Foundation. January 2004.

“RCC: Releasing Confidence and Creativity: Building Sound Foundations For Early Learning in Pakistan, Baseline Survey Family Profile Form”, “Baseline Survey School Profile Form”, and “Baseline Survey Child Assessment Form”. Prepared by the Sindh Education Foundation (no year)

“Early Childhood Care and Development in Pakistan: a Second Review.” Aga Khan Foundation. June 30, 2003.

“RCC: Releasing Confidence and Creativity: Building Sound Foundations For Early Learning in Pakistan, Quarterly Reports”, submitted to USAID by Aga Khan Foundation, dated:

- Phase II, Oct-Dec 2005 (Jan 2005)
- Phase II, July – Sept 2005 (Oct 2005)
- Phase II, April-June 30, 2005 (July 2005)
- Phase II, Jan-March 2005 (April 2005)
- Phase II, Oct-Dec 2004 (Jan 2005)
- Phase II, July-Sept 30, 2004 (Oct 2004)
- Phase II, March 24 - June 30, 2004 (July 2004)
- Phase II, Oct 2003 – Dec 2003 (Jan 2004)
- July 1, 2003 – Sept 30, 2003 (Oct 31, 2003)
- April 2003-June 2003 (Sept 2003)

“Releasing Confidence and Creativity: Building Sound Foundations For Early Learning in Pakistan”, Framework Proposal, Submitted to USAID/ANE Bureau, by Aga Khan Foundation. August 14, 2001.

Supporting RCC Materials

“Health and Hygiene Game for Parents, Teachers, and Children”, *Nurture*, Issue No. 3, September 2006.

“Raising Capable Children: A Symposium on Early Childhood Development” CD and Conference Folder, May 22-24, 2006, Gilgit, Pakistan.

“A Symposium on Rediscovering Childhood and Conference on Early Childhood Development”, a thematic series folder.

“RCC GANTT Chart”, January 2003 – March 2004.

“SCSPEB Update”, Vol. 2, Issue 1, January – March 2004.

Nurture and *Parvarish* issues

“Early Childhood Development in Pakistan”, CD, by the Aga Khan Foundation. March 2004.

Baseline Survey Report, January 2004.

“SCSPEB Update”, Vol. 2, Issue 3, October – December 2003.

“RCC: A Semi-Annual Progress Report, October 2002-March 2003”, submitted to USAID/Pakistan by the AGA Khan Foundation. May 21, 2003.

“SCSPEB Update”, Vol. 1, Issue 2, July-September 2002.

“SCSPEB News”, Newsletter, October 2001.

“Society for Community Support for Primary Education in Balochistan”, SCSPEB Brochure, since 1993

“RCC Program Presentation”, PowerPoint

“Let’s Smile”, a compilation of poems on English, Urdu, Sindi. By AKESP, under the RCC program.

“Releasing Confidence and Creativity Program – Building Sound Foundations for Early Learning in Pakistan”, RCC brochure.

“Early Childhood Development: A Resource Book”, by the Sindh Education Foundation.

“Understanding ECD Through Practice: An Exploratory Study with ECD Teachers in Sindh”, The Sindh Education Foundation.

“Children Matter” brochure.

“A Touch of Magic: The Story of the Releasing Confidence and Creativity Program: Building Strong Foundations for Early Learning in Pakistan, Its Beginnings, Development, Impact, and Future” by Ms. Jill Worrall, for the Aga Khan Foundation.

“RCC Quarterly Report, Oct 2003- Dec 2003”, Submitted to Aga Khan Foundation by Sindh Education Foundation. Jan 2004.

“ECD Mapping Survey”, developed by Sindh Education Foundation, as part of RCC II.

Assorted partner-developed posters, brochures, and other resources; Power Point presentation materials from RCC Partner interviews.

Children’s Resources International

“Program Description: Supporting Democratic Reforms To Basic Education in Pakistan”, submitted by CRI, Inc. through the Global Civil Society Strengthening Leader with Associate Awards Cooperative Agreement, Implemented by PACT, Inc. (date unknown)

“Creating Democratic Schools Program – Pakistan, Quarterly Programmatic Report January – March 2006 and Final Programmatic Report”, submitted to USAID by PACT on behalf of CRI, Inc., January 2006-March 2006.

“A Study of the Benefits and Costs Associated with Implementation of the *Creating Democratic Schools* Program, Pakistan”, prepared by Children’s Resources International, December 2005.

“Interactive Teaching and Learning Program in Pakistan, Fourth Quarterly Report (Dec 2006-Feb 2007)”, submitted by CRI, Pakistan (Guarantee) Limited. March 2007.

“Interactive Teaching and Learning Program in Pakistan, Third Quarterly Report (Sept-Nov 2006)”, submitted by CRI, Pakistan (Guarantee) Limited. December 2006.

“Interactive Teaching and Learning Program in Pakistan, Second Quarterly Report (June-Aug 2006)”, submitted by CRI, Pakistan (Guarantee) Limited. September 2006.

“Interactive Teaching and Learning Program in Pakistan, First Quarterly Report (March-May 2006)”, submitted by CRI, Pakistan (Guarantee) Limited. June 2006.

“Creating Democratic Schools Program – Pakistan, Quarterly Programmatic Reports” submitted to USAID by PACT on behalf of Children’s Resources International, Inc. dated:

- Fourth Quarterly Report (Oct-Dec 2005)
- Third Quarterly Report (July-Sept 2005)
- Second Quarterly Report (April-June 2005)
- First Quarterly report (Jan-March 2005)

- October-December 2004
- July-September 2004
- April – June 2004
- First Quarter 2004 Report (Jan – March), (Apr 5, 2004)
- Fourth Quarterly Report (Oct-Dec 2003), (Jan 2004)
- Third Quarterly Report (July-Sept 2003), (Oct. 2003)
- First Quarterly Report (Jan-March 003), (April 2003)
- Third Quarterly Report (Oct-Dec 2002), (Jan 2003)
- Second Quarterly Report (July-Sept 2002), (Oct 2002)
- Draft First Quarterly Report (April – June 2002), (July 2002)

“Creating Democratic Schools Program – Pakistan, Quarterly Narrative Reports”, submitted by CRI, Inc. dated:

- 8th Report, Jan-March 2004
- 7th Report, Oct-Dec 2003 (Jan 2004)
- 6th Report, July-Sept 2003 (Oct 2003)
- 5th Report, April-June 2003 (July 2003)
- 4th Report, Jan-March 2003 (April 2003)
- 3rd Report, Oct-Dec 2002 (Jan 2003)
- 2nd Report, July-Sept 2002 (Oct 2002)
- 1st Report, April – June 2002 (July 2002)

Supporting CRI Materials

“Press Clippings: July 2002 – October 2007” Compiled by Policy, Research, and Advocacy Department, Children’s Resources International, Pakistan.

“Interim Draft report on the Impact Evaluation of Children’s Resources International (Pakistan) - Phase Zero”, prepared by the Lahore University of Management Systems (LUMS) Team: Dr. Farooq Naseer, Ms. Manasa Patnam, Dr. Reehana Raza, and Mr. Muhammad Yasir Khan, September 25, 2007.

“Children Seeking ECE”, by CRI, Pakistan, a program informational booklet. 2006.

“Child-Centered Curriculum: A Course for Early Childhood Faculty”, by CRI, Pakistan. Revised March 2004.

“Individualized Teaching in Early Childhood Education: A Course for Early Childhood Faculty: January 16-20, 2005”, by Joan P. Isenberg, Ed.D, and Mary R. Jalongo, Ph, D., edited by Carolyn Rutsch, for CRI, Inc. Revised 1997.

“Assessing Children’s Development Through Observation.” CRI, Pakistan (Guaranteed) Limited

“School and family Partnerships: A Course for Early Childhood Faculty.” CRI, Pakistan. Revised March 2004.

“Bachoon Per Markooz Classroom Ki Tashkeel”: teachers guides for 3-5 year olds, 6-7 year olds, and 8-10 year olds.

“Rehnuma-e-Waldain”: parenting manual.

“Subah Ki Meeting”: morning meeting manual.

“Laddu”: CRI-Pakistan’s newsletter

Additional training and curriculum guides, for both classroom and family literacy projects, translated into local languages.

Supplemental material offered by CRI for review, including: meeting minutes, course outlines, and MOUs with schools.