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The Transforming Education in Cocoa Communities (TRECC) initiative aims to improve the living conditions of children and youth in Côte d'Ivoire by promoting quality education in cocoa-growing communities. Via its Grant Matching Mechanism round 2 (GMM2), 13 pilots-to-scale projects are being co-funded with 12 cocoa companies and implemented by 14 implementing organizations in the sectors of Early Childhood Development, Primary Education and Vocational Training.

The role of Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) is to provide technical support to the companies and implementing agencies to design and implement sound monitoring systems to closely monitor and learn from these pilots. IPA also conducts its own independent and complementary data collection to evaluate the pilot projects. For each pilot, IPA analyzes these two sources of information—the administrative data collected by the implementing organizations through their own M&E system and IPA’s independently collected data—to assess the pilot on a pre-agreed rubric. The final scale-up report will therefore be based on the evaluation rubric that was agreed upon by all partners.

This report contains IPA’s analysis and recommendations on the potential scale-up of the EPT pilot. The scale-up under discussion here is focused on other relevant cocoa-growing communities, as is GMM2’s contractual emphasis. However, TRECC may consider whether certain pilots are feasible for future scale-up beyond such communities, for example to the regional or national level.

The report is divided into the following five sections. Each section is broken down into 2-3 components, for a total of eleven criteria:

1. **Relevance**
   - 1.1. The program is targeting important needs in the community
   - 1.2. The program is aligned with donors’ priorities
2. **Results (outputs and immediate outcomes)**
   - 2.1. The program delivers outputs at high quality
   - 2.2. The program achieves direct outcomes
   - 2.3. Beneficiary feedback about the program is positive
3. **Costs & Operations management**
   - 3.1. Costs are well-managed
   - 3.2. Project management is successful
4. **Capacity to learn, improve and innovate**
   - 4.1. Project collects credible monitoring data
   - 4.2. Monitoring is used to learn and improve
5. **Sustainability**
   - 5.1. Provides sustained benefit to the community
   - 5.2. There are prospects for scale-up beyond GMM2
Each of these eleven components (e.g., “5.1. Provides sustained benefit to the community”) is evaluated on indicator-level criteria and assigned a color score.

- **Green** indicates that the pilot is, in IPA’s view, consistent with the criteria required for potential scale-up.

- **Orange** indicates that IPA’s data shows the pilot is partially consistent with the criteria for scale-up and that eligibility for scale-up should be conditional on corrective measures to be taken in that area.

- **Red** indicates that the pilot does not appear to be consistent with the requirements for scale-up.

Pilots with green assessments on all 11 criteria receive an unconditional recommendation for eligibility for a scale-up proposal; pilots with only green and orange criteria (no red), and among these a majority of green criteria, receive a conditional recommendation for scale-up (i.e. conditional on the various corrective measures being proposed in the orange criteria). Pilots with any red criteria are not recommended for scale-up.
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Project summary

Through the Transforming Education in Cocoa Communities (TRECC) initiative, the Ivorian NGO “Ecole Pour Tous” (EPT), with support from the Ministry of Education (MENET-FP), established four bridge schools in the region of Agboville, a cocoa production zone in Côte d’Ivoire. The pilot attempted to combine standard EPT bridge school curricula with Save the Children’s “Literacy/Numeracy Boost” (LB/NB) approach to achieve rapid learning gains.

Bridge schools aim to provide a stepping-stone for out-of-school children to enter the formal education system, offering them classes to catch up to their grade level and preparation for classroom expectations. The pilot bridge school locations were selected according to three criteria: (i) Company name’s (COMPANY NAME) and Ministry of Education’s (MENET-FP) assessment of the number of out-of-school children eligible for primary school; (ii) communities’ and MENET-FP’s willingness to welcome a bridge school in the selected sites; and, (iii) availability of facilities like classrooms or class shelters.

The pilot targets out-of-school children ages 9-14 who are particularly vulnerable in cocoa production zone because they are exposed to child labor. The objective of the pilot is to offer quality learning to integrate those children into formal schooling.

Communities were involved at all steps of the pilot’s implementation from site identification to learners’ integration into formal schools. Clubs for mothers and daughters “Clubs Mères Enfants Filles” (CMEF) were set up in the four schools and strengthened to manage schools’ canteens.

EPT, with the support of MENET-FP, recruited four teachers – called rural animators – and trained them to teach the national curriculum, manage bridge classes, and implement LB/NB methodology. EPT also arranged and equipped the four class shelters to guarantee a good learning environment.

MENET-FP support consisted in monitoring of teachings through pedagogical advisors and headmasters. Pedagogical advisors were responsible for developing and organizing, in collaboration with EPT, the transfer test to determine the level reached by the child and consequently his grade of assignment in formal schools. The transfer test was a Grade 4-level evaluation allowing the best students to be integrated in the Grade 5 while the remaining students will be considered as having Grade 4 level.

Bridge schools aim to educate students extremely quickly. Classes take place over 34 weeks. Children are taught, using Grades 1 and 2 curricula, to read and write in their mother tongue during the first six weeks. Then they continue in French during the remaining 28 weeks focusing on Grades 3 and 4 curricula. LB/NB was used to encourage children to actively participate in classes.

---

1 MENET-FP’s division which were involved in the pilot were the “Antenne Pédagogique et de la Formation Continue” (APFC) and the “Direction de l’Alphabétisation et de l’Education Non Formelle” (DAENF).
LB/NB aims to support the existing national curriculum to encourage children to read more confidently, broaden their vocabulary and improve their mathematics competency.
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### Snapshot of specific assessment against each pre-defined evaluation criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targets an important need in the community</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Aligns with the priorities of the donors</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Results: outputs and direct outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Delivers outputs at high quality</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Review master trainer and rural animator training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Achieves direct outcomes</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Improve canteen system and review LB/NB implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Beneficiaries’ feedback about the program is positive</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Costs and operations management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Costs are well managed/cost scale-up vision</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Project management is successful</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Increase engagement of company and technical partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Capacity to learn, improve and innovate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Project collects credible monitoring data</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Improve attendance monitoring strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Monitoring is used to learn and improve</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Provides sustained benefit to community</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Identify pathways to support communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 There are prospects of scale-up beyond GMM2</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

General assessment and recommendation

IPA's Right-Fit Evidence unit conducted an independent process evaluation of the EPT bridge classes program that aims to educate out of school children in an accelerated timeframe. The goal of bridge classes is to have learners achieve equivalent certified competencies as in the formal system, to transition them into mainstream education. The current pilot combines EPT bridge school approach with the Literacy Boost (LB) and Numeracy Boost (NB) approach developed by Save the Children. EPT equipped four bridge classrooms hosted in formal schools' compounds in the region of Agboville.

To assess the pilot's performance IPA surveyed rural animators and tested children before, during and at the end of the program. In addition to this, IPA's staff conducted two spot-checks to check the reliability of the monitoring data collected and the attendance rate.

Overall, the EPT bridge school program as piloted by COMPANY NAME, EPT, Save the Children, and the MENET-FP has not earned a recommendation for scale-up as 7 criteria were rated as orange and 4 as green. The pilot in its current form was not able to successfully adapt the LB/NB approach and IPA does not recommend scaling up this approach. Our recommendations for the project implementers and any future project are included below.

1. Relevance:
   This project targets an important need in the community as 84 percent of the students in the program were out of school last year. Most of them interrupted their schooling and 38 percent never had access to school. Stated reasons for children being out of school include financial constraints and inadequate infrastructure. Child labor has not been reported by parents as a major barrier to schooling, nor does low priority on schooling appear to be a problem. In fact, most parents believe that the returns to education are high. Focus groups revealed that parents in the community were able to identify a clear group of out of school children that were mostly stigmatized and seen as young offenders.

   Despite addressing a specific need, the pilot as implemented does not align with the priorities of all donors. While Jacobs declared being interested in continuing to support bridge classes, COMPANY NAME seemed to prefer to change strategy to work directly with the MENET-FP.

2. Results: Outputs and direct outcomes:
   The pilot didn't achieve most outputs at the required quality. The first master trainer training on the LB/NB methodology was very incomplete and didn't include two key components of the methodology - the community approach and the evaluation approach. Key trainers from the Department of Pedagogy and In-Service Training (DPFC) were not present during the rural animator's training. The delivery of school kits was delayed from two months. Due to a teacher strike beyond their control, EPT experienced a low attendance rate of around 50 percent during the month of March which EPT did not immediately rectify. Children did not have consistent
access to canteen meals, likely further impacting the attendance rate. Following this episode of low attendance, EPT did eventually manage to implement extensive mobilization campaigns and 83 percent of students did eventually undertake the final exam. Another bright spot was that EPT managed to renovate and refurnish four classrooms, and the mentoring system was implemented with headmasters and pedagogic counselors visiting schools.

The pilot only partially achieved its direct outcomes. Pre and post data on rural animators’ knowledge tests were not collected by EPT and shared with IPA. The combination of the classic bridge school approach developed by EPT and the LB/NB was not successful: most teachers were unable to explain the core elements of LB/NB program other than using more games in classrooms. IPA believes that this limited implementation of the LB/NB approach is due to an incomplete training of master trainers. Learners who graduated from the bridge schools were mostly assigned to grade 5 classes, based on their age; but their level of numeracy and literacy was well below what would be expected at grade 5. In its independent evaluation IPA did not observe a clear increase in performance on basic literacy or numeracy skills over the period of the program, with only small improvements in number recognition evident.

Rural animators were not completely satisfied with the training's length and quality. They were however satisfied with the child centered pedagogy and felt that children were making progress.

Recommendations in case of scale-up:

- **Improve LB/NB training**: EPT should work with Save the Children to ensure the training and mentoring is sufficient for teachers to understand and implement the LB/NB approach. This may involve extending the period of training and Save the Children’s support in the field.
- **Improve canteen operations**: ensure schools have operational canteens to encourage student attendance.

3. Costs and Operation management:

The project management team made efficient use of resources and spent less than budgeted to implement all the activities of the pilot. IPA also acknowledges the good financial reporting of the organization. However, total unit cost per child of the program appears to be higher than similar programs implemented in the region indicating a need to further think about the cost structure. As COMPANY NAME didn't share information about their vision for scale including the location and number of bridge schools, EPT was not able to develop a clear vision of the scale-up and no financial plan was included in the proposal.

Project management strayed from the initial proposal as EPT received very little support in the field from both Save the Children on the technical aspects and COMPANY NAME to foster community engagement.

Recommendation in case of scale-up:

---

2 EPT was aware that these children were not at the standard expected for grade 4. However, EPT explained that their strategy was to make sure the oldest children entered at a high enough grade that allowed them to finish primary school within the age rules, to get access to other types of education like vocational training.

3 While one should not consider a before and after comparison on test scores as an estimation of impact, not seeing an improvement is a fairly clear sign that the program didn't achieve what it intended.
• **Increase engagement of the company in the field:** COMPANY NAME should provide more support in the field to build the acceptance of the NGO in the community.

4. **Capacity to learn, improve and innovate:**
EPT did not always collect and shared monitoring data according to plan. Spot-checks revealed that attendance data was not always reliable, particularly in one community, X. Data was not actionable as EPT failed to identify and respond to the increase in dropouts early enough during the teachers’ strike.
On the positive side, EPT undertook strong initiatives to decrease dropouts. An intense mobilization campaign after the strike was organized and succeeded in getting most of the children back in school to take the final exam.

**Recommendations in case of scale-up:**
- **Improve monitoring:** More regular use of monitoring data should be undertaken to track key outputs like attendance and identify mitigation strategies
- **Increase support of technical partner:** Save the Children should increase its support to EPT and share their evaluation instruments to allow better tracking of progress.

5. **Sustainability:**
There are limited signs that the community will continue to benefit from the project. There appear to be significant challenges to maintaining the bridge schools as they are in the community. In addition, the rural animators’ poor retention of the LB/NB approach (discussed in Chapter 2) means there is little prospect that they will continue the approach in their future teaching. Continuation of the project without the financial support of the NGO appears to be unrealistic as parents of out of school children have very limited financial resources. In addition, few of the children are likely to be able to build on what they may have learned by integrating successfully into formal schooling. IPA did observe that some pre-requisites exist to foster children’s integration in the formal schooling system. However, two key reasons why those children drop out of school were not addressed, namely financial resources of parents to fund their ongoing schooling and student's motivation and level of readiness. In addition, the integration of bridge classes in the formal school network including COGES was not optimal.

In a broader sense, Accelerated Education Programs do have prospects for expansion beyond the GMM2 program. Despite strong signs of governmental buy-in around alternative education projects, there is yet to be practical support for bridge classes in terms of resources and guidelines. Private sector partners also seem to be interested in financing such projects while strengthening the participation of the MENET-FP.
Data and Methodology

IPA collected original, independent data and analyzed data from implementer and government sources. (See Table 1)

Table 1: Targets population, Round of data collection, Sources of data and Sample size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round of data collection</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Survey planned</th>
<th>Survey covered</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Period of data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>Nov. 6th to 9th, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beneficiaries Parents</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-beneficiaries Parents</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers (animators)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midline</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Mar. 14th to 15th, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers (animators)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>June 11th to 13th, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers (animators)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Non-beneficiary parents are parents from out of school children age 9 to 14 not enrolled in the program. As the stock of out of school children was relatively small IPA managed to find only 20 children in the age range not enrolled in the program.

5 This low rate of surveyed children is due to the low attendance rate during class hours. IPA did track children in the different communities for two days.
Data collected:

IPA performed three rounds of data collection – Baseline, Midline and Endline – alongside the pilot implementation. Data collected targets different population depending on the goal of each survey round. The baseline survey aimed at gathering beneficiaries' characteristics at the beginning of the pilot, including levels of needs. During the midline survey, a follow-up was made on baseline indicators. It was also the opportunity for IPA to observe pilot implementation and deliver information to course correct the project if needed. The endline focused on collecting feedback and learning levels from beneficiaries.

IPA conducted interviews with parents during the baseline data collection to assess needs. To have a better idea of success of the program in targeting children who really needed the program, IPA decided to interview parents that had access to the program and other parents with similar characteristics that didn't. Parents' interviews were performed in the four communities where bridge classes were built.

IPA gathered qualitative inputs from community members through Focus Group Discussions (FGD): in two targeted communities with groups of 12 beneficiaries' parents; and, in the other two bridge schools with groups of 6 CMEF's members.

Students' skill levels were tested in Reading and Mathematics in all four pilot bridge schools during the three rounds of data collection. Data on students' learning level were collected through ASER literacy and numeracy tests administrated by IPA enumerators (details on this test can be found in annex 1).

IPA interviewed teachers (rural animators) at three different points in time, during baseline, to know their level of confidence with the program, at midline, to see if their expectations changed over time and capture potential challenges in their work and at endline to have their feedback at the end of the school year.

Because we found that LB/NB was not implemented, the focus of classroom observations was not to see its implementation by teachers. IPA organized two rounds of classroom observations during baseline and midline to collect students' participation rate and document teachers and children's interactions.

EPT organized the final transfer test which aims at assessing the level of each child before transferring them into the formal system in an appropriate grade. This data was shared with IPA and enabled a comparison with ASER scores collected by IPA.

Sample covered

All schools and teachers were interviewed during the three waves of data collection. During the midline survey, IPA enumerators did not perform classroom observation in one school given that the teacher did not taught the day of survey since he was sick. However, students were in the
classroom the day of survey and the teacher took the time to complete the questionnaire while being at home.

Data collected by IPA’s independent evaluation shows that EPT continued to enroll students throughout the pilot implementation. Before the baseline data collection, EPT provided to IPA a list of 115 students enrolled in the pilot schools while IPA enumerators found 25 new non-listed students in classes. During the midline survey, enumerators found 9 new students who were not listed among the 140\(^6\) students they expected to survey. Also, endline data shows that three students who were not surveyed either at the baseline and the midline were present during IPA’s endline ASER test.

To summarize, 152 students attended at least one of the three IPA ASER tests. 63 of them were assessed three times by IPA enumerators – Baseline, Midline and Endline. And 93 students took the baseline and endline test.

---

\(^6\) 140 is the sum of 115 old students provide by EPT before the baseline and the 25 new found in classroom during by IPA enumerators during the baseline data collection.
1. Relevance

Relevance is divided into two components, both of which the pilot is assessed on:

- The program is targeting important needs in the community
- The program is aligned with donor's priorities

1.1. The program is targeting important needs in the community:

This project targets an important need in the community as 84 percent of the students in the program were out of school last year. Most of them interrupted their schooling and 38 percent never had access to school. Reasons for children being out of school include financial constraints and inadequate infrastructure. Qualitative evidence suggests that young boys over the age of 12 seem to be more interested in earning petty cash than going to school. Child labor has not been reported by parents as a major barrier to schooling, nor does low priority on schooling appear to be a problem. In fact, most parents believe that the returns to education are high. Focus groups revealed that parents in the community were able to identify a clear group of out of school children that were mostly stigmatized and seen as young offenders.

Criteria 1.1.1. IPA baseline reports show evidence of a need being addressed by the pilot

The baseline survey clearly indicates that children enrolled in the program are out of school. Indeed, 84 percent of children's parents declared that the child didn't go to school during the last school year (2017-2018). These out of school children encompass a large diversity of profiles. 52% of the children had attended school before but interrupted their schooling due to external reasons such as health issues or strained familial environments. 32 percent of children never went to school before.

*Figure 1: Schooling status of children during the last school year 2007-2018*
Qualitative evidence suggests that school interruption is very different from not having access to school at all. Figure 2, therefore presents reasons why children missed school during the last year. As expected, we observe very different patterns. Parents that never sent their children to school overarchingly reported reasons related to financial means such as lack of financial supports or lack of canteen as the main reason. For children that interrupted their schooling, parents mostly reported that their children themselves decided to drop out of school. The next section will discuss in more details reasons why children interrupted or have no access to school using qualitative and quantitative evidence.

**Figure 2: Children that missed school last years: Parents’ reasons given for dropout**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Some past school</th>
<th>No past school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of canteen</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child was ill</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack birth certificate</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of family support</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial support</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child left school himself</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge of parents about the need to educate their children

Ignorance does not seem to be a primary barrier for schooling. Interviews revealed that parents value education in the target communities. Strong foundations underpin all learning and the support of communities and parents in this endeavor is central for the readiness and motivations of students. Regarding the perception on education, IPA noticed that most parents do think that education plays a big role in life, 94 percent in the beneficiary group. Looking at the gender dynamic of the return on schooling, more than 90 percent of parents declared that both boys and girls should have access to education (See Table 2).

Table 2: Comparison of beneficiary’s and non-beneficiary’s parents’ perceptions about education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-beneficiary’s parents</th>
<th>Beneficiary’s parents</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Prop.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of parents who think that attending school plays big role for succeeding in life</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of parents who think that boys and girls have the same right to attend schools</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant differences marked with asterisks: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

The lack of resources for parents to send their children to school

Lack of financial resources is still a major barrier to schooling in Côte d’Ivoire. As presented in the figure 1, 90 percent of children that never attended school before are in this situation because of a lack of financial resources from their family. This lack of resources impacts the capacity of parents to pay for functioning costs but also to pay for birth certificates and children's food that in turn exclude children from school.

Sending a kid to school is not free and parents bear much of the functioning costs. These could amount to several thousands of francs CFA and includes: registration fee, canteen, school uniforms, school material, exam costs, COGES donation, documentation papers (the detail of this list can be found in annex 5). In this respect, bridge classes can appear to be a good solution for vulnerable parents as most of these additional costs do not exist.

The lack of birth certificate for children

Birth certificates are a barrier to schooling as they are effectively mandatory for formal school enrollment. A recent MENET-FP directive authorizes school directors to register children in first grade without obliging parents to present birth certificates, but we observe much discrepancy in
the application of this directive. In addition to this, certificates are required to pass the end of primary exam. In fact, according to IPA’s baseline interviews, 21 percent of parents declared not enrolling their children in school because of a lack of birth certificate. In Côte d’Ivoire, birth certificates are not free and have to be requested within three months after birth. Beyond this period, a very costly court judgement has to be requested in lieu of birth certificates (more than around 2,000 XOF). Finally, we observe that this barrier is much more prevalent among the group that declared no schooling than among the group that declared interrupting schooling. Indeed, in the latter group, only 5 percent of parents reported birth certificates as a major barrier.

Inadequate infrastructure and quality of learning in schools

Parents reported a lack of classroom and formal schools in the community. However, parents seem to be more concerned about the access to school than the learning component. In fact, 34 percent of parents reported that there were not enough teachers in the surrounding schools and 44 percent of them reported not enough classrooms were available. Despite clear concerns about the access to education, parents seemed to assess the quality of education offered positively as 80 percent reported that education in the schools of the community is of good quality (see table3).

Table 3: Comparison of beneficiary’s and non-beneficiary’s parents’ perceptions about education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-beneficiary’s parents</th>
<th>Beneficiary’s parents</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Prop.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who think that quality of education in communities’ schools was good</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who think that there are enough classrooms in schools</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who think that there are enough teachers in schools</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant differences marked with asterisks: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Child labor in the intervention communities as a barrier to schooling

Parents did not declare child labor as a barrier for schooling. However, qualitative evidence suggests that older children tend to prefer working by themselves to gain some money than to go to school. While asking in which types of activities children were involved within and outside the household, very few parents reported that children were highly involved in domestic or field work. These results however have to be interpreted with cautious as child labor is a very sensitive
issue that focuses a lot of attention in Côte d’Ivoire and more specifically in the cocoa value chain. Parents might have a strong social desirability bias and may underreport child labor.

IPA administered to parents’ questions about the type of domestic and field activities children did at home. Before discussing this into more details, we should note that participation in field activities highly depends on seasonal variation.

The general results suggest that children were more involved in domestic than field work. For instance, only 3 percent of parents interviewed responded never having their child performing the listed domestic work during the last 30 days; while 46 percent of them said that their child did not perform any of the listed activities in the last 30 days.

According to interviewed parents, more than three quarter of children shopped for the family while less than half took care of other family members. There are also variations around the type of field tasks performed by children. Most children were not involved in dangerous activities such as spraying insecticides. More children, 38 percent were however involved in harvest activities such as picking, piling, breaking cocoa pods, transporting or drying beans. Finally, most parents reported that these field activities were mostly done outside schooling hours during the weekend or holidays.

Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable. and Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable. describe the different domestic and field activities students did out of school during the last 30 days before the baseline survey.

Figure 3: Students’ domestic work during the last 30 days

---

As part of parents’ interviews, they were listed 7 current domestic tasks and 5 usual field activities, and they were asked to give the number of times it happens their child involved in the activities during the last 30 days. The options of answers were: Never, Less than 5 times, between 6 and 10 times, between 11 and 15 and More than 15 times.

The listed 7 domestic works are: Do shopping for the family; Prepare food; Clean utensils / house; Washing clothes; Caring for children, the elderly or the sick; Go get water at a waterhole; Go to bring back wood.

The listed 5 field works are: Clean the fields; Plant seed; Spray insecticides or spread fertilizers; Maintain the field; Participate in the harvest.
Focus groups carried out with parents in communities revealed that most parents have a clear classification in mind on which activity a child can or can't do. Discussions surfaced two important age categories. Between 9 and 12-year-old, children are more involved in domestic work including fetching water, washing dishes, washing clothes or harvesting kola nuts. These are...
mostly out of school activities that do not really impact school attendance. The second age category reported corresponds to children between 12 and 15 that are more involved in the farming work, helping in cleaning fields, collecting wood, harvesting peppers or taking care of younger siblings. Parents indeed reported that children and more specifically boys tend to spend significant amount of time doing small activities to earn cash such as harvesting kola nuts or hunting. Parents agreed that the latest activities adversely impacted school attendance. “When the kola harvest is coming, children leave school to harvest kola to earn money” (Focus group de X).

Criteria 1.1.2. Beneficiaries’ description of their needs links to the outcomes delivered by the pilot

Lack of resource to send their children to school

Qualitative evidence supports the above argument. During focus groups, beneficiaries’ parents declared not having enough money to send their children to school. In fact, they are unable to pay the enrollment fees, school supplies such as books, they can’t also pay to get their children a birth certificate. Some kids refuse to attend school because some of their parents are unable to feed them once they go to school. “The child refuses to go to school when enrolled because he can’t find food when he comes back home” (Focus group of X).

Pool of out of school children:

Participants in the focus groups seemed to clearly identify a pool of out of school children. During focus groups, in all communities, there emerged a strong judgement towards out of school children. Parents participating to the focus group reported that young children that are not going to school are a source of problems and that school is giving them a safe environment “When children are not going to school they roam the street, they steal, create disputes, throw stones with slingshots, play dangerous games such as climbing in trees, school will really save them “. Interestingly some parents identified that violence was a source of dropouts for children and that in the new bridge schools teachers should be even more patient and gentle “Someone that left school- if we hit him, he will flee again”( FG X community)
1.2. Aligns with the priorities of the donors

Despite addressing a specific need, the pilot as implemented does not align with the priorities of all donors. While Jacobs declared being interested in continuing to support bridge classes, COMPANY NAME seemed to prefer to change strategy to work directly with the MENET-FP.

Criteria 1.2.1. The pilot, as implemented, remains aligned with Company name objectives

According to the Key Informant Interviews, the current pilot is not aligned with COMPANY NAME’s strategy anymore as COMPANY NAME would like to leverage a stronger involvement of the governmental counterparts. Seeking a closer collaboration with the MENET-FP would mean for COMPANY NAME to work directly with one specific Directorate of the MENET-FP. COMPANY NAME already has experience working with the Department of Literacy and Non-Formal Education (DAENF) on an alphabetization project and would like to build on this experience to include the bridge school approach. It is important to note that after some back and forth between the DPFC and the DAENF, it is DAENF that is now in charge of the Accelerated Education Programs (AEP) that includes bridge schools.

In the inception of the project COMPANY NAME declared that the community approach has been identified as a promising way to reduce child labor while connecting local structures to local governmental counterparts. In this endeavor the Child Labor Remediation System (CLMRS) has been a core component of COMPANY NAME’s projects. COMPANY NAME therefore signaled a keen interest in financing bridge school projects as it was offering an interesting opportunity to vulnerable children identified through the CLMRS approach.

Current pathways forward would therefore include a direct collaboration with the DAENF to finance rural animators and support the different management and supervision layers of the project.

Recommendation for scale-up: Implementing a bridge school program requires an in-depth understanding of the educational decentralized structures and the many communication channels between them. Bridge classes are embedded in an ecosystem of stakeholders and Ministry Directions that all need to be on board to sustain the project.

Criteria 1.2.2. The pilot, as implemented, remains aligned with Jacobs Foundation’s objectives

Jacobs Foundation developed a strong interest in bridge schools investing significant resources during the GMM1 phase on bridge school construction. Based on this experience, Jacobs wanted
to broaden their scope of work and foster local NGO on the implementation of this types of programs.

In addition to the standard bridge school approach developed by EPT, Jacobs was very interested in developing a qualitative component to the program while adding the NB/LB approach.

TRECC envisions bridge schools as integrated in the MENET-FP system in the medium run and would very much appreciate more investment on the ministry side around this question.
2. Results (outputs and direct outcomes)

Results are divided into three components:

- Delivers output at high quality
- Achieves direct outcomes
- Beneficiaries’ feedback about the program is positive

2.1. Delivers outputs at high quality

Most outputs were not achieved at required quality. The first master trainer training on the LB/NB methodology was very incomplete and the rural animator’s training was not sufficient even if all four animators reported being satisfied. Pre and post test results revealed weak learning levels. On the delivery of the different equipment, EPT managed to renovate and refurnish classes with the required material. School kits were delivered to all children but with significant delays. EPT managed to enroll 120 out of school children but due to the strike struggle to maintain high attendance rates. Mentoring system did work during the program as headmasters and pedagogic counselors did visit schools. Finally, children did not benefit consistently across the program of the canteen further impacting the attendance rate.

Criteria 2.1.1. Key outputs from the proposal log frame were achieved

- 2 EPT trainers trained in 5 LB sessions and 5 NB sessions

2 EPT trainers were trained but the quality of the training didn’t meet sufficient standards to ensure a smooth roll-out of the program. According to Key Informant Interviews and final reports, 2 EPT staff were trained by one staff of Save the Children during a three days’ workshop. Despite the training happening many sources of information indicate that the training was of poor quality and that it didn’t really allow EPT to have the capacity to implement the methodology. Critiques around the training can be classified into three categories:

Practical exercises: Interviewed participants declared that the training was “too theoretical” without much practical exercises and role plays. In addition to this, Save the Children master trainers seemed to have limited practical experience of the program in turn affecting participants’ involvement.

Community component: The NB and LB approach heavily relies on a community approach that aims at fostering the learning environment of children. This is done via an increased access to books and pedagogical material but also through the organization of reading sessions and
support of specific readings. Despite the critical aspect of the community engagement, no formal training has been conducted on the community component.

**Evaluation component:** As many education programs, the third pillar of the NB/LB approach relies on the tracking of children learning levels through regular assessments. Once again despite being central, no specific training has been organized around the evaluation component of the program. LB/NB approach designed a specific evaluation tool based on the Early Grades Reading Assessment (EGRA) tool. However, according to EPT staff, none of these tests have been shared by Save the Children.

Comparing to other contexts the current trainer training received by EPT was relatively light touch. In fact, the entire training that includes 9 sessions and 6 activities (see Annex 5 for more details on the LB and NB approach) lasted for three days while the one organized in Rwanda lasted for five days.

**Recommendation for scale-up:** Constructing capacities around a new teaching pedagogy requires an extensive set of training with close follow-ups. Dedicated workshops to discuss learnings and ways to improve the implementation of the program should also be organized. If interested by integrating the LB/NB components we recommend project stakeholders to invest much more on the capacity building side.

**4 bridge classrooms renovated and equipped**

Two bridge classes were effectively renovated, and the two others didn’t need it. Three out of the four classes required equipment. As bridge schools are hosted in formal schools’ compounds, in the four communities, a dedicated space was given to the bridge schools programs.

During the needs assessment in the target communities, two formal schools gave access to one of their classrooms within their school structure in X, X. In the two other communities Ores-krobou and X, a space that needed extra renovation work was made available for the program.

**Table 4: Class rooms renovated and equipped**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nb of class renovated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IPA spot-check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb of schools equipped: Tables, desk and flipchart</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EPT delivery note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detail of the school equipment received includes

**Table 5: School equipment distributed**

---

Using existing infrastructure to roll-out the bridge school programs makes sense in a context with scarce resources. However, each school in the area is embedded in a complex web of reciprocal arrangements. Key Informant Interviews revealed that the class made available in the X community was constructed by a different Cocoa Cooperative. This negatively impacted the sense of ownership of the project in this community since people from the COMPANY NAME cooperative didn’t want to support a bridge class that was hosted by a school built by another cooperative.

**Recommendation for scale-up:** EPT has not been used to work in Cocoa regions. In this sense they had a limited knowledge of the different interactions between cooperatives and private companies. IPA therefore recommend project stakeholders to collect information on all past projects in a community during the needs assessment to have a better picture of what is at stake.

**4 animators recruited and trained**
Four rural animators were hired in the communities and trained by EPT staff over more than two weeks. However, training on LB/NB was very incomplete.

**EPT training**
The training was initially supposed to last for 15 days and was extended to 20 days between the 12th of September and the 4th of October in Agboville. In their final report, EPT explained that the training was supposed to be led by the DPFC with the technical support of Save the Children while EPT would mobilize the needed resources.

**LB/NB training**
Has described earlier, in the first stages of the project, EPT received a very incomplete master trainer training of the LB/NB methodology. This had a negative impact on the cascading training and global understanding of the pedagogy. In addition to these many barriers to implement LB/NB, EPT reported that the key contact person in charge of the pedagogy at the DPFC was not available for the training of rural animators.

---

**Table 6: Number of rural animators recruited and trained**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Gand Morié</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Desk</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flipchart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural animator desk</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Using existing infrastructure to roll-out the bridge school programs makes sense in a context with scarce resources. However, each school in the area is embedded in a complex web of reciprocal arrangements. Key Informant Interviews revealed that the class made available in the X community was constructed by a different Cocoa Cooperative. This negatively impacted the sense of ownership of the project in this community since people from the COMPANY NAME cooperative didn’t want to support a bridge class that was hosted by a school built by another cooperative.

**Recommendation for scale-up:** EPT has not been used to work in Cocoa regions. In this sense they had a limited knowledge of the different interactions between cooperatives and private companies. IPA therefore recommend project stakeholders to collect information on all past projects in a community during the needs assessment to have a better picture of what is at stake.

**4 animators recruited and trained**
Four rural animators were hired in the communities and trained by EPT staff over more than two weeks. However, training on LB/NB was very incomplete.

**EPT training**
The training was initially supposed to last for 15 days and was extended to 20 days between the 12th of September and the 4th of October in Agboville. In their final report, EPT explained that the training was supposed to be led by the DPFC with the technical support of Save the Children while EPT would mobilize the needed resources.

**LB/NB training**
Has described earlier, in the first stages of the project, EPT received a very incomplete master trainer training of the LB/NB methodology. This had a negative impact on the cascading training and global understanding of the pedagogy. In addition to these many barriers to implement LB/NB, EPT reported that the key contact person in charge of the pedagogy at the DPFC was not available for the training of rural animators.

**Table 6: Number of rural animators recruited and trained**
Recommendation for scale-up: EPT and Save the Children should coordinate to design and implement a better training with clearer explanations about the pedagogy.

✔ 120 students are equipped with a school kit

All students received the school kits\(^9\) but with delays. 30 students from each bridging class received a school kit. The distribution of school kits took place from Tuesday 09 to Thursday 11 October 2018 when classes started the 5\(^{th}\). Each animator signed a “receipt slip” to confirm that the students received the material.

Table 7: School kits delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NB of school kits delivered</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>EPT delivery note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✔ Animators provided with didactic material

Animators and children received didactic material but with a significant delay of two months. According to the proposal, each animator was supposed to receive a set of didactic material\(^{10}\) after the training. Looking at the receipt slips of the didactic material, we observe that it was delivered two months after the start of the classes, the 5\(^{th}\) of December 2018.

EPT didn't consider this delay as possibly affecting the quality of the teaching as their program is organized in two phases. During a first 8 weeks phase, rural animators are only teaching in local language and therefore don't need activity books.

Information gathered during IPA's field visits also point towards a lack of material. During midline data collection one rural enumerators in X reported having not enough didactic guides in his class and the same situation was again reported in June 2019 during the endline.

Table 8: Number of rural animators provided with didactic material

---

\(^9\) School kits are composed of , One 200 Pages copy book, two 100 pages copybooks, One drawing copybook, Three colors pen (blue, red and green), one pencil, one eraser , one pair of scissors, one 10 white chalk pack, three copybook cover (blue, red and green), one bag, one square, animators provided with didactic

\(^{10}\) This includes a trainer manual, educational curriculum and activity books in French mathematics and civic education for every child
EPT did enroll more than 120 children in their program. In fact, EPT had to identify and enroll a list of 120 out of school children in the four communities meaning around 30 for each of the four community. The target age range was between 9 and 14, and EPT declared focusing their effort on the oldest out of school children as they are the most vulnerable. According to Ivorian law after 15 a child cxt be enrolled in primary school anymore thus definitely cutting of their access to higher education. During baseline, IPA did manage to interview 126 out of school children. IPA did try to identify other out of school children in the community to compare beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries’ outcomes. Only 20 children were identified, possibly indicating a low stock of out of school children between 9 to 14 in this community. 75 percent of the non-beneficiary children that were out of school were located in the Grand Morie.

100% of the students benefit from the school canteen

Canteens were very dysfunctional during project implementation and not all children benefited from it during the 260 days of schooling. In the proposal, the initial idea was to use the existing canteen structure of formal schools. Children from bridge classes would eat with children from formal schools using a financial compensation directly given by EPT to the canteen. This system didn't work out for two main reasons.

First, it is difficult to rely on the current formal canteen system as it is highly deficient. Food supplies are not delivered on time and at required quantities. According to one official from the MENET-FP, his results in an average of 18 days of operational canteens during a school year.11

Second, canteens are managed by a specific division of the MENET-FP called the Direction des Cantines Scolaires (DCS) that refused to deliver meals to bridge classes’ children, even against

---

11 This figures was reported by one employee of the MENEP-FP during the Key Informant Interviews
payment. Project stakeholders should have been in contact with this Direction to get the approval that bridge classes pupils could eat in canteens before project implementation. Another entry point could have been the headmaster that usually has enough leverage to influence canteens' decisions.

As a response to these challenges, EPT created canteens based on a community structure called the mother children club or les Clubs de Mères Enfants Filles (CMEF) in French. CMEF were not the adequate structure to deliver food to children. The initial idea of this CMEF structure is to create a group of women that would advocate for children's schooling in the community and emphasis the need to send girls to schools. In addition to this those women would support the community in having access to birth certificates and in some cases run small Income Generating Activities to strengthen their sense of belonging.

In addition to the fact that CMEF were not built with the idea to deliver food to children, the composition of these clubs has created operational challenges. In fact, bridge classes’ first anchor in the community were supposed to be the cooperatives. Most women participating in the CMEF committee were relatives of cooperatives’ members. The issue of such a composition was that no cooperative member households had children enrolled in the bridge schools’ classes. Therefore, the foundation of the community engagement that is grounded in having their own children in bridge classes was not there. As a result, CMEF did deliver some food to children but very intermittently and with low financial investment from the community.

Recommendation for scale-up: Canteens are a key driver of attendance for out of school children that are usually the most vulnerable. Better planning of food supply and canteens operations could significantly increase attendance.

Canteens finally worked very intermittently as displayed in table 8 and data on their days of operations is only available for the month of December to March.

Table 8: Canteens open days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>EPT adminstrative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year total open day</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the endline data collection IPA collected data to check if mentors performed their coaching work. When asked whether they received assistance during the last 3 months, all teachers interviewed said that they benefited from assistance from their school director and their pedagogical advisors and two of the four declared receiving assistance from their inspectors. (See, table 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: Percentage of animators who received supervision/visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers received supervision/visit during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers received supervision/visit from the director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers received supervision/visit from the pedagogical advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers received supervision/visit from the teaching inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria 2.1.2. Participation rate

At least 95% attendance rate of students in class

EPT admin data shows that 136 students were enrolled in the four bridge classes. The location of X had the largest number of students, with 42 children enrolled. Looking at EPT admin data, we observe big discrepancies in attendance among the different communities. These discrepancies significantly increased during the teachers’ strike\(^\text{12}\) period between January and March 2019. In fact, in one location X, we observe a clear breakdown in attendance rate achieving 35 percent in March 2019. The highest attendance rate is observed in the location of X where 87 percent of enrolled students at the beginning of the program are still present at the end of the school year.

Attendance rates presented in table 10 are coming from EPT internal M&E system and are a monthly average of children’s attendance rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: Attendance rate from EPT admin data per bridges’ schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{12}\) As bridge classes are hosted in formal schools, children of bridge schools started to mimic their peers and started not attending schools anymore.
IPA independent data shows a breakdown of students’ attendance during the midline survey as only 54 percent of the baseline children were surveyed. This takes into account the fact that the enumerator team tracked children in villages to survey them, indicating that the attendance rate - meaning the number of children sitting in class this day - might was lower. It's important to mention that EPT attendance rate is computed over an entire month while IPA observed attendance for one day during the same month. Despite this shortcoming the magnitude of this gap raises questions on the reliability of the collected data during this period. Other than this IPA finds very similar attendance rate during baseline and endline.

2.2. Achieves direct outcomes

Key immediate outcomes were only partially achieved. Pre and post data on rural animators’ performance were not diligently collected and the LB/NB pedagogy not

---

IPA also collected information about the presence of children during its three rounds of data collection. To summarize, before the baseline data collection, EPT provided IPA with a list of 115 students enrolled in the pilot schools while IPA enumerators found 25 new non-listed students in classes. Which give 140 students enrolled in the bridge classes during the baseline. IPA attendance rate were computed based on the 140 students.
clearly implemented. This is mostly because of the incomplete master trainer training on the pedagogy, but no real remediation has been implemented during program implementation. Learners did pass the final transfer exam and based on their age were mostly assigned to grade 5 class. In its independent evaluation IPA did not observe a clear increase in performance on basic literacy and computations skills. Despite early changes in number recognition, Children transferred to formal schools do not seem to reach the expected levels of skills required to follow grade 5 programs. Being aware of these results, EPT explained that their strategy was to get the oldest children finish primary schools, to get access to other types of education like vocational training.

Criteria 2.2.1.a. Results of pre and post-test show immediate improvement in knowledge

Percentage of rural animators and supervisors scored above 75% on the post-training knowledge test

EPT reported that no rural animators scored above 75 percent on the Save the Children knowledge test after the training. Despite repeated requests, EPT could not share with IPA the results of the pre and post test training as they declared it was implemented by Save the Children. However, in their final report, EPT explained that only 2 out of four rural animators received an average score on Save the Children’s test and that the level increased after the follow-up.

Recommendation for scale-up: IPA strongly recommends implementing tests after the training to measure knowledge. This has two key advantages. First it can allow better tailored individual support based on the test results. Second it can allow the project team to monitor progress along pre-defined criteria.

Criteria 2.2.1.b. Changes of beneficiaries’ knowledge, behavior and practices have been observed over time

Percentage of rural animators who apply the LB/NB methodology during classroom observation

IPA could not observe the implementation of the LB/NB methodology due to the incomplete initial training received by EPT staff. The incomplete master trainer training created confusion around the essence of the LB/NB approach.

Key Informant Interviews with the core staff of EPT revealed many confusions around the understanding of the LB/NB approach. One core area of convergence on both EPT and LB/NB methodologies was the child centered approach and the use of games to stimulate child learning. On this aspect EPT’s staff reported having learned interesting new games or precise technics to
implement with children. This association between games and LB/NB methodology is best crystalized in the testimony of one rural animator “LB/NB motivates more children through games”. EPT chief of pedagogy also mentioned during a discussion that the team spent a lot of time integrating the games taught in the LB/NB approach into their curricula and to link them to specific skillsets. In the final validated curricula shared with IPA by EPT it is not possible to disentangle what is related to the LB/NB pedagogy from what is related to the classic EPT pedagogy that also integrates games and manual activities.

A more salient consideration is that the two key components that define LB/NB and that could have been observed by our team were not part of the core initial training: the community component that tries to engage parents on specific reading habits and the evaluation component that follows specific standards set by the program.

Despite these major shortcomings in the early stages of the program, Save the Children never really course corrected this lack of a community approach and evaluation during the 4 follow-up visits.

**Recommendation for scale-up:** For future iteration of the project we recommend the implementing partners offering a new pedagogy to be more precise about what type of practice should be implemented and what are the core features of the methodology. This would enable better monitoring strategy and clearer implementation of the approach.

Percentage of students who obtain the average score required to integrate the formal education system following the final exam

83 percent of the baseline students took the final exam to integrate formal schools.

According to EPT’s final test results, 99 out of 100 children that followed the entire program attended the final test. Almost all of those who attended the test were assigned in formal schools (Grades 4 or 5) – except one child that was too old to integrate formal school (age limit in Côte d'Ivoire is 14). On average, children assigned to integrate Grade 5 performed better than the ones assigned to Grade 4. This last result remains consistent regardless the bridge schools. (See Table 11)

*Agouahui* had the highest variance in terms of students’ performance. Indeed, X got the lowest average score for children assigned to Grade 4 (0.84 over 10) and the highest average score for those assigned to Grade 5 (7.28 over 10). X’s school got the highest rate of children assigned to Grade 5 (96 percent) and X got the lowest rate to children assigned to Grade 4 (18 percent).

It is important to note that student’s performance is not the only factor influencing children integration in the formal system. In fact, EPT and the decentralized structure of the MENET-FP agreed to take into account the age as the primary factor of children integration into formal schools. In fact, children above 13 would be directly directed to the grade 5 so they can finish primary school and have access to vocational training after
Table 11: Proportion of students who got the required score to be integrated in the level 4 & 5 of the formal system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># children who passed the test</th>
<th>Average score of students assigned to grade 4 (over 10)</th>
<th>Percentage of children assigned to grade 4</th>
<th>Average score of students assigned to grade 5 (over 10)</th>
<th>Percentage of children assigned to grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average ASER score of students in Math and French at the baseline/endline evaluations

IPA does identify early improvements in number recognition but does not observe significant changes on the literacy and computation skills.

IPA carried out three rounds of students learning level assessment (Baseline, Midline and Endline) in literacy and numeracy using ASER\(^{14}\) test. Given the high rate of dropouts during midline\(^{15}\), only baseline and endline results of these assessments are presented below.

EPT’s assignment of students to Grade 4 or 5 do not guarantee that students had a minimum level in reading and number recognition. In general, IPA ASER tests show that students learning levels in literacy and numeracy are low even if they performed better in numeracy. For instance, only 17 percent of students can read at least a word at the end of school year and 60 percent of them can recognize at least 2-digits numbers. (See Figure 5, Figure 6 and Figure 7)

Comparing these performances with other education pilots, we observe slightly better results in literacy in formal schools. In the region of Meagui, at the end of grade 4, 37 percent of children know how at least to read a word. These results give an estimation of children’s achievements and do not include all the other skills developed through the bridge schools that could include verbal communication or problem solving. A broader set of skills was also tested during the transfer exam.

\(^{14}\) The ASER tool tests basic reading and numeracy skills that are taught in grade 1 and 2. The choice was made to use the ASER to assess the students given its advantages compared to other tests. The ASER is reliable to measure grade level reading skills, more appropriate for French speaking country (like Côte d’Ivoire), and less complex to develop and administrate. For more detail, see Annex 1

\(^{15}\) The high rate of absent students results could be driven by a selection bias.
The rationale developed by EPT is that age is a paramount criteria of school transfer in the current system. Indeed a 14 years old child even if not completely at the level will not accept to seat with 9 years old children in a grade 4 class. EPT explained that it might be better for them to follow one additional year of primary school in grade 5 and then have access to vocational training. As repetition is not allowed anymore in the current system children would automatically finish primary school before their 15.

Figure 6: Students literacy level at ASER test – Baseline vs Endline

![Baseline vs Endline Literacy Level Chart]

Figure 7: Students numeracy level at ASER test – Baseline vs Endline
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2.3. Beneficiaries’ feedback about the program is positive:

Feedback on the program was overall positive. Rural animators were not completely satisfied with the training length and quality. One also reported missing didactic material towards the end of the program. Rural animators were however satisfied with the child centered pedagogy and could observe children making progress.

Criteria 2.3.1.a Beneficiaries provide positive feedback on the delivery of outputs

Teachers and rural animators provide a positive feedback on the training

Teachers had mixed opinions regarding their training. At baseline and during a spot-check visit, IPA’s enumerators asked the bridge classes’ animators several questions to estimate their level of satisfaction regarding their training.

Regarding the quality of training, during the spot-check, visit 2 out of 4 animators reported that they were satisfied with their training, 1 said that he could not comment on the quality of training.
and the last one reported that the training was too short. As for training, I will say no because we received only one month's training. For me, it is insufficient. However, all teachers seem to agree that they would benefit from additional training. During quantitative endline survey, when asked how they think their performance could improve, all animators requested more training.

Animators provide a positive feedback on the availability of didactic material

Animators feedback on the availability of didactic material is mitigated. Some animators declared having received all materials while others reported that they missed some of it.

At baseline and endline, IPA's team asked animators whether they had all the materials and if no which material was missing in their classes. During the baseline survey, three out of the four teachers reported not having received all the materials yet. However, it was not too concerning because only stationery items rather than didactic material were missing from classes. This is because stationary materials such as glue or paint brushes are important but not essential for the functioning of classes.

At endline, two animators reported not having all the materials. This is more alarming because one of them indicated that the team in charge of implementation of the project did not provide certain textbooks.

Criteria 2.3.1.b Beneficiaries provide positive feedback on the main immediate outcomes

Teachers/rural animators provided a positive feedback on the improvement on their students' learning/outcomes as result of PALEC methods

All animators gave positive feedback on the improvement of students. During all three data collection phases, all animators reported that they believe students can learn more with the bridge class approach.

Table 12: Animators feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of teachers who think that students will be able to learn more with EPT approach</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Midline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How the approach implemented in bridge classes improves students learning outcomes?

Teachers reported that the approach implemented in bridge classes improves students’ learning. They stated that the pedagogy implemented in bridge classes enabled children to learn more than when using traditional pedagogy and gave different reasons to explain this. According to one animator the use of games enables children to learn more. Furthermore, another one explained that the children in his class can read and solve certain exercises that children in traditional classes cannot solve.

Criteria 2.3.2 Interviews with the animators show that they are satisfied with the project.

During IPA’s spot-check visit, animators expressed mostly positive views about the project but noted a few issues they encountered during the project.

All animators interviewed reported that they believe the pedagogy implemented in bridge classes is efficient. They seem to believe that the use of games as a pedagogical tool as part of the pedagogy has played an important role in the efficiency of the pedagogy. According to some animators, the use of games facilitates teaching. Yes, I’m comfortable with this pedagogy because when you use games to teach, it processes easily. Another animator explained that the use of games enables children to learn better. Yes, in my opinion this approach is based on the game. It helps children too because they like to have fun, so they learn better while having fun. Also, it creates a positive atmosphere and positively changes teachers’ role. Yes, it is effective because games allow the teacher to become a facilitator rather than an instructor, it creates a good atmosphere.

As negative points, animators noted that the program was too intense. I think this methodology is effective, but things are too condensed”. They also mentioned that EPT did not do the communities’ sensibilization appropriately. The return of the bridge class was not done in a good way in my opinion. It was necessary that the leaders of EPT had previously made a great awareness.
3. Costs and operations management

✓ Costs are well managed

✓ Project management is successful

✓ 3.1 Costs are well managed:

The project management team made efficient use of resources and spent less than budgeted to implement all the activities of the pilot. IPA also acknowledges the good financial reporting of the organization. However, unit cost per child of the program appears to be significantly higher than similar programs implemented in the region. As COMPANY NAME didn't share information about their vision for scale including the location and number of bridge schools, EPT was not able to develop a clear vision of the scale-up and no financial plan was included in the proposal.

[Details removed]

✓ 3.2 Project Management is successful

Project management strayed from the initial proposal as EPT received very little support in the field from both Save the children on the technical aspects and COMPANY NAME to foster community engagement

[Details removed]
4. Capacity to learn, improve and innovate

Capacity to learn, improve and innovate is divided into two components, both of which the pilot is assessed on:

- Project collects credible monitoring data
- Monitoring is used to learn and improve

---

4.1 Project collects credible monitoring data

Monitoring data was not always collected and shared according to the agreed plan. Spot-checks revealed that attendance data was not always reliable specifically in one community. Data was not actionable and at a critical moment during the teachers strike, EPT did not identify the clear increase in dropouts. Some initiatives were taken to mitigate to make appropriate changes such as the intense mobilization campaign after the strike that succeeded in getting most of the children back in school to pass the final exam.

---

Criteria 4.1.1. Routine monitoring data are collected and shared on time with the stakeholders

EPT did share data regularly with IPA. EPT collected three different types of data during the pilot implementation.

1. **Classroom attendance data:** Every school day, rural animators recorded students' attendance in a logbook. EPT's staff was collecting this daily attendance and compiling it into a monthly attendance rate that shared with partners.

2. **Canteen attendance rate:** EPT collected data around student's canteen attendance. These data allow us to have the number of opening days during the project.

3. **Transfer test data:** EPT conducted a student test transfer to assess pupils' levels before moving into the formal system. Those results were also compiled in excel and shared with IPA.

EPT did also regularly report the field results through monthly operational meetings held with all project stakeholders. Despite making clear efforts around the data collection, IPA observed a lot of missing information during specific period. Attendance was for example not available for each month of the program, the same for canteen attendance rate.

---

Criteria 4.1.2. Monitoring data is actionable and aligned with program management

EPT did not always collect actionable data. Despite being collected and shared regularly with project partners, monitoring data was not always actionable and used to take corrective measures. In January 2019 started a period of teachers’ strike that strongly impacted teachers
and children attendance. While children from the formal schools were not going to class, children from the bridge classes started to follow the same path. It is only during IPA's midline data collection that project stakeholders were informed that attendance rate was plummeting.

**Recommendation for scale-up:** IPA recommends EPT to implement strict monitoring routines with field staff especially during periods of strikes. Very close monitoring of EPT's staff during this period could enable the team to find mitigation strategies to maintain children attendance.

Criteria 4.1.3 IPA spot-check visits confirm the quality and accuracy of the data shared by partner.

IPA conducted two spot-checks during the pilot. Results cast doubts on the accuracy of the attendance rate data collected by EPT.

**Spot-check 1:**
The first spot-check took place from 15 to 17 January 2019. Its focus was on administrative data quality and canteens operations. IPA checked the attendance logs to make a comparison with the compiled EPT data sent by the management staff. EPT’s data on class size has found to be reliable as spot-check confirmed data was accurate. Concerning attendance rate, the data has been reliable in three out of the four communities: X, X and X. For the community of X, the attendance rate has been strongly overestimated and in-house computation are much less optimistic.

**Table 13: Spotcheck 1 results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing classes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance rate</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To check if canteens were operational, IPA interviewed one canteen manager and three students in order to have their opinion on how the canteen is working. Regarding canteens operations, interviewed students reported that there are satisfied with the food quality. However, the Canteen manager reported lack of food supply was a major barrier for canteens’ operations.
IPA assess the credibility of data around three dimensions:

- **Validity**: valid data accurately captures the core concept EPT one is seeking to measure.
- **Reliability**: implies that the same data collection procedure, implemented repeatedly to measure the same reality, will produce consistently similar data.
- **Unbiased**: data does not have systematic errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credible data criteria</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
<th>Unbiased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom attendance data</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canteen attendance rate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer test data</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPA does not consider classroom attendance data as accurate (see annex 7 for a picture of the logbook). Clean and detailed log books were available for rural animators. The data was collected each half day. The spot-check conducted identified that rural animator were using different methods to fill-in the same logbooks. This can introduce a systematic bias in the data. The registration method was to put horizontal line when the student is present, and vertical line if not. But all rural animators did not respect this methodology. Some animators only recorded absent students while other only recorded present students. IPA flagged this issue during the first field visit but no remediation strategy was put in place.

**Canteen attendance rate.**
EPT made a clear effort to collect data on canteens' operations. The focus of the reporting was on the canteen attendance rate per community per children. Canteens attendance rate is a clear example of a non-valid indicator. In fact, our primary focus here is the number of days of operations of the canteens not the attendance.

**Transfer test data**
We are confident in the transfer test data. Indeed, a pedagogical committee was set by EPT in which formal school directors, pedagogical advisor and EPT's pedagogical chiefs designed this test.
4.2 Monitoring is used to learn

Data was collected but not always used to learn and take corrective measures. Indeed, EPT didn't really identify the raise in dropouts during the teachers' strike. After the identification of the problem, EPT invested a significant amount of energy and resources to understand dropouts and mobilize children to come back to school. Strong field monitoring enabled EPT to have 83 percent of the children taking the final exam.

4.2.1 Program improvement in response to monitoring

Based on the needs assessment EPT decided to change one of their target community. EPT finally decided to work in X instead of another community.

EPT discovered that formal school principal didn't want bridge school children to go to the canteens of formal schools. As a result, EPT had to use CMEF to deliver food to bridge schools' students. During the needs assessment it appeared that bridging school students couldn't go to the formal school canteens. As a solution, EPT tried created their own canteens using CMEF to deliver food to students.

Following high drop-out rate of children, EPT organized an intense session of mobilization in the community through public criers and awareness campaigns targeting parents. In addition to this, EPT established a supervisory committee to monitor student attendance. Animators seem to believe that surveillance committee set up by EPT were efficient to improve students' attendance. According to rural animators, the surveillance committees helped to improve students' attendance and to have better interactions with the parents. "...we have to work with and worked hard to bring back those who left the bridge classed. IPA acknowledges and observed the big mobilization effort of EPT in the field that managed to get most of the children back to school.

Information gathered during interviews suggested that they are equipped to overcome challenges linked to students' participation. According to animators, when a student was absent to classes they tried to discuss with the child or his/her family to understand the reasons for the absence. "When a child is often away, we call a meeting and we go to the family to see what is going
on”. EPT set up four surveillance committees in each of the communities where bridge classes were implemented.

Finally, on a critical issue such as attendance EPT failed to diligently monitor it as IPA informed the organization about the serious problem of attendance.
5. Sustainability

Sustainability is divided into two components, both of which the pilot is assessed on:

- Provides sustained benefit to the community
- There are prospects for scale-up beyond GMM2

5.1. Provides sustained benefit for the community:

There are limited signs that the community will continue to benefit from the project. There appear to be significant challenges to maintaining the bridge schools as they are in the community. In addition, the rural animators’ poor retention of the LB/NB approach (discussed in Chapter 2) means there is little prospect that they will continue the approach in their future teaching. Continuation of the project without the financial support of the NGO appears to be unrealistic as parents of out of school children have very limited financial resources. In addition, few of the children are likely to be able to build on what they may have learned by integrating successfully into formal schooling. IPA did observe that some pre-requisites exist to foster children's integration in the formal schooling system. However, two key reasons why those children drop out of school were not addressed, namely financial resources of parents to fund their ongoing schooling and student's motivation and level of readiness. In addition, the integration of bridge classes in the formal school network including COGES was not optimal.

Criteria 5.1.1 Indications that the community members are likely to continue to benefit from program activities

Parents engagement:
Parents declared being ready to support bridge schools by enrolling their children in it. During focus groups, beneficiaries' parents mentioned important improvement points that would enable them to further support the project. The first point is that project stakeholders should make a better community awareness campaign. These awareness sessions could mainly be addressed to parents living outside the centre of the village. "The improvement is that it takes a lot of information and training for parents and COGES members to understand the project"(Focus group of X)
The second improvement point concerns vocational training for the oldest children. If parents know that their children will learn a job they will be more involved. Also, some of the parents reported that bridge schools would be better off if two sections were created, one with children that never went to school and the other with children that had an interruption in their schooling. “What I see is what I said. Children do not have the same levels. We have already learned something and others not, so two sections to better supervise children.” (Focus group of X).

Continuation of bridge classes in the community

COGES representatives are usually in charge of centralizing the financial resources of the community to pay for operating school expenses. COGES do receive state subsidies but the system appears to be very deficient. In turn, one avenue forward to finance the continuation of a bridge school project would be for the COGES to step-in. They would have to integrate the costs of the rural animators in their yearly budget and ask parents for a specific contribution.

Qualitative feedback in the community raises some serious doubts over the COGES capacity to mobilize financial resources to pay for a bridge schools for two main reasons. First, we observed that out of school children are stigmatized in the community and many members of the community think that they are hopeless cases. Not feeling concerned about this issue parents might not be willing to pay for out of school children while their own children attend school. Second, parents of out of school children are already often in a very stained situation limiting their capacity to financially contribute to the COGES.

Criteria 5.1.2 Indications that children will continue their schooling in formal schools

IPA did observe that important pre-requisites exist to foster children integration in the formal schooling system. Two key components of children dropout were however not really addressed, financial resources of parents and student’s motivation.

The integration in the formal system is based on the test children took at the end of the program. However, NRC reported cases were school directors re-tested children to allocate them in a specific class depending on their age and level. The advantage of the EPT’s project is that the final test was carried out with local representatives of the MENET-FP further encouraging re-integration of children.

Space is usually a major concern for children’s integration into the formal system as classes are overcrowded. In the current situation, IPA believes re-integration would be more feasible as many formal schools exists in the community and not many students were enrolled the bridge classes.

A more concerning issue is related to the financial resources of parents. As mentioned earlier in the report, formal schools are not free and many parents at the end of the program will still not be able to enroll their children in formal schools. During parents focus groups, more than 50
percent of fathers declared being willing to enroll their children in the bridge school next year if possible as it was free of charge.

Children's lack of interest in schooling is an important driver of dropouts. Many parents reported being helpless in pushing their children to go to school. Parents also declared that rural animators did an excellent work in visiting all the dropout children to encourage them to attend the class. There is little indication that such individualized support will exist in formal schools that have bigger classes.

Other studies evaluating the impact of Accelerated Education Programs revealed an increasing gender gap in the dropout rates after the reintegration in formal schools. This issue raises the need to collect reliable data on bridge school children progress throughout the system.

**Recommendation for scale-up:** To better evaluate and understand the key mechanisms that enables children to complete the primary cycle after the integration in the formal system, IPA recommends collaborating with the MENET-FP to set-up a tracking system of bridge classes students.

---

**5.2. There are prospects of scale-up beyond GMM2**

Accelerated educations programs have interesting prospects for scale beyond GMM2 program. Despite strong signs of governmental buy-in around alternative educations projects, the support of bridge classes in practice lacks resources and clear guidelines. Private sector partners also seem to be interested in financing such projects while strengthening the participation of the MENEP-FP. Finally, EPT has revealed a clear willingness to learn and good budget management that This shortcoming will have to be taken into account in the future project design.

---

**5.2.1. Are there indications that there is potential for further scale-up of the pilot approach in some way, by the government of Côte d'Ivoire, the Cooperation Partner or other development actors?**

There are clear indications that the bridge school approach is aligned with the education strategy in Côte d'Ivoire. In the education sectoral plan 2016-2025, the MENET-FP explains clearly that one of the key objectives is to offer an adequate access to schooling to children in age of going to primary. This includes increasing the scope of bridge schools to give a chance to out of school
children to come back in the formal system. In this respect, the document recommends the creation of bridge schools within formal primary schools for 30,000 children per year. Given that a bridge class has approximately 30 children, the MENET-FP would be ready to support around 1,000 bridge classes in the entire country per year. It is also written that headmasters should be part of this endeavor while supporting bridge schools' teachers and titling.

Given the scope and target number of bridge classes per year there is a big potential for scale-up within the next five year.

5.2.2. Enabling environment

Côte d'Ivoire has already gained a significant experience in the implementation of Accelerated Education Programs (AEP) that largely emerged after the political crisis of (2002-2011) to give access to education to children that had their education interrupted due to violence and conflict. In fact, between 2007 and 2015 the Norwegian Rescue Committee (NRC) implemented around 747 bridge classes functional for at least one year. NRC has been at the forefront of the bridge school implementation and advocacy work and decided to leave Côte d'Ivoire in 2015. NRC experience in Côte d'Ivoire shed an interesting light on the ambitious targets in the current education sectoral plan.

Despite being considered as an alternative form of education with specific targets in the education sectoral plan, in practice, there is no clear guidelines given by the MENET-FP to the decentralized educational structures on how to allocate resources and staff to this approach. As described in the NRC report\(^{16}\), bridge classes are still mostly seen as an “NGO affair”. As a result, there is still little ownership of decentralized ministry structures on bridge classes pupil's performance, attendance and access to canteens. In this context, if not properly planned beforehand, bridge schools are often seen as a burden by headmasters and pedagogical advisors. More work should therefore be carried out on the advocacy side to better integrate bridge schools into the formal structure of the MENET-FP.

5.2.3. Financing

Bridge schools have been at the center of the company approach to tackle child labor. The rationale being that if children are in school they are not working in the fields. For this reason, such programs still leverage significant interests among company partners that are ready to support bridge school to offer a mitigation strategy to child labor in areas where it was identified as a problem.

5.2.4 Organizational capacity to implement at scale

\(^{16}\) Accelerated Education Evaluation, Cote D'Ivoire | SEPtember 2015
EPT demonstrated capacity to implement projects at a larger scale and had similar experience in the past. EPT started activities after the second Ivorian civil war of 2010. The NGO was created by a group of teachers who wanted to offer a solution to children that missed school during the crisis. After an advocacy campaign on the need to address the education problem in the North of the country, EPT received significant funding's from UNICEF to finance school kits and the operation of 50 bridge schools. Remaining very local with a core team of former teachers, EPT has been in charge of large-scale projects in the past. However, due to the short-term nature of bridge school programs, the organization has experienced very large variance in the number of employed staffs. IPA would like to acknowledge the strong engagement of the field team and the very deep knowledge of the education challenges in Cote d'Ivoire. The organization has also demonstrated willingness to learn participating in all workshops and working closely with IPA's team in the field to collect quality data. The needs assessment was finally successfully carried out and procurement and distribution of school equipment went according to plan even if with some delays. EPT has however some room for improvement concerning technical reporting and monitoring system implementation.
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The pilot and scaling plan included a number of strengths that should help to facilitate scaling, including:

- Intervention addresses a clearly articulated need and targets children most at risk of being left behind and excluded from school;
- Engagement with government actors in delivering training and monitoring implementation throughout the pilot and planned for the next phase;
- Successful monitoring implemented during pilot phase, including more than double the planned classroom visits;
- Significant proportion of beneficiaries transferred into formal classrooms at the end of the school year.

There are several areas of the scaling plan that CUE felt could benefit from additional information, consideration, or clarity, especially since these areas will have significant implications for designing, implementing, and financing the initiative at scale.

**Issue of volunteers.** In both the pilot report and the scaling plan, it is noted that the facilitators in the classroom are all volunteers. However, nowhere is there a discussion of this volunteer model and the potential implications for scaling. Were there any challenges in the pilot with the voluntary nature of these roles, such as with teacher motivation? Do they anticipate any challenges or new issues moving forward, such as with certification? Is there any discussion around whether having voluntary facilitators (who are central to the delivery of the project) is sustainable at larger-scale? CUE strongly suggests including discussion and consideration of the volunteer model as part of process of planning for scale, as it could have significant impact on the sustainability of expansion.

**Necessity and sustainability of canteens.** The final project report specified that without functioning canteens, children’s attendance in the bridging classes dropped; this seems to
indicate that EPT considers school canteens to be a core element of the model, which needs to be maintained during scaling. As such, it will be important to continue to explore questions about how to ensure the sustainability of the canteens moving forward. The plan for the next phase of work to address some of the challenges with the canteens seen in the pilot phase includes strengthening the commitment of the CMEF by initiating income-generating projects, better planning for canteen stocks, motivation bonuses for canteens, and strengthening the involvement of the COGES through a structural reorganization. It would be useful to include additional details in the scaling plan (particularly in the activities section) around these proposed changes to be tested in the next phase of work and potential sustainability of these activities when considering long-term scaling goals.

**Partnership challenges.** The final report noted among key challenges a lack of collaboration between the various partners involved in the pilot project, which could pose significant barriers moving forward if not addressed. However, CUE noted that the section on partnerships was left blank in the scaling plan and no discussion was included either about the challenges of the existing partnerships or of plans to cultivate additional partnerships. Given the essential role partnerships play in scaling and sustainability, CUE feels additional consideration of this issue is needed as part of the development of the scaling plan, in particular addressing how to strengthen and improve existing partnerships.

**Lack of places in the formal school system.** A key aim of the bridging classes project is to enable out-of-school children to catch up and then integrate or re-integrate into the formal school system. However, the final pilot report noted that a significant constraint to this goal is the lack of sufficient places for these students in local formal schools. This systemic issue will likely become more challenging when implementing at a larger scale. CUE agrees it is important to recognize these structural challenges beyond the pilot project and was gratified to see the discussion about ways to address them included in the documents; EPT proposes as a solution that the Ministry of National Education build additional classrooms for these students to the standards of the formal schools. However, no space is given in the scaling plan to discussion around advocacy efforts to the MEN on this issue. It would be useful to give additional consideration to what activities and actions might need to be taken to lay the groundwork for this solution and build the necessary government outreach and engagement into project activities in the next phase of work. It also would be useful to consider what short-term solutions might be attempted for the current cohort of students before these classrooms might be built.
**Several elements of scaling plan not addressed.** CUE noted that several sections of the scaling plan were left blank, including around champions, resource needs for expansion, the enabling environment, and adaptation. Regarding the latter, it seemed from the final pilot report that several adaptations to the model were being considered, such as around the issue of canteens, targeting students, etc. CUE underscores the importance for the EPT team to give further consideration to each of these key elements in the scaling plan. Further, CUE feels several sections of the scaling plan would benefit from additional detail, including the scope of the problem being addressed (such detailing as the total number of children in the region who are out of school), the long-term vision for scale (particularly beyond the TRECC GMM2 extension phase), and envisioned scaling pathways (for example, does EPT plan to always be the implementer and grow alongside the intervention?). In all of these areas, further discussion would be beneficial. As an aside, CUE also wonders if some of the scaling-related questions are unclear and if it makes sense to consider rephrasing them to better explain what is being asked.

**Remaining questions around monitoring from pilot phase.** There were a few issues around monitoring raised in the pilot report that were not addressed in the scaling plan: 1) the challenge of some facilitators resisting the feedback and monitoring of their supervisors, and 2) the fact that more than twice as many classroom visits took place than were originally planned. Regarding the former, it would be useful in the scaling plan to directly address this challenge, why it might be the case, and ideas for improving this relationship in the subsequent phase of work. Regarding the latter, additional discussion would also be helpful—were additional monitoring visits necessary because of implementation challenges? Did facilitators need more support than expected? Will the same number of visits be planned in the next phase? Is the increased number sustainable?

**Targeting students.** The final report detailed the challenges of targeting students in the pilot phase, notably the lack of access to COMPANY NAME data, issues around birth certificates, and an unequal gender balance among students in the bridging classes. While a few recommendations around these points were touched on in the scaling plan, CUE feels it would be beneficial to build out further details for addressing these challenges, particularly around strategies for enrolling an equal number of boys and girls.

**Alignment with scaling lab.** As a final point of reflection, CUE thinks it would be useful to have a discussion with Scaling Lab Manager, and the rest of the scaling lab members (in particular those from the Ministry of National Education) about how they envision the learning from these bridging classes supporting and informing their broader vision for the “Reading, Writing, and Math for All” program. This could even be a key point of discussion in one of the lab meetings.
Annex 1: ASER test and Implementation

- Presentation of the test

The ASER tool tests basic reading and numeracy skills that are taught in grade 1 and 2. The choice was made to use the ASER to assess the students given its advantages compared to other tests. The ASER is reliable to measure grade level reading skills, more appropriate for French speaking country (like Côte d'Ivoire), and less complex to develop and administrate.

**Literacy test**

The literacy learning assessments tested the ability to read in French and placed learners into one of five levels:

1. Beginner. At this level, a learner can identify sounds or letters correctly.
2. Letter level. A learner can identify sounds or letters but cannot read words.
3. Word level. A learner can read words but cannot read sentences coherently.
4. Simple paragraph level. A learner can read sentences that use simple language but cannot read a short story.
5. Story level. A learner can read a short story containing simple language.

**Numeracy/Mathematics test**

The numeracy assessments are split into two parts. The first part tests number recognition and the second part tests math's operations.

For number recognition, a learner can be placed into one of four levels:

1. Beginner. At this level, a learner is unable to name even one-digit numbers.
2. One-digit level. A learner can name one-digit numbers but not two-digit numbers.
3. 2-digits level. A learner can name two-digit numbers but not three-digit numbers.
4. 3-digits level. A learner can name three-digit numbers. Learners should be at this level by the end of grade 2.

For math's operations, learners are tested on two sets of operations. First, they are given some two-digit by two-digit addition and subtraction sums. Second, learners are tested on two-digit by one-digit multiplication and division sums. Depending on their results they can be placed into one of five levels:

1. Beginner. These learners are unable to recognize a one-digit number (So, they can not do either addition, subtraction, multiplication or division given that they have not prerequisite for that) or they have none either addition, subtraction, multiplication or division levels (see definition below).
2. Addition. These learners can do addition. Learners are expected to reach this level by the end of grade 2.
3. Subtraction. These learners can do subtraction. Learners are expected to reach this level by the end of grade 2.
4. Multiplication. These learners can do multiplication.
5. Division. These learners can do multiplication and division.

- IPA/IDC ASER tests sample

IPA’s ASER tests was developed with the support of MEN experts—who received the expertise to developed ASER test which were used by teachers from Pratham team. The fact to have IDC tests were validated by MEN's experts ensures to IPA to have reliable tests in the sense that students should perform in the same way regardless of the assessor (IPA enumerators or Teachers).

- IPA implementation of ASER test

IPA implementation of ASER test follows the same protocol as describe below. See Annex 2 and Annex 3 for details for the ways to administrate ASER test.

The test was programmed in the electronic tablets in such way assessors were only able to gather learners’ answers at each step of the test step but cxt provide the final score or level. The learners score was automatically calculated by the device and was unknown to the assessors. This choice was made to minimize assessors bias in learners final score.

The test was delivered during one-on-one friendship’s discussions with students in respect of “IPA Child Safeguarding Policy”. Besides of schools’ staff consent to implement the survey, students’ assent was required to administrate the test. In addition, enumerators were trained to reassure children and help them to perform at their best during the test.
Annex 2: Protocol to administrate ASER literacy test

**Comment tester la lecture:**

**Commencer par le niveau « Paragraphe »**
Demander à l’enfant de lire un des deux paragraphes.
Laisser l’enfant choisir le paragraphe lui-même / elle-même. Si l’enfant n’arrive pas à choisir, lui désigner un des deux paragraphes.
Lui demander de le lire. Écouter attentivement comment il / elle lit.
S’il fait des erreurs, lui laisser une seconde chance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L’enfant n’est pas au niveau « Paragraphe » s’il/elle :</th>
<th>L’enfant est au niveau « Paragraphe », s’il/elle :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lit le texte comme un enchaînement de mots, plutôt que comme une phrase.</td>
<td>• Lit le texte comme une phrase, plutôt que comme un enchaînement de mots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lit le texte de façon saccadée, en s’arrêtant souvent.</td>
<td>• Lit le texte de façon fluide et aiséée, même s’il/elle lit lentement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lit le texte de façon fluide mais en faisant plus de 3 erreurs.</td>
<td>• Lit le texte avec 3 erreurs ou moins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Si l’enfant n’est pas au niveau « Paragraphe », lui demander de lire des mots. | Si l’enfant peut lire un paragraphe, lui demander de lire l’histoire. |

**Tester le niveau « Mot »**
Demander à l’enfant de lire 10 mots parmi la liste de mots.
Laisser l’enfant choisir les mots. S’il / elle ne choisit pas, lui montrer des mots à lire.
L’enfant est au niveau « Mot » s’il / elle :
• Lit au moins 6 mots sur 10 avec aisance.

**L’enfant est au niveau « Histoire » s’il/elle :**
• Lit le texte comme une phrase, et non comme un enchaînement de mots.
• Lit le texte de façon fluide et aisée. L’enfant peut lire lentement.
• Lit le texte avec 3 ou moins de 3 erreurs.
Annex 3: Protocol to administrate ASER numeracy test

Comment tester les mathématiques :

Instructions pour la partie 1 : « Reconnaissance des nombres »
Commencez avec les nombres à 3 chiffres. Si l’enfant est capable de reconnaître 4 nombres à 3 chiffres, il est au niveau 3, et vous pouvez passer à la partie 2 du test.

Si l’enfant n’est pas capable de reconnaître les nombres à 3 chiffres, demandez-lui de reconnaître les nombres à 2 chiffres. Si l’enfant est capable de reconnaître 4 nombres à 2 chiffres, il est au niveau 2, et vous pouvez passer à la partie 2 du test.

Si l’enfant n’est pas capable de reconnaître les nombres à 2 chiffres, demandez-lui de reconnaître les chiffres. Si l’enfant est capable de reconnaître 4 chiffres, il est au niveau 1, et vous pouvez passer à la partie 2 du test.

S’il n’est pas capable de reconnaître les chiffres, il sera au niveau débutant.

Instructions pour la partie 2 : « Opérations »
Il faut demander à l’enfant d’essayer toutes les opérations en commençant par l’addition, puis la soustraction, puis la multiplication et enfin la division. Dans chaque section, le facilitateur notera si l’enfant « peut faire » ou « ne peut pas faire » ce type d’opérations.

Commencez par le niveau « addition ». Si l’enfant est capable de résoudre au moins deux opérations, inscrivez « peut faire addition ». S’il résout moins de deux opérations, inscrivez « ne peut pas faire addition ».

Une fois les exercices d’addition terminés, demandez-lui de faire les soustractions. Si l’enfant est capable de résoudre au moins deux opérations, inscrivez « peut faire soustraction ». S’il résout moins de deux opérations, inscrivez « ne peut pas faire soustraction ».

Une fois les exercices de soustraction terminés, demandez-lui de faire les multiplications. Si l’enfant est capable de résoudre au moins deux opérations, inscrivez « peut faire multiplication ». S’il résout moins de deux opérations, inscrivez « ne peut pas faire multiplication ».

Enfin, demandez à l’enfant de faire les divisions. Si l’enfant est capable de résoudre au moins deux opérations, inscrivez « peut faire division ». S’il résout moins de deux opérations, inscrivez « ne peut pas faire division ».
S’il ne peut pas faire ni addition, ni soustraction, ni multiplication ni division, il est débutant en opérations.
**Annex 4: IPA Independent Evaluation results**

**Table 14: Literacy assessment by enumerators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Midline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15: Number recognition assessment by enumerators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Midline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 digit level</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 digits level</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 digits level</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16: Basic operations assessment by IPA enumerators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Midline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner in operation</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can do Addition</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can do Subtraction</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can do Multiplication</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can do Division</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17: Child who went to school in the past parents reasons of drop out**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial support</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack birth certificate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child left school himselft</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child was ill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of family support</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: Child who has never been to school parents’ reason of no schooling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason of No Schooling</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial support</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack birth certificate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of canteen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 5: Details of primary education costs bear by parents

Here a non-exhaustive list of the costs related to primary education drawn from the NRC report:

- **Registration fees**: Generally, a low amount (a few hundred CFA), asked as a once-off payment by the pupils registering in CP1. They cover the cost for their administrative file. They were abolished by decree a few years ago but they continue to be used in practice.
- **COGES contributions**: generally ranging between 1,500 and 3,000 FCFA. Calculated at the beginning of the school year based on the estimated budget needed to cover all expenses (the budget is then divided by the number of registered pupils).
- **Exam/evaluation fees**: ranging between 1,200 and 2,500 francs CFA annually in the localities visited.
- **Grades bulletin**: until recently, all bulletins used to be produced by the IEPs. During the 2014-15 school year, schools were authorized to produce their own. The cost for the parent ranged between 100 and 200 CFA. School directors send the tests results later to the IEPs.
- **Documentation papers** (ID): these could reach several thousand CFA when a Court judgement was needed (the maximum reported price was 17,500)
- **Uniform cost**: the government reintroduced compulsory uniforms in October 2011 (‘kaki’ for boys, and white and blue square fabric for girls). The cost of the clothing materials significantly increased as a consequence.
- **Canteen fee**: when operational, a meal costs 25 FCFA/day at the school canteen. It is collected by the canteen manager (who is different from the COGES institution)
- **contributions to the school cooperative** (25-50 CFA a day).
Annexe 6 : About Literacy Boost

Literacy Boost comprises three components:
1) Teacher Training,
2) Community Action
3) Assessment.

Program implementers use a ‘toolkit’ – separated into three parts corresponding to each of the three components – to roll out and implement the program. The following sections describe: the development of Literacy Boost; then an overview of each component as it appears in the toolkit.

Literacy Boost Creators
In 2007, Dr. Amy Jo Dowd at Save the Children created the original Assessment Component in order to assess whether students in Save the Children program sites were experiencing the challenges in their learning. This assessment was conducted in Haiti, Nepal, Ethiopia, and Guatemala. As results came back showing low levels of learning, she enlisted Carol da Silva to develop the Teacher Training Component and Elliott Friedlander to create the Community Action Component. This Community Action Component built on activities that had been implemented across a range of Save the Children countries, specifically originating in Bangladesh’s Reading for Children program, as well as incorporating new ideas for activities in the home and community. Several others at Save the Children, most notably Cecile Ochoa, spent several years refining the toolkit, adding features to make it more adaptable, easier to use, and filling in gaps that existed in the original toolkit.

Worldwide Implementation of Literacy Boost
Literacy Boost was first implemented in Malawi in 2009. Nepal, Mali, and Pakistan quickly followed with their own pilot projects. Since then, communities and schools in more than thirty countries around the world have participated in Literacy Boost activities. Image 3 provides a global overview of countries that have participated in Literacy Boost. Note that none of these countries have implemented the full Literacy Boost program on a national scale. Nonetheless, over one and a half million children have participated in Literacy Boost worldwide since the start of the program (Dowd et al., 2016).

Component 1: Teacher Training
The teacher-training component aims to improve teachers’ reading pedagogy. This component provides in-service teacher training to all early primary teachers over the course of an academic year. All of the information provided in this sub-section is summarized from the Literacy Boost Teacher Training Toolkit (Save the Children US, 2012d).

Teacher Training sessions
The teacher training toolkit is organized according to the teacher training sessions set out for delivery. The toolkit contains nine sessions in total. Those are:
- Session 1: Introduction to Reading Development and Instruction for Young Children
- Session 2: Formative Assessment
- Session 3: Addressing Language Issues in the Literacy Classroom
- Session 4: Letter Knowledge / Alphabetic Principle
- Session 5: Phonemic Awareness
- Session 6: Reading Fluency
- Session 7: Vocabulary
- Session 8: Reading Comprehension
Session 9: Conclusion

**Component 2: Community Action**
The Community Action portion of Literacy Boost seeks to fulfill SC's commitment to the education approach called Life-wide learning. All of the information provided in this sub-section is summarized from the Literacy Boost Community Action Toolkit (Save the Children US, 2012b).

The Community Action component provides implementers a list of potential activities to improve children's opportunities to engage in quality reading activities outside of school hours. The Literacy Boost Community Action component is separated into the following three sections:

Section 1: Enhancing the Literacy Environment
Section 2: Community Reading Activities
Section 3: Reading Awareness Workshops

For reasons explained below, we only describe the 'Community Reading Activities' and the 'Reading Awareness Workshops' in this chapter section, and reserve the description of 'Enhancing the Literacy Environment' for Section 2.6, below.

**Community Reading Activities**
The toolkit describes four potential activities that implementers may choose to implement within a given Literacy Boost site. Those four activities are:

Activity 1: Reading Camps / Reading Clubs
Activity 2: Reading Buddies
Activity 3: Story Time
Activity 4: Community Read-A-Thon

Reading Camps are regular (occurring anywhere from a few times a week to a few times a month), village-based gatherings for children. Led by a trained local volunteer, children who attend Reading Camps / Reading Clubs participate in a variety of activities intended to support children's reading development, including reading storybooks aloud, playing games that involve letters, words or oral language, storytelling, and singing. There are also recommendations for a Make-and-Take activity to occur during Reading Camps, to provide children with materials that they can bring home to encourage their continued engagement with reading throughout their day.

Reading Buddies pairs up competent readers with other children who are struggling to read. The Reading Buddies then borrow books together to read and share. This activity provides children with a fun and engaging way to have one-on-one exposure to reading and print.

Story Time is an activity open to all villagers, regardless of their literacy abilities. During Story Time, villagers tell stories to children. This has many functions: it provides children exposure to oral language, questions and discussions of the story encourage critical thinking skills, and the telling of the stories themselves encourage intergenerational transfer of cultural knowledge, local traditions, and the local folklore.

Community Read-a-Thons track the number of books children read over a specific period of time. As laid out in the toolkit, these Read-a-Thons can be competitive, or can simply recognize all children for the effort they put forward in reading.

Country offices and program implementers are not limited to these four activities, but rather are encouraged to add in different activities to fit the local context and communities.
**Reading Awareness Workshops**

The Reading Awareness Workshops are workshops whose target audience is not the children themselves, but rather the families of students. These workshops build off of earlier work done by Save the Children around the world, and particularly in Bangladesh.

In the toolkit, seven workshops are outlined. Those seven sessions are:

1. Children's Language and Literacy Development
2. Everyday Activities for Reading Readiness
3. Reading for Children Part 1
4. Reading for Children Part 2
5. Reading for Children Feedback and Reading with Children
6. Creating Reading Materials to Help Children Learn to Read
7. Reading Corners

Each Reading Awareness Workshop occurs locally, where family members can easily attend. Sessions last for approximately 90 minutes. They are led by Save the Children staff members, partner organization staff members, trained volunteers who live in or close to the village, or some combination thereof. Different countries remunerate volunteers according to local norms and customs. Workshops are recommended to occur over a short timeframe and, similar to the teacher trainings, participants in the Reading Awareness Workshops are encouraged to practice what they learn in the workshops and return to the next session ready to discuss their success and challenges with the previous week's content.

**Component 3: Assessment**

An important feature of Literacy Boost is the focus on rigorous, longitudinal assessment. The third component of Literacy Boost is the Assessment Toolkit. This component differs from the Teacher Training formative assessment training session in that this component describes how to conduct summative assessments.

Summative assessments track how students' reading skills grow over time. The Assessment Toolkit provides Save the Children staff guidance on how to assess children longitudinally to estimate program impact. The Assessment Toolkit offers guidelines on how to create a reliable and valid reading assessment in the language of instruction as well as other languages that program staff think appropriate. In addition to creating tests of students reading skills, the Assessment Toolkit outlines what sort of questions to ask to pick up variation in children's background characteristics, including basic demographics such as the sex and age of the child, as well as socioeconomic status, the ecology of literacy in the home and community (also referred to as the Home Literacy Environment), and other questions of interest to the program implementers and researchers.

The reading skills subtests included in the Assessment Toolkit, independently created by researchers at SCUS, resemble some subtests found on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), used widely in the United States) and the Early Grades Reading Assessment (EGRA), used widely in low income countries (RTI International, 2009). However, the LB Assessment component has important differences that distinguish it from similar assessments and provide program staff with the most useful and actionable information possible.

The Assessment toolkit also outlines methods to collect baseline data as well as endline data from the same students, meaning that estimates of impact by Save the Children researchers are based on longitudinal samples.
The toolkit calls for teams of assessors to visit schools at baseline and endline to collect data on student reading skills and other relevant information. The assessments are usually led by researchers employed by Save the Children, and employ local data collectors who speak the language and know the context very well.

**Annex 7: teachers log book**
Annex 8 : Evaluation matrice

The Transforming Education in Cocoa Communities (TRECC) initiative aims at improving the living conditions of children and youth in Côte d'Ivoire by promoting quality education in cocoa-growing communities. Via its Grant Matching Mechanism round 2 (GMM2), 9 pilots-to-scale projects are being co-funded with 10 cocoa companies and implemented by 14 implementing organizations in the sectors of Early Childhood Development, Primary Education and Vocational Training.

The role of Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) is to provide technical support to the companies and implementing agencies to design and implement sound monitoring systems to closely monitor and learn from these pilots. In parallel, IPA conducts its own independent and complementary data collection. IPA will use these two sources of information – the administrative data collected by the implementing organizations through their own M&E system and the independent data collection – to feed into an evaluation matrix to assess each pilot.

Each evaluation matrix describes how IPA will use the data to make recommendations on the potential scale-up of the pilots to other relevant cocoa-growing communities. In addition, TRECC may consider whether certain pilots are feasible for future scale-up beyond such communities, for example to the regional or national level, though this is not a central focus of this evaluation matrix given the existing contractual arrangements on GMM2.

The evaluation matrix comprises five sections which will be the basis on which to recommend eligibility of a pilot team to submit a proposal for potential scale-up. The five criteria are Relevance; Results (outputs and immediate outcomes); Costs & Operations management; Capacity to learn, improve and innovate; and Sustainability. For each criterion, we describe the key evaluation questions, which will be common across all pilots.

This document presents the evaluation matrix tailored to the EPT and COMPANY NAME pilot, with the five criteria and the qualitative and quantitative indicators to that will be used to assess each criteria. IPA will work with COMPANY NAME and EPT to finalize the indicators, targets and data sources for the pilot, drawing on their logical framework.

We will use a “traffic light” color system to provide an overall assessment against each of the five criteria: green will mean that the pilot is compliant with the criteria requirement for potential scale-up, red will mean that it is not, and orange will mean that it does partially comply and that eligibility for scale-up should be conditional on corrective measures to be taken. At the final evaluation stage:

- pilots with green assessments on all 11 criteria will receive an unconditional recommendation for eligibility for a scale-up proposal;
- pilots who have only green and orange criteria (no red), and among these a majority of green criteria, will receive a conditional recommendation for scale-up – i.e. conditional on corrective measures in response to findings from monitoring and evaluation.
- pilots who have only green and orange criteria (no red), and among these a majority of orange criteria, will not be recommended for scale-up.
- pilots with any red criteria will not be recommended for scale-up
During implementation, IPA will provide work-in-progress traffic-light assessments to the pilots as part of our quarterly updates (ideally during advisory calls), for criteria for which there is enough data already available for an interim assessment. This will allow opportunities for course correction and improvement. Before sharing our work-in-progress assessments, if any.
## 1. Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Targets an important need in the community</td>
<td>1.1.1. Is there any evidence of this being an important need in the community?</td>
<td>1.1.1. EPT's needs assessment report shows evidence of the need being addressed</td>
<td>1.1.2. Beneficiaries’ description of their needs links to the outcomes delivered by the pilot</td>
<td>Administrative data o Project targeting criteria o Needs assessment report o Independent evaluation o Quantitative and qualitative Interviews with beneficiaries</td>
<td>Green: Pilot addresses specific important needs that were among targeted population. The intervention as implemented focuses on the objectives initially agreed, or agreed changes. Orange: Pilot did not fully address important identified needs and/or partially reached the targeted population. The implementation strayed somewhat from the initial agreed objectives. Feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues Red: Pilot does not address important needs in the community and/or does not serve the targeted population. The implementation shows that program objectives are no longer relevant to those originally agreed. No feasible remediation identified for these issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2. Is the intervention model appropriate to respond to the identified need?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3. If relevant, do the project’s targeting criteria allow to reach the group that needs the intervention the most in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Children are not attending school,** because of:
  - The ignorance of parents about the need to educate their children
  - The lack of resources for parents to send their children to school
  - The lack of birth certificate for children,
  - Inadequate infrastructure and quality of learning in schools,
  - Child labor in the intervention communities

- **Children have delay in schooling**

- **Beneficiaries’ description of their needs links to the outcomes delivered by the pilot**
  - When asked why children in their community are not going to school, parents mention a lack of accessible, quality schools.
  - Parents are positive regarding the opening of a bridge school in their community.
1. Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Aligns with the priorities of the donors</td>
<td>1.2.1. Does the pilot still align with the objectives of TRECC and COMPANY NAME?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1. The pilot, as implemented, remains aligned to the objectives originally agreed and any agreed changes have been documented</td>
<td>Independent evaluation</td>
<td>Green: Pilot addresses specific important needs that were among targeted population. Orange: Pilot did not fully address important identified needs and/or partially reached the targeted population. Red: Pilot does not address important needs in the community and/or does not serve the targeted population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Interview with program management team confirms that the program goals remain aligned with the priorities originally described in the proposal, which Out-of-school children in intervention areas have access to quality education through bridging classes and the literacy boost / numeracy boost approach</td>
<td>o Interviews with program management including TRECC and COMPANY NAME&lt;br&gt;o Desk Research&lt;br&gt;o Review of initial proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No feasible remediation identified for these issues
## 2. Results (outputs and direct outcomes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1. Delivers outputs at high quality | **2.1.1.** Has the pilot produced measurable outputs with the required quality? | **2.1.1. Key outputs from the proposal logframe were achieved**  
- 2 EPT trainers trained in 5 LB sessions and 5 NB sessions  
- 4 built bridges classes built/equipped  
- 4 animators recruited and trained  
- 4 animators provided with didactic material  
- Class attendance rate of animators  
- 120 students out of school identified and enrolled  
- 120 students are equipped with a school kit  
- 100% of the students benefit from the school canteen  
- # of days during which students benefited from the school canteen  
- # of animators who receive supervision visits / participate to a workshop in the last 2 months |  | Administrative data  
- Review of the quarterly & annual reports and routine monitoring reports  
- Analysis of project monitoring data | **Green:**  
- Most of the outputs and key immediate outcomes were achieved, and with the expected quality  
- A high and sustained participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries, who provided positive feedback  
- Feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues |
| | **2.1.2.** Did the expected number of beneficiaries engage in sustained way? | **2.1.2. Participation rate**  
- At least 95% of attendance rate of students in class |  | Independent Evaluation  
Results from spot-checks | **Orange:**  
- Some outputs and/or key immediate outcomes were not achieved, or not with the expected quality  
- Below expectation participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries who provided mixed feedback  
- Feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues |
| |  |  |  |  | **Red:**  
- Outputs and key immediate outcomes were only partially achieved and/or low quality  
- Low participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries who provided negative feedback  
- No feasible remediation identified for these issues |
| 2.2. Achieves direct outcomes | 2.2.1. Have changes been observed/self-reported in the knowledge, attitudes, behavior or practices directly targeted by the interventions? | 2.2.1.a. Results of pre and post-tests show immediate improvement in knowledge  
- At least ...% of the animators and supervisors scored above 75% on the post-training knowledge test  
2.2.1.b. Changes in beneficiaries’ knowledge, behavior and practices have been observed over time\(^{17}\)  
- 100% of animators who apply the LB/NB methodology during classroom observation  
- # of animators absent during the classroom observation  
- % of students absent during the classroom observation  
- 85 % of students who obtain the average score required to integrate the formal education system following the final exam  
- Average Aser score of students in Math and French at the baseline/endline evaluations | Administrative data  
Pre and post-test evaluation conducted by the EPT  
Results from transfer test  
Independent evaluation  
- Quantitative interviews with the direct beneficiaries | Green:  
- Most of the outputs and key immediate outcomes were achieved, and with the expected quality  
- A high and sustained participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries who provided positive feedback  
Orange:  
- Some outputs and/or key immediate outcomes were not achieved, or not with the expected quality  
- Below expectation participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries who provided mixed feedback  
- Feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues  
Red:  
- Outputs and key immediate outcomes were only partially achieved and/or low quality  
- Low participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries who provided negative feedback  
- No feasible remediation identified for these issues |

\(^{17}\) Any changes observed over time cannot be attributed to the program without a counterfactual; but the absence of such changes might indicate that the program is not operating as planned.
### 2.3. Beneficiary feedback about the program is positive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.1. How satisfied are the beneficiaries with the intervention?</th>
<th>2.3.1.a Beneficiaries provide positive feedback on the delivery of outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1.a.1. % of interviewed animators who provided a positive feedback on the LB/NB materials/activities</td>
<td>2.3.1.a.2. % of animators who would be likely to recommend the LB/NB approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.1.b Beneficiaries provide positive feedback on the main immediate outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of animators who provided positive feedback on the improvement on their students’ learning/outcomes as result of LB/NB methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.1.c Beneficiaries describe positive experiences with the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview with the animators shows that they are satisfied with the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.2. Beneficiaries report that the pilot was meaningful for them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the interviews with the animators, they can describe how the LB/NB helped out of school children to learn and improve their level in French and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Independent evaluation

- **Green:**
  - Most of the outputs and key immediate outcomes were achieved, and with the expected quality
  - A high and sustained participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries, who provided positive feedback
- **Orange:**
  - Some outputs and/or key immediate outcomes were not achieved, or not with the expected quality
  - Below expectation participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries who provided mixed feedback
  - Feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues
- **Red:**
  - Outputs and key immediate outcomes were only partially achieved and/or low quality
  - Low participation rate was recorded among beneficiaries who provided negative feedback
  - No feasible remediation identified for these issues
## 3. Costs and operations management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1. Costs are well managed</th>
<th>3.1.1. Did the project make efficient utilization of resources?</th>
<th>3.1.2. Does the implementing partner have a vision for cost-efficiency at scale within GMM2?</th>
<th>3.1.1. Budget expenditures show good value for money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1. Did the project make efficient utilization of resources?</td>
<td>Did the project make efficient utilization of resources?</td>
<td>3.1.1. Did the project make efficient utilization of resources?</td>
<td>The expenditure indicates cost-efficient use of money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2. Does the implementing partner have a vision for cost-efficiency at scale within GMM2?</td>
<td>Does the implementing partner have a vision for cost-efficiency at scale within GMM2?</td>
<td>3.1.2. Does the implementing partner have a vision for cost-efficiency at scale within GMM2?</td>
<td>There are indications that cost-effectiveness was continuously sought during the pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Project management is successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.1. Has the project been implemented as planned, with any changes being justified or outside the partners' control?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The pilot was implemented according to the roadmap, and significant deviations were fully justified and approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPANY NAME participated as agreed in the management and implementation of the pilot, or changes in this role have been documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Review of the quarterly &amp; annual reports including realized end dates of key activities and realized spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Review of the pilot relevant meetings reports (operational, advisory, steering and review meetings) reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Interviews with EPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Interviews with COMPANY NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Good cost and project management, in line with the proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Some signs that costs could have been better managed resourced better allocated; some delays were observed; costs significantly exceeded initial budget; some activities initially planned were not implemented because of lack of time or resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Most issues were justified and feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues if pilot was scaled-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Signs that costs were not well managed and some resources were wasted; costs significantly exceeded budget without justification; important delays occurred without justification; key activities were not implemented by lack of resources or time. No feasible remediation identified for these issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4. Capacity to learn, improve and innovate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Project collects credible monitoring data</td>
<td>4.1.1. Is actionable monitoring data collected? 4.1.2. Are the routine monitoring data credible and reliable?</td>
<td>4.1.1. Routine monitoring data are collected and shared on time with the stakeholders  Monitoring data are collected and analyzed by program management and shared with IPA monthly as defined in the monitoring plan. 4.1.2. IPA spot check visits confirm the quality and accuracy of the data shared by partner  IPA spot check confirms the data quality; percentage discrepancies found in the data shared by COMPANY NAME/EPT compared with IPA independent data is not statistically significant</td>
<td>4.1.1.b. Monitoring data is actionable and aligned with program management  - Routine monitoring data that was collected that provides actionable insight on program management.  - EPT identified and documented project risks IPA observed in spot checks and acted on them in a timely manner.</td>
<td>Administrative data  - Review of the monitoring plan and routine quarterly reports  - Analysis of the project routine monitoring data  - RAID Template Independent evaluation  - Results of spot-check visits  - Review of the pilot relevant meetings reports (operational, advisory, steering and review meetings) reports</td>
<td>Green:  - Credible and reliable data was regularly collected by the partner and shared according to the agreed calendar  - Data were analyzed and used to learn and take corrective measures to improve the implementation  Orange:  - Signs that data was not always credible or reliable and/or was not collected and shared according to agreed calendar  - Data was collected but was only sometimes used for learning and improvement or not documented  - Most issues were justified and feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues  Red:  - There was little data collected and shared and/or data was not reliable nor credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Monitoring is used to learn and improve</td>
<td>4.2.1. Is the EPT demonstrating willingness to learn, innovate and incorporate monitoring feedback?</td>
<td>4.2.1. Program improvement in response to monitoring</td>
<td>Administrative data</td>
<td>Green:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2. Did the EPT test some key assumptions in their theory of change?</td>
<td>Significant of appropriate changes in program management or delivery that can be linked to monitoring findings</td>
<td>Review of the monitoring plan and routine reports</td>
<td>Credible and reliable data was regularly collected by the partner and shared according to the agreed calendar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2. Use of data to refine the ToC</td>
<td>EPT shows that they have refined their understanding of the Theory of Change through use of their own data, and documented these refinements.</td>
<td>Analyses of the project routine monitoring data and reports</td>
<td>Data were analyzed and used to learn and take corrective measures to improve the implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GMM2 scale-up proposal</td>
<td>Orange:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with EPT</td>
<td>Signs that data was not always credible or reliable and/or was not collected and shared according to agreed calendar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data was collected but was only sometimes used for learning and improvement or not documented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most issues were justified and feasible remedial measures are identified to address these issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There was little data collected and shared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and/or data was not reliable nor credible
- If data was collected, it was rarely used to take corrective measures or documented

| 5. Sustainability | }
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators</th>
<th>Data source and collection method</th>
<th>Assessment definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1. Provides sustained benefit to community | 5.1.1. Are there any signs that the intervention from the pilot will continue to benefit the beneficiaries/community members over time? | 5.1.1. Indications that the community members are likely to continue with the practices or program activities | Interview with animators shows that they are equipped to overcome challenges to their continued use of the practices adopted during the program. Evidence of actions taken by EPT to sustain the pilot in the communities after the end of the pilot. At least 4 stakeholders in the target localities, members of the working group (IEP, COGES, CMEF, Cooperatives ....) improved their knowledge of the accelerated learning technique and the functioning of the bridge school. | Independent evaluation  
  o Field observations  
  o Qualitative interviews with the beneficiaries, community members and key informants  
  o Interview with the EPT | Green:  
  o Strong signs of sustained benefits in the community  
  o Promising prospects for scale-up beyond the company funding  
 Orange:  
  o Some signs of sustained benefits in the community and ways of improvement are identified  
  o Few potential prospects can be explored for scale-up beyond the company funding  
 Red:  
  o No sign of benefits or only short-term benefits  
  o No prospect for scale-up beyond the company funding was identified |
| 5.2. | There are prospects of scale-up beyond GMM2 [It is still to be defined how IPA and Brookings will collaborate to address this criterion – currently being discussed] |
| 5.2.1. | Are there indications that there is potential for further scale-up of the pilot approach in some way, by the government of Côte d'Ivoire, the Cooperation Partner or other development actors? |
| 5.2.1.1. | Evidence of government/partners buy-in Level of participation of government representatives in implementation or monitoring Government staff confirm the alignment of the pilot with government priorities |
| 5.2.1.2. | Enabling environment Interviews with relevant stakeholders show that the national and or local environment is suitable for pilot scale-up |
| 5.2.1.3. | Financing Interviews with TRECC indicate the potential for government, other donors or the Cooperation Partner to fund the scale-up |
| 5.2.1.4. | Organizational capacity to implement at scale EPT can demonstrate capacity to operate at larger scale, or plans to handover the program to a partner with this capacity |
| Independent evaluation | Keys informant interviews with implementing Côte-D'Ivoire government/Cocoa company relevant representatives |
| | Interview with TRECC team |
| | Interview with Brookings Institution team |
| **Green:** | Strong signs of sustained benefits in the community |
| | Promising prospects for scale-up beyond the company funding |
| **Orange:** | Some signs of sustained benefits in the community and ways of improvement are identified |
| | Few potential prospects can be explored for scale-up beyond the company funding |
| **Red:** | No sign of benefits or only short-term benefits |
| | No prospect for scale-up beyond the company funding was identified |