

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

**”Evaluation of Modelling of Services for Children
under three”**

Final Evaluation Report (vol.2)

August 2016

Prepared for UNICEF Moldova by:

Camelia Gheorghe (Team Leader)
Institute for Public Policy (Moldova)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference.....	3
Annex 2 – Primary Data Collection Methods	11
Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix.....	13
Annex 4 – Control Group	22
Annex 5 – Primary Data Collection Guides and Templates.....	24
Annex 6 – Documents Consulted during Evaluation	47
Annex 7 – People Consulted during Evaluation	50

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Evaluation of modelling of services for children under three.

The project was implemented in the period of November 2013 – March 2015.

Duration of consultancy: November 2015- March 2016

PCR1: The Government addresses disparities in access to quality education, health, protection and justice services for all children and their families.

IR 3: By 2017, integrated quality services that promote young children’s well-being and development are delivered by the primary health care system, education and protection systems in cooperation with local public authorities and civil society

CEE/CIS Regional Knowledge and Leadership Areas (RKLA): RKLA 1 “Child Care Reform”, RKLA 3 “Early Learning and School Readiness”, RKLA 6 “Child Survival”, RKLA 7 “Young Child Wellbeing”.

1. Background/ Evaluation Context

Early and pre-school education services represent an important issue both for families and the public authorities. Access to and the quality of these services help in reconciling parental and family roles and constitute an essential element in raising the share of women in the labour market thereby ensuring gender equality. Investment in early and pre-school education services is a fundamental investment in the development of a child’s personality, preventing school-dropouts and facilitates children’s social and economic integration.

Several studies, including in the Republic of Moldova,¹ demonstrate the contribution of early and pre-school education in raising the learning opportunities of children from poor families, improving their preparedness for school, and, in the longer term, increasing social mobility and poverty reduction. That is an important consideration for single-parent families, families with many children, Roma families, inter alia. The availability and accessibility of early education services contributes to growth in the birth-rate, and to the share of women in the labour market.

The findings of a joint UNICEF/UN Women study on demand and supply of services for children under six² prove that there is a high demand of services for children under three in the country but in spite of this high demand, only 15% of needs are covered. Hence, availability of child care and education institutions can make significant impact on the ability of women to obtain and retain employment.

In order to promote gender equality and contribute to women’s employability and professional development, UNICEF started to model services for children under three through a Direct Cash Transfer signed with Moldova Social Investment Fund (MSIF) in November 2013 and a Partnership Cooperation Agreement signed with CNETIF, a national Civil Society Organization (CSO) in November 2014. MSIF was responsible for the hard part of the project. Under this intervention, 10 crèche-groups were set up in existing kindergartens which were fully equipped with furniture, toys, books for professionals, caregivers and children. CNETIF dealt with the soft part of the project under which two guides for educators on working with children under three and their parents were developed and 40 professionals (including educators, managers and rayon inspectors) enhanced their knowledge on child-centered methodologies, benefited of local mentoring and apply child-friendly approaches in their daily work. Around 250 children under three, including children with special education needs exercise their right to early education and care and around 200 parents, including fathers, apply positive parenting practices to stimulate the social-affective, cognitive, and motor development of their children and are aware on issues related to health care and nutrition.

The applied community driven development approach facilitated the direct involvement and ownership of the beneficiaries and was essential to ensure the sustainability of newly created services. Availability of such services, in addition to ensuring a child’s full development, can significantly improve the ability of women to get and stay employed.

¹ UNICEF (2010). National Survey on Early Childhood Care and Development: Family Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices.

² UNICEF/UN Women study on demand and supply of services for children under six from the perspective of women’s employability and ECD importance, Chisinau 2012

Both, the overall objectives of the project and the key results planned to be achieved were consistent with the outcomes of the UN – Government of Moldova Partnership Framework and the UNICEF Country Programme for the period 2013-2017.

Rationale for evaluation: The Project was implemented in the period of November 2013 - March 2015. Although Implementing Partners and UNICEF monitored the planned interventions on a regular basis, a more comprehensive independent evaluation is needed to validate achieved results, document good practices and lessons learnt to better understand attribution of the project to the changes of the situation on children under three in targeted localities.

The project will be evaluated in accordance with OECD-DAC criteria, considering human rights perspective and having in mind that the evaluation will look not only at the results but also at how the project was implemented from duty bearers' and right holders' perspective.

Based on the above, UNICEF will contract an International Consultant-Team Leader- to conduct the project evaluation in accordance to the present Terms of Reference and in cooperation with a national company, hired under a separate contract. The consultancy is expected to be carried out within a five months period, starting with November 2015.

2. Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope

The evaluation purpose is to assess end of project results and achievements in relation to the project objectives and document good practices, lesson learned for future planning and programming.

The evaluation will be conducted to assess the situation in ten localities where the interventions took place: Balti (krg. 48); Cosnita, |Dubasari; Mindresti, Telenesti; Pirlita, Ungheni; Taraclia de Salcie, Cahul; Baurci, Ceadirlunga UTAG; Nisporeni (krg. Nr. 1); Calarasi (krg. Nr 2); Mingir, Hincesti; Talmazza, Stefan Voda.

Specific objectives are:

1. To evaluate overall project achievements against planned results (as per initial project design)
2. To evaluate the sustainability of the project and the newly established services and the level of institutionalization of good practice
3. To evaluate coordination and capacity of professionals to provide quality services for children under three
4. To evaluate the potential contribution of the project to future relevant government policy and/or regulations change in regard to services for children under three
5. To evaluate contribution and engagement of the LPA/caregivers/private sector in setting up and maintaining the ongoing, quality functioning of services for children under three
6. To evaluate the impact of the project in 10 targeted localities against control group
7. To measure the satisfaction of parents in regard to the newly established services
8. To evaluate the needs for future support.

One of the key evaluation outcomes will be the recommendation on how the model implemented in the above-mentioned localities can be rolled out nationally based on identified demand and needs.

The evaluation findings will serve as an important source of information for the development of legislative and normative framework for services for children under three, capacity building of cross-sectorial teams of professionals and national scale-up of such services, as well as to identify needs for future support. The evaluation results will be shared at large with line ministries (the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family, Ministry of Finance), CSOs and relevant donors, and will be used both for programming and policy work.

The evaluation will cover the entire implementation period (November 2013-March 2015) and will target direct beneficiaries (caregivers especially vulnerable families/caregivers/women and children) and professionals (health professionals, social assistants, psychologists etc.) in project localities.

3. Evaluation Criteria and Tailored Evaluation Questions

The project will be evaluated in accordance with OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact). Additional criteria to be used are: coverage, coordination and coherence. Human rights-based approach, gender and other crosscutting issues will be taken into consideration.

The evaluator will take into consideration the following criteria and key tailored evaluation questions:

- **To assess the relevance/ To what extent does the Project respond to the priorities defined in the Moldova National Development Strategy 2020, Family Code, Code of Education, National Strategy on Education 2020 , Child Protection Strategy 2014-2020, National Health Strategy 2022 and social Sector Reform?**
 - How does the project fit into the wider context of national child and social protection priorities?
 - Was the project designed and implemented in taking into consideration existing policy and regulatory framework and socio-economic environment and needs?
 - Do the project outcomes address key issues, their underlying causes and challenges?
 - To what extent does the Project respond to the needs of the target groups?
 - To what extent and how did the Project take into account existing institutional and human capacities and results of the previous efforts as a basis for planned interventions?
 - Were the project objectives set realistically to be achieved in a given period of time?
- **To assess the efficiency / Does the programme use the resources in the most efficient manner to achieve its objectives?**
 - How well have the implementation of activities been managed? To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled, how flexible was the project in adapting to changing needs? How well have the financial resources been used?
 - Did the project ensure co-ordination with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps?
- **To assess the effectiveness / To what extent does the Project meet the outcomes as defined by the Project log-frame?**
 - What progress has been made towards the realization of project outcomes? Have the planned results been achieved by the end of the project? What are the results of interventions in terms of: number of targeted children who benefit of services for children under three; number of targeted parents/caregivers who benefited of individual counselling; number of targeted parents/caregivers who benefited of curriculum-based learning; number of children with disabilities included in the new crèche services in targeted communities; number of targeted parents/caregivers who use positive practices to stimulate the social-affective, cognitive, and motor development of the child, as well as health care and nutrition; number of targeted professionals who use positive practices to stimulate the social-affective, cognitive, and motor development of the child, as well as health care and nutrition?
 - What is the number and functionality of established group crèches?
 - To what extent did the project succeed in strengthening capacities of authorities and service providers, realisation of human rights, promoting gender equality and reflecting the equity dimensions?
 - To what extent did the project contribute to improving life of women in terms of employment opportunities?
 - Which are the main factors that contributed positively or negatively to the progress towards the foreseen outcomes?
- **To assess the sustainability / To what extent were the project outcomes achieved? Are they sustainable?**
 - What measures have been taken to ensure sustainability of the project? What are the resources (both human and financial) used to sustain the intervention? To what extent and in what way have capacities been enhanced in public institutions?
 - Are the activities likely to be continued when external support is withdrawn, and will it be more widely replicated or adapted?
 - Which was the LPA contribution in setting up and supporting services for children under three?
 - **What are the next steps to be undertaken in order to scale up this intervention?**

- **To assess the impact /To what extent and in what way did the project succeed in modelling and institutionalizing these models in targeted localities?**
 - What was the impact of project activities on target groups?
 - What is the potential of project activities to support positive and realistic policy and regulatory framework changes for children under three?
 - The question of *causality* and attribution will be addressed to explore the possibility to assess the effect of the project on the life of women and young boys and girls in target localities.
- **To assess human rights-based approach, gender and relevant cross-cutting issues / To what extent do the project outcomes contribute to achievements of children’s rights and to what extent have they contributed to addressing key cross-cutting issues?**
 - Does the project actively contribute to the promotion of child and women rights, especially the most vulnerable?
 - To what extent and how does the project ensure a non-discrimination and equity focus?
 - Is the project gender sensitive?
 - Does the project use child and women/caregivers participation? Which are the views of caregivers’ and women’s feed back into the project planning and activities?

Additional criteria to be used to the extent possible are as follows:

- **Coverage:** Was representativeness of coverage ensured by project activities? Which groups have been reached by the project and what is the different impact on those groups? Have vulnerable children been reached, including children with disabilities and Roma?
- **Coordination:** What was the role of the MoE, MLSPF, MH, LPAs, CSO, community and other key actors in the design, coordination and implementation of project activities? How does the project relate to What was the role and comparative advantage of UNICEF?
- **Coherence:** What were the areas and ways of cooperation with other UN and donor agencies’ in regard to development of services for children under three? How does the project relate to the existing national and/or local policy on children under three? Was there coherence across interventions supported by different agencies?

4. Evaluation Process and Recommended Methodology

The evaluation methodology will be guided by the Evaluation Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)³.

The evaluation will assess the results of interventions and their effect on children under three and women in target localities at the end of the project (**summative, impact, equity focused evaluation**). **Objectives-based approach** will be applied which will include mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) with participation of professionals and vulnerable families/ caregivers/ women (gender and human rights responsive evaluation).

The following methods will be used:

- desk review and analysis of:
 - project related documents (project concept/proposal/TORs/objectives/expected results),
 - existing national strategies, policy and normative frameworks (Moldova National Development Strategy 2020, Family Code, Code of Education, National Strategy on Education 2020 , Child Protection Strategy 2014-2020, National Health Strategy 2022, relevant reports/surveys, communication and training materials, etc.)
 - available government/ development partners/CSO studies, surveys, program reports etc.
- structured observations/interviews with implementing partners and CSO representatives;
- individual face-to-face interviews with key stakeholders (MoE, LPA, social and medical assistants, educators, kindergartens’ managers, caregivers, representatives of the private sector etc);
- focus groups with service providers and beneficiaries (most at risk and especially vulnerable caregivers) and control groups.

³ UNEG Norms: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>, UNEG Standards: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/22>

The Evaluation Team will comprise an International Consultant-Team Leader and representatives of a national company, hired separately by UNICEF.

Confidentiality: The evaluation team should be sensitive to beliefs and act with integrity and respect to all stakeholder and ensure confidentiality of information regarding individual children/caregivers/women. Evaluators should not share the findings of the report on individual children/caregivers or individual institutions with media.

Ethical issues: The Evaluation team engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities should aspire to conduct high quality work guided by professional standards and ethical and moral principles in accordance with UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation⁴. The team should be able to exercise independent judgment and ensure that s/he is not unduly influenced by the views or statements of any party. The evaluations must give a comprehensive and balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the project being evaluated, taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.

The Team Leader shall:

- a. Operate in an impartial and unbiased manner at all stages of the evaluation.
- b. Collect diverse perspectives on the subject under evaluation.
- c. Guard against distortion in her/his reporting caused by their personal views and feelings.

Accountabilities: The Team Leader will be accountable for:

- Developing of evaluation methodology (including evaluation questions and matrix), detailed work plan and inception report
- Conducting desk review of available data/documents /reports etc
- Writing the inception report with inputs from national experts
- Overall Coordinating and conducting the evaluation
- Analysing data, elaborating draft report and finalizing it, integrating UNICEF's comments/ feedback ;
- Elaborating Summary report (up to 10 pages) and Power Point Presentation of key findings and recommendations
- Presenting the major evaluation findings during a round table organized by the national company.

UNICEF will be accountable for providing all project related documentation, reports etc., reviewing/approving the evaluation methodology, inception and final evaluation report.

5. Evaluation Work Plan / Details of how the work should be delivered

The period of this evaluation is November 2015 – March 2016. The evaluation must be completed in 20 weeks with submission of Final report (in English) and presentation of key evaluation findings and recommendations.

The Contractor will be entrusted with the evaluation based on the information and documents gathered, interviews with key partners, beneficiaries etc. to ensure the impartiality, consistency and coherence of the Final Evaluation Report.

Detailed work plan will be developed by the Contractor as part of submission package and finally agreed with UNICEF.

The Team Leader will undertake the following tasks:

1. Desk review: the Contractor will analyse UNICEF's project documents and project reports, counterpart progress/activity reports, relevant national programmes, law, strategies and regulations, funds spent, official statistics and data/information from service providers on services for children under three (see Annex A. List of resources).

⁴ UNEG Guidelines <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/102>

2. Elaboration of Inception Report: draft evaluation methodology and tools, elaboration of Work Plan (with clear responsibilities/timeline, coordination), evaluation questions, matrix, and Outline of the evaluation report as a part of Inception report to be submitted for review to UNICEF.
3. Involvement in information and data collection in targeted localities: information will be collected through key informant interviews, focus group discussions with service providers and beneficiaries, and site visits. Completed data sets (filled out questionnaires, records of individual interviews and focus group discussion, etc.) will be presented in electronic format in English and Romanian (national company will be responsible for the Romanian translation).
4. Data analysis and report writing: the Contractor will analyse all available information and data and develop Draft evaluation report in accordance with Evaluation standards and requirements including also relevant description on limitations to the evaluation and reliability of disaggregated data.
5. The national company, hired under a separate contract, will be responsible for the organization of validation of evaluation results. The Contractor will present the key findings and recommendations of the evaluation during the validation workshop.
6. Finalisation of the report: the Contractor will incorporate all comments and suggestions into the Final Report and develop the Summary Report (up to 10 pages) taking into consideration inputs from stakeholders and UNICEF staff.

The Evaluation Report will include executive summary, description of methodology and data collection tools, findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned, attachments (ToR, project log frame, evaluation matrix and tools, list of persons interviewed etc.).

The evaluation report will be required to follow UNICEF's Evaluation Report Standards and UNICEF's Evaluation Technical Criteria⁵.

Stakeholders' participation

Stakeholders will be mainly involved in the evaluation process through (i) facilitation of data collection and provision of information for the analysis, (ii) review and validation of the report and (iii) addressing key recommendations to be integrated in forthcoming national strategies on services for children under three.

During evaluation process the following stakeholders will be consulted through interviews and or/focus groups: representatives of target beneficiaries (medical and social assistants, educators and managers of kindergartens and representatives of targeted LPA and caregivers, representatives of line ministries (MoE, MH, MLSPF), MSIF and CNETIF CSO etc.

The identification of relevant representatives from above mentioned stakeholders will be done by the national company hired under a separate contract in consultation with UNICEF CO.

6. Deliverables and Delivery dates

Nr.	Activity	Deliverables	Tentative deadlines ⁶
1.	Conduct desk review and develop inception report including detailed methodology, data collection tools, evaluation Matrix, work plan and outline of Final evaluation report	Inception report 5 weeks	Within 5 weeks from contract commencement
2.	Data collection of additional information, focus group discussions, interviews, field visits etc.	Documentation of the data collection process (field notes, list of interviewed persons, statistics etc.) 5 weeks	Within 10 weeks from contract commencement
3.	Data analysis and evaluation report writing	Draft report 5 weeks	Within 15 weeks from contract commencement

⁵ http://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/UNEG_UNICEF_Eval_Report_Standards.pdf

⁶ Expected deadlines will be mutually agreed upon contract signature

4.	Presentation of key findings and recommendations (in Power Point format)	Power Point presentation on key findings and recommendations 2 weeks	Within 17 weeks from contract commencement
5.	Incorporation of UNICEF and partners comments. Finalisation of evaluation report and elaboration of summary report (up to 10 pages)	Final report and Summary report 3 weeks	Within 20 weeks from contract commencement

All deliverables need to be submitted to UNICEF in electronic format in English.

7. Performance indicators for evaluation of results

The performance of work will be evaluated based on the following indicators:

- Completion of tasks specified in the ToR;
- Compliance with the established deadlines for submission of deliverables;
- Quality of work;
- Demonstration of high standards of work with UNICEF and with counterparts.

Poor quality reports that do not correspond to the above-mentioned requirements will be returned for review.

8. Qualifications and experience

The evaluation is planned to be conducted by an International Consultant, Team Leader and a national company, hired by UNICEF under a separate contract. The key qualifications required for the Team Leader are as follows:

- Demonstrated capacity and capability to conduct evaluations, research and/or analysis ;
- Previous experience in evaluating/assessing services for children under three or early childhood development/education/health programmes (copies of report summaries);
- Proven expertise in the area of early childhood development/education/health/social services;
- Familiarity with existing European practices on providing services for children under three;
- Demonstrated capacity and capability to analyse the data/information and to write reports and ,in particularly, evaluation reports;
- General knowledge of UN evaluation policy, norms and standards, including human/child rights based approach as well as gender expertise;
- Previous cooperation with UNICEF or other UN agencies is an asset.
- Advanced University degree in early childhood development or a related social field;
- Proven evaluation expertise and experience;
- Strong interpersonal communication abilities;
- Expertise in gender and human/child rights based programming and evaluation
- Very good English speaking and writing skills. Romanian language skill is an added advantage.

9. Financial proposal

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount and payment terms (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. The financial proposal should include a breakdown of the lump sum amount (including fee and number of anticipated working days, travel costs and per-diems).

10. Evaluation criteria for selection

The candidate is expected to reflect in his/her application the qualifications/ knowledge/ experience related to the qualifications and tasks above. Technical evaluation will be performed through a desk review of applications, and if necessary, may be supplemented by an interview.

The selection will be based on the principle of “best value for money” among the technically qualified candidates.

11. Definition of supervision arrangements

The selected Consultant will work under direct supervision of the Evaluation Management Team including Deputy-Representative, M&E and ECD Officers. Fees will be rendered upon written approval by the UNICEF Supervisor, and contingent upon the quality of deliverables.

UNICEF will regularly communicate with the Contractor and provide formats for reports, feedback and guidance on performance and all other necessary support to achieve the objectives of the Evaluation, as well as remain aware of any upcoming issues related to expert's performance and quality of work.

12. Description of official travel involved

The consultancy will require international travel to Chisinau. The national company will cover the cost for local travel to targeted localities. An international travel plan will be included in the submission package. All arrangements and expenses for the international travel will be covered by the Contractor and included in the financial offer (lump sum). Prior to starting the assignment, the selected candidate shall be required to undergo the UN Basic Security in the Field training and certification (on-line).

13. Support provided by UNICEF

To achieve the above-mentioned objectives, UNICEF will facilitate the contact with line ministries (the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Social Protection and Family), MSIF and the CSO which implemented the project and will provide timely feedback to all deliverables to be presented by the Contractor. If need be, UNICEF will provide support in contacting other relevant stakeholders during the evaluation process.

Annex 2 – Primary Data Collection Methods

Key informants	Research method	Tool	Notes
UNICEF country office management and relevant staff	In-depth interview	Interview guide	Deputy Representative; ECD, Health, Child Protection Officers; Monitoring and Evaluation Officer; Communication Officer
MSIF and CNETIF	In-depth interview	Interview guide	Management and project staff, trainers and mentors
Line ministries (Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family), National Council for Protection of Child Rights, international development partners	In-depth interview	Interview guide	Representatives of stakeholders, nominated by their management to meet the evaluation team
Preschool principals (managers), mayors/representatives of LPA, rayon education specialists from both target communities (called 'treatment group') and the control group	In-depth interviews	Interview guide	Representatives of stakeholders, nominated by their management to meet the evaluation team during the visits in the communities forming the treatment and control groups
Preschool educators from both target communities (called 'treatment group') and the control group	Focus Group	Focus group guide	8-10 participants/group, 1-2 participants from each community forming the treatment group, respectively the control group Recruitment criteria: work experience; no. of children in the crèche-group for whom the respective educator is responsible; gender representation (to the extent possible)
Parents/caregivers of children under three, from both target communities (called 'treatment group') and the control group	Focus Group	Focus group guide	8-10 participants/group, 1-2 participants from each community forming the treatment group, respectively the control group Recruitment criteria: gender representation (both mothers and fathers); employment status of mothers; vulnerability profile of parents and their children (CwD, Roma, poor, single-parent families, many children in the family, children of migrant workers, etc.)
Parents/caregivers of vulnerable children under three, from both target communities (called 'treatment group') and the control group	In-depth interview	Interview guide	Interviews with parents/caregivers of vulnerable children to add more insight evidence on issues and information collected via the Focus Group above. These interviews will also serve as a back-up data collection method in case vulnerable parents/caregivers cannot participate in the Focus Group (impossibility to leave the children alone at home while coming to Chisinau, sensitivity of issues which might render a discussion in public/Focus Group not appropriate for ethical reasons, etc.)

Key informants	Research method	Tool	Notes
Multi-sectorial teams functioning at local level to support the special protection of children under risk and of children separated from their parents	Group discussion	Group discussion guide	Around 6 participants/group, depending on the actual size of these working groups functioning in the communities In case group discussions are not possible (e.g. for instance because of lack of time availability of key informants), individual in-depth interviews will be organised.
Service providers i.e. preschools (kindergartens) located in the treatment and control group	Structured observation	Structured observation grid	Site visits to various service providers during the visits in the target communities Collection of quantitative and qualitative data on relevant indicators for evaluation
Civil Society Organisations	Round table	Round table discussion points	CSOs involved in the area of children under three, either as service providers or researchers or advocates for children's rights

Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Judgement Criteria	Indicators/Descriptors	Documentary Data Sources and Data Collection Methods (<i>in italics</i>)
RELEVANCE - To what extent has the Project responded to country priorities and needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries?				
EQ 1	To what extent was the Project relevant for the national policies, strategies and priorities as well as for international commitments of Moldova?	<p>Alignment of the Project objectives and specific interventions with the needs and priorities identified in country policy papers and strategies aimed to guide and advance preschool education reforms and social inclusion</p> <p>Alignment of Project objectives and specific interventions with the international human rights standards</p>	Evidence of consistency between needs and priorities of preschool education reform and Moldova's international commitments <u>and</u> the Project objectives and specific interventions	<p>Work Plan UNICEF-MoE PCAs MSIF and CNETIF Demand and Supply Study (UNICEF, UN Women, 2013) Key relevant legislation and strategic documents (e.g.: National Development Strategy 2020, Family Code, Code of Education, National Strategy on Education 2020, Child Protection Strategy 2014-2020, National Health Strategy 2022, etc.) Concluding Observations of CRC (2009) and CEDAW (2009) UNDAF and UNICEF CPD 2013-2017 National and local reports, research studies</p> <p><i>Documentary review</i> <i>Mapping of available situation and contextual analyses</i> <i>Interviews with key stakeholders</i></p>
EQ 2	<p>Has the Project addressed the underlying causes of exclusion and responded to the needs of children under three, especially of the most vulnerable children, from the perspective of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equity - Human rights principles (non-discrimination, participation, etc.) - HRBA and gender mainstreaming 	<p>The Project design documents and implementation strategy addressed the key causes of inequality and discrimination hindering access of children under 3 to early learning and development services in the reference period, in particular of vulnerable children (CwD, Roma, poor, living in rural areas, etc.)</p> <p>Alignment of the Project strategy and activities with the human rights principles, gender mainstreaming and</p>	<p>Evidence of Project contribution to counteracting inequality and discrimination of vulnerable children under 3</p> <p>Examples of most effective/ineffective approaches and strategies for reducing causes of inequality and discrimination</p> <p>Evidence of consistency between needs and priorities for broadening access to early learning opportunities of most marginalised children (Roma children,</p>	<p>Project documents, reports Relevant assessments, reviews, evaluations, researches, studies on education, social exclusion, child protection in Moldova Reports of Ombudsman, oversight bodies, human rights NGOs Relevant literature on early learning and development in relation to human rights principles UN literature on HRBA and gender mainstreaming</p> <p><i>Stakeholder mapping</i> <i>Documentary review</i> <i>Mapping of available situation and contextual analyses</i> <i>Technical analysis and testing of the ToC</i></p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Judgement Criteria	Indicators/Descriptors	Documentary Data Sources and Data Collection Methods (<i>in italics</i>)
		equity-focused development priorities	children with developmental delays and disabilities), the strategy implemented by the Project and the overarching principles of equity, anti-discrimination, gender equality, participation and progressive realisation of children's rights Presence of equity, as a cross-cutting issue within the modelling approach of services for children under 3, implementation strategy, accountability (results) frameworks and reporting	<i>Focus groups with professionals and parents</i> <i>Interviews with implementation partners and key stakeholders</i> <i>Site visits, structured observation</i>
EQ 3	To what extent was the Project relevant to the needs of other key stakeholders, i.e. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preschool education professionals ▪ LPA ▪ Parents/Caregivers 	Extent to which the capacity building of stakeholders is in line with objectives and priorities for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ improving access and quality of pre-school education in Moldova ▪ planning and expansion of services for children under 3 at local level ▪ empowering parents to use positive parenting practices and participate in activity planning and implementation in the targeted preschools 	Coherence between the capacity building needs for improvement of quality and provision of pre-school education in Moldova and the programmes designed and implemented within the Project Training curriculum and mentoring support match capacity building needs Consistency between training topics and priorities for diversification and expansion of services for children under 3 Consistency between training topics/counselling services for parents/caregivers and priorities for developing their parenting skills and engagement in the process of improving the quality of services for children under 3	Project documents, reports Strategic and regulatory documents Available training needs assessments Training packages Training reports (evaluations and feedback from trainees) <i>Stakeholder mapping</i> <i>Documentary review</i> <i>Mapping of available situation and contextual analyses</i> <i>Technical analysis and testing of the ToC</i> <i>Focus groups with professionals and parents</i> <i>Interviews with implementation partners and key stakeholders</i> <i>Site visits, structured observation</i>
EFFECTIVENESS – To what extent did the Project achieved the envisaged objectives and results?				
EQ 4	What was the achievement level of planned results (quantitative and qualitative) for final beneficiaries (children, in particular of vulnerable ones) and target groups	The project produced the outputs planned The outputs produced the intended outcomes (quantitative and qualitative)	% outputs and outcomes achieved (indicators) Outcome indicators: • No. of children aged 0-3 enrolled in preschool institutions renovated and	Project design documents, statistics and reports (progress and field monitoring) Enrolment criteria of children in the crèche groups Evaluation results of CNETIF on knowledge and skills of parents/caregivers and professionals

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Judgement Criteria	Indicators/Descriptors	Documentary Data Sources and Data Collection Methods (<i>in italics</i>)
	(parents/caregivers, professionals, service providers)	Intended outcomes (i) have been achieved, (ii) have been partially achieved (in which areas) or (iii) have not been achieved to date	<p>endowed with project financial support, disaggregated by gender</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of children under 3 enrolled in preschool institutions supported by the project of the total number of eligible children in the targeted communities, disaggregated by gender • No. and % of disadvantaged children of the total number of beneficiary children enrolled in newly-set up crèche groups, disaggregated by gender, residence, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic status • No. and % of targeted professionals who use adequate practices to stimulate the social-affective, cognitive, and motor development of the child, as well as health care and nutrition • No. and % of targeted parents/caregivers who use positive parenting practices to stimulate child development and provide appropriate nutrition and health care <p>Quality of outputs and outcomes</p> <p>The project has a well defined intervention logic, demonstrating how the outputs will produce the intended results</p> <p>Evidence and examples of high/poor effectiveness</p>	<p>Project outputs (curricula, guides, training packages, mentoring and counselling materials) TNA, Training reports, mentoring and counselling reports/records Local statistics</p> <p><i>Analysis of results from UNICEF/CNETIF/ MSIF M&E data at community level</i> <i>Contribution analysis to determine progress against intended results and pathways generated</i> <i>Interviews with key informants</i> <i>FG with parents/caregivers and professionals</i> <i>Site visits</i> <i>Structured observation</i></p>
EQ 5	To what extent and in what way did the Project succeed in modelling services for children under three?	<p>There is a written concept paper of the model with explicit objectives and elements/approaches to pilot</p> <p>Documentation of the model was done in terms of both</p>	<p>Model of services for children under 3 designed and tested in the target communities (yes/no)</p> <p>Key elements of model design: hypotheses, key bottlenecks to be addressed, overall objective, expected</p>	<p>Concept papers, studies Project documents, progress reports, monitoring reports Preschools statistics Decisions of LPA/preschools to set up crèche-groups Daily programme of the crèche-groups</p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Judgement Criteria	Indicators/Descriptors	Documentary Data Sources and Data Collection Methods (<i>in italics</i>)
		<p>results and processes which led to their achievement</p> <p>New services for children under three were piloted in target communities</p>	<p>results, indicators as basis for hypotheses, envisaged implementation strategy, monitoring mechanisms, planned documentation, exit strategy, potential national scaling up strategy, dissemination, geographical area (treatment and control) period and budget of the model, contribution to RKLA, key duty bearers, participation principle, , , target groups, final beneficiaris, activities,</p> <p>No. and functionality of established crèche-groups</p> <p>Typology of piloted services</p>	<p><i>Documentary review</i> <i>Structured desk analysis of modelling design, implementation approaches, documenting of results and processes</i> <i>Interviews with key informants in communities</i> <i>Focus groups with professionals and parents/caregivers</i> <i>Site visits</i></p>
EQ 6	<p>What were the major factors which contributed positively or negatively to the progress towards the foreseen results for children, their parents, professionals and LPAs? (at output and outcome level)</p>	<p>The achievement of the Project results has been facilitated by certain factors</p> <p>Progress of the Project has been impeded by certain barriers and bottlenecks</p>	<p>Examples of factors which contributed or hampered the effective achievement of outputs and outcomes</p> <p>Modalities used by the Project team and its implementation partners to overcome barriers and bottlenecks</p>	<p>Project progress reports Trip monitoring reports</p> <p><i>Contribution analysis to determine factors which promoted or blocked the progress against intended results</i> <i>Mapping of risks analyses undertaken and mitigation measures implemented</i> <i>Interviews with key informants</i> <i>Focus groups and group discussions</i></p>
EQ 7	<p>Has the Project provided any additional (unplanned) significant contribution towards improvement of service provision for children under three in target communities?</p>	<p>Identification and assessment of additional (planned and unplanned) results</p> <p>The identified additional results are (not) classified into positive or negative</p>	<p>Evidence through examples of additional results and their appraisal</p> <p>Effects (positive or negative) of identified results</p>	<p>Project documents, progress reports Research studies and reports developed within the Project CNETIF/MSIF monitoring data Third party researches, studies and assessments</p> <p><i>Documentary review</i> <i>Analysis of results from UNICEF/CNETIF/ MSIF M&E systems and data at national and community level</i> <i>Interviews with key informants</i> <i>Focus groups and group discussions</i> <i>Site visits, structured observation</i></p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Judgement Criteria	Indicators/Descriptors	Documentary Data Sources and Data Collection Methods (<i>in italics</i>)	
EFFICIENCY - To what extent did the management of the Project ensure an efficient use of resources to achieve its objectives?				
EQ 8	How well have the implementation of activities been managed? To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled? What management and monitoring tools have been used?	<p>Management of the Project ensured timeliness and efficient use of resources</p> <p>Chosen management and implementation modalities are in line with best practices of other UNICEF or donors' interventions</p>	<p>Evidence that chosen management modalities provided for needed efficiency, timely delivery and adaptation/flexibility in Project implementation</p> <p>Examples of management intervention for overcoming barriers and constraints in Project implementation</p>	<p>UNICEF annual reports Project reports (progress, field monitoring) Work Plan MoE-UNICEF PCAs, timetables</p> <p><i>System analysis of management, monitoring and quality control and assurance strategies Systematic data review, particularly of UNICEF M&E systems and data; similarly for its two implementing partners i.e. MSIF and CNETIF Interviews with key informants (UNICEF, MSIF, CNETIF, MoE, LPAs in target communities, preschool principals)</i></p>
EQ 9	How well have the Project resources been used? Were funds managed in a cost-effective manner to achieve expected results?	<p>Financial and human resources spent for the achievement of results</p> <p>Results so far could have been achieved at a lower cost (or not) – qualitative judgement</p> <p>Same / better results could have been achieved (or not) at same cost using other means – qualitative judgement</p>	<p>Examples of Project activities with a good/poor cost-effectiveness level</p> <p>Cost/unit of achieved results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average value of rehabilitation per preschool • Average value of goods per educational unit <p>Evidence of efforts made to achieve efficiency gains and savings</p> <p>Value for money</p>	<p>UNICEF annual reports Agreements between MSIF and LPAs in target communities Financial reports from CNETIF and MSIF (planned/spent budgets) Procurement documentation UNICEF financial rules and regulations Relevant costing/benchmarking studies</p> <p><i>System analysis of management strategies Financial review (planned/spent, local counterpart funding, delivery mechanism) Systematic data review, particularly of UNICEF M&E systems and data and of implementing partners Structured observation Interviews with stakeholders</i></p>
EQ 10	Did the Project ensure coherence with other relevant interventions for children under three to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps? Has the Project built upon previous interventions?	<p>Judgement will be based on the examination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objectives of similar interventions ▪ Complementarity with the Project ▪ Sequencing of assistance 	<p>Coherence between the Project and similar interventions' objectives; co-ordinated implementation schedules</p> <p>Demonstrable effects of complementarity or/and overlaps, both upstream on the level of UN/donor coordination and</p>	<p>Projects documentation Minutes of coordination meetings (if available) Documentation on interventions of other UN and donor organisations for children under three, reports, evaluations</p> <p><i>Documentary review</i></p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Judgement Criteria	Indicators/Descriptors	Documentary Data Sources and Data Collection Methods (<i>in italics</i>)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UN and Donors coordination and consultation processes with stakeholders & beneficiaries 	downstream on Project implementation level	<i>Mapping of relevant interventions of other UN/donor organisations</i> <i>Interviews with key informants</i> <i>Group discussions with inter-sectoral working groups</i>
EQ 11	What was the role of key stakeholders and UNICEF partners in the design, coordination and implementation of Project activities? What was the role and comparative advantage of UNICEF?	<p>There are clear roles and responsibilities assigned to UNICEF and various implementation partners and stakeholders in the project design documentation</p> <p>UNICEF intervened, through its core roles, in areas where it has comparative advantage</p>	<p>Specific description of roles and responsibilities in project documents</p> <p>Achieved results could be attributed to specific partners (MSIF, CNETIF, MoE), stakeholders (line ministries,, LPAs, preschools, CSOs, etc.) and UNICEF</p> <p>The comparative advantage of UNICEF could be identified</p>	<p>Project design documents, progress reports, field monitoring reports PCAs with MSIF and CNETIF UNICEF annual reports Reports of partners and stakeholders</p> <p><i>Systematic documentary review</i> <i>Contribution analysis to determine progress against intended results obtained with the engagement of various partners and stakeholders</i> <i>Interviews with key informants</i> <i>Group discussions with inter-sectoral working groups</i></p>
IMPACT - To what extent and how did the Project succeed to have a positive effect on the life of children and women in target communities?				
EQ 12	To what extent has the Project impacted on the learning and development outcomes of children under three in the target communities (treatment group) compared to those in the control group?	The services developed with support of the Project had positive effects on beneficiary children compared to the control group, in terms of social-affective, cognitive, motor development	<p>Evidence and examples of positive effects and benefits of the piloted services on targeted children</p> <p>Satisfaction level of parents/caregivers concerning the effects of new services on the development of their children (qualitative)</p> <p>Preschool professionals are able to indicate at least 2 examples of progress made by beneficiary children in each of the following areas of child development: social-affective, cognitive, motor; health care and nutrition, as a result of the Project</p> <p>Contribution of the Project to the progressive realisation of children's rights</p>	<p>Project documentation (progress reports, trip monitoring reports) CNETIF evaluation instruments and results</p> <p><i>Aggregation and analysis of data collected via the structured observation grid</i> <i>Focus groups with parents/caregivers and professionals</i> <i>Interviews with parents of vulnerable children, mentors, CNETIF</i></p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Judgement Criteria	Indicators/Descriptors	Documentary Data Sources and Data Collection Methods (<i>in italics</i>)
			in target communities (none/modest/significant) Comparative analysis with the control group for all units of analysis	
EQ 13	What were the effects of the Project on the employment status of mothers of children under three in the target communities?	The services developed by the Project allowed mothers of children under three to re-enter the labour market due to the possibility to reconcile family and professional life Fathers are more engaged in childhood learning and caring due to Project intervention	No. and % of targeted women who returned on the labour market due to enrolment of their children in the crèche-groups set up within the Project-supported preschools No. and % of targeted fathers who developed positive parenting practices (based on self-evaluation and perceptions of mothers/professionals) Comparative analysis with the control group for all units of analysis	Project documentation (progress reports, trip monitoring reports) CNETIF evaluation instruments and results Local labour statistics <i>Aggregation and analysis of data collected via the structured observation grid</i> <i>Focus groups with parents/caregivers and professionals</i> <i>Interviews with parents of vulnerable children, mentors, CNETIF</i>
EQ 14	What is the potential of the Project to support positive and realistic policy and regulatory framework changes for children under three?	The Project provides solid results-based evidence to inform policy and legal changes for the benefit of children under three Systemic barriers (administrative, institutional, financial, human resources, etc.) exist which might reduce the potential of the Project to inform policy and legal change	Evidence provided by the Project has been presented to policy-makers and steered debate on needed amendments to policy and legal framework Factors reducing the potential of the Project to influence change (external and internal to the management of the Project) Risk management strategies developed and implemented	Project documents, reports and statistics Project presentations Policy papers Agenda and minutes and policy discussions, round tables, conferences <i>Structured desk analysis of policy documents and legislative frameworks</i> <i>Contribution analysis of the Project to national level policy dialogue</i> <i>Mapping of risks analyses undertaken and mitigation measures implemented</i> <i>Interviews with key stakeholders (line ministries, National Council for Child Protection, CNETIF, LPAs)</i>
SUSTAINABILITY - To what extent are the Project outcomes sustainable?				
EQ 15	Are the services for children under three still functioning in the target communities one year	Functionality level of services for children under three supported by the Project after	One year after the end of external support, there are the same number of crèche groups in all target communities,	Preshool official documents (planning strategies, enrolment statistics, payroll, inventory, consumables, budgets)

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Judgement Criteria	Indicators/Descriptors	Documentary Data Sources and Data Collection Methods (<i>in italics</i>)
	after the end of the Project? Have they been institutionalised in target communities?	the Project ended Services are part of the standard service provision provided in the community to children under three	beneficiary children, unchanged working hours (10.5 hours/day) comparable staffing levels, adequate endowment of premises. No. of communities where services for children under three have been institutionalised (none/partially/fully)	<i>Review of preschool books and records</i> <i>Interviews with LPAs and preschool principals</i> <i>Site visits to target communities</i> <i>Structured observation</i> <i>Focus groups with professionals and parents/caregivers</i>
EQ 16	What measures has the Project put in place to ensure the sustainability of results?	The Project has a sustainability strategy which is implemented / monitored Ensuring sustainability has been a subject matter discussed by UNICEF with LPAs and preschools	The Project design documents embed a sustainability strategy Examples of actions undertaken to ensure sustainability	UNICEF annual reports Project design documents/PCAs/Workplans Agreements MSIF – LPAs Field monitoring reports Progress Reports Minutes of the meetings where sustainability issues have been addressed <i>Documentary review</i> <i>Analysis of sustainability strategies</i> <i>Mapping of risks and systemic barriers to sustainability</i> <i>Analysis of mitigation measures</i> <i>Interviews with key informants</i>
EQ 17	What factors are likely to hinder or support the sustainability of results, i.e.: - Regulatory framework - Capacity of preschool education professionals	Existence of a regulatory framework which promotes service development and diversification targeted to children under 3 in place Extent to which professionals integrate their newly acquired knowledge into regular activities to be judged by: ▪ extent to which new approaches are integrated in the services for children under three ▪ level of use of teaching materials ▪ availability of human resources to maintain	Main features of existing laws and by-laws enabling reforms of pre-school education and service provision for children under three No. of educators applying new knowledge and skills in their regular activities, measured through extent of integration of new methodologies in their work practices No. of pre-school institutions integrating new child-centred methodologies developed by the Project into everyday activities Equipment procured is in use and well maintained	Relevant legal framework on preschool education, health and social protection Analytical reports by government and independent experts Project documentation Field monitoring reports CNETIF evaluation results Local budgets <i>Systematic documentary review, applying structured tools</i> <i>Mapping of relevant laws and by-laws</i> <i>Interviews with key informants</i> <i>Focus groups with professionals</i> <i>Site visits</i>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Judgement Criteria	Indicators/Descriptors	Documentary Data Sources and Data Collection Methods (<i>in italics</i>)
	- Financial resources at local level to continue financing services for children under three	<p>effects in beneficiary preschools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ further staff development planning, based on capacity building packages developed by the Project <p>Provision of funds in local budgets for running services that target children under three</p> <p>Sufficiency of human/material resources at LPA level to continue the functioning of services</p>	<p>No. of new services where salaries and running costs have been fully taken over by the local budgets</p> <p>Evidence through examples of sustainable actions, continuation of Project activities and goals beyond its duration (after the end of granted period)</p>	

Annex 4 – Control Group

A control group of communities has been constructed, as requested by the ToR (page 3), in order to compare the effects of the Project on various evaluation themes between the targeted communities (the so-called ‘treatment’ group) and the ones not supported by the Project (called ‘control’ group). The communities in the control group are comparable to the ones in the treatment group in the characteristics relevant for this evaluation, notably: level of population of children under three, ECD service provision, geographical distribution, community deprivation level, female unemployment.

The table below provides an overview of the criteria used to construct the control group and its composition. The treatment group is also included in the table to provide an image of the commonalities with the control group.

Community characteristics	Treatment group	Control group
Geographical distribution		
<i>Residence:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban Rural 	3 (Bălți, Călărași, Nisporeni) 7 (Taraclia de Salcie, Coșnița, Mingir, Talmază, Mîndrești, Pîrlița, Baurci)	3 (Bălți ⁷ , Anenii Noi, Strășeni) 7 (Antonești, Hulboia, Inești, Petrești, Boșcana, Cărpineni, Beșalma)
<i>Region:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Centre South UTAG Transnistria 	1 (Bălți) 5 (Pîrlița, Mîndrești, Călărași, Nisporeni, Mingir) 2 (Tarmaza, Taraclia de Salcie) 1 (Baurci) 1 (Coșnița)	1 (Bălți) 6 (Petrești, Inești, Strășeni, Anenii Noi, Cărpineni, Boșcana) 2 (Antonești, Hulboia) 1 (Beșalma) . ⁸
Community deprivation level		
<i>IDAM (2012, rural areas)⁹:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ≤ 100 101-500 ≥ 501 	1 (Talmază) 5 (Taraclia de Salcie, Mingir, Mîndrești, Pîrlița, Baurci) 1 (Coșnița)	1 (Hulboia) 4 (Petrești, Antonești, Inești, Beșalma) 2 (Cărpineni, Boșcana)
<i>Economic status (2012, urban areas)¹⁰</i>	1 (Bălți) 1 (Nisporeni)	1 (Bălți) 1 (Anenii Noi)

⁷ Bălți is a city which is not comparable to any other city in the Republic of Moldova from the perspective of socio-demographic characteristics and relevant selection criteria of the control group for this evaluation. Since the ToR require 10 localities in the control group and UNICEF country office has confirmed that number during the kick-off skype discussion, Bălți city has been retained in the control group, the unit of analysis being in this case the preschool.

⁸ No locality was identified from Transnistria region without crèche groups (an important selection criteria for the control group). Hence, another locality was selected from the South region.

⁹ Deprivation Index of Small Areas, calculated only for rural areas, <http://www.mec.gov.md/ro/content/indicatori-social-economici-pe-localitati>, accessed on 20 January 2016

¹⁰ Based on the analysis of economic indicators in the database of Ministry of Economy, <http://www.mec.gov.md/ro/content/indicatori-social-economici-pe-localitati>, accessed on 2 February 2016

Community characteristics	Treatment group	Control group
	1 (Călărași)	1 (Strășeni)
Children under three		
<i>No of children under three:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≤ 200 • 201-300 • ≥ 501 	7 (Taraclia de Salcie, Mîndrești, Talmaza, Pîrlița, Coșnița, Mingir, Baurci) 1 (Nisporeni) 2 (Bălți, Călărași)	7 (Antonești, Hulboia, Inești, Boșcana, Petrești, Cărpineni, Beșalma) 1 (Anenii Noi) 2 (Strășeni, Bălți)
Female unemployment		
<i>Number of unemployed women (2012)¹¹:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≤ 100 women • 101-500 women • 501-1,000 women • ≥ 1,001 women 	3 (Talmaza, Taraclia de Salcie, (Nisporeni) 3 (Mingir, Călărași, Mîndrești) 3 (Pîrlița, (Coșnița, Baurci) 1 (Bălți)	4 (Antonești, Hulboia, Boșcana, Strășeni) 3 (Inești, Carpinei, Anenii Noi) 1 (Beșalma) 2 (Petrești, Bălți)
ECD supply for children under 3 (at the start of the project/2013)		
<i>Presence of ECD services in the community:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crèche-groups • Early Development Centres • None 	- 3 (Bălți, Călărași, Nisporeni) 7 (Taraclia de Salcie, Coșnița, Mingir, Talmaza, Mîndrești, Pîrlița, Baurci)	- 3 (Bălți, Anenii Noi, Strășeni) 7 (Antonești, Hulboia, Inești, Boșcana, Petrești, Cărpineni, Beșalma)

¹¹ Source: <http://www.mec.gov.md/ro/content/indicatori-social-economici-pe-localitati>, accessed on 4 February 2016. There are no data concerning the unemployment rate, which would have been a more appropriate indicator.

Annex 5 – Primary Data Collection Guides and Templates

General methodological notes:

Each interview, focus group and group discussion will start with the presentation of the evaluator and of the evaluation objectives, followed by the presentation of the interlocutors. Whenever necessary, a brief presentation of the Project will be also done.

The evaluators will confirm the interviewees that participation in the evaluation is voluntary and that their opinions will be confidential and presented in the report in an anonymous manner. They will be also reminded that they could withdraw anytime during the interview, focus group or group discussion without any obligation to explain the reasons. Participants will be informed that focus groups and group discussions will be audio-recorded, explaining the reasons and seeking their consent.

The questions will be sent in advance to the people who are going to be interviewed. Interviews will last 1-1.5 hours each and will take place in Chisinau and in communities, as the case.

The participants in focus groups and group discussions will be briefed in advance about the major topics to be discussed during the meeting. The groups will be composed of around 10-12 people. The focus groups will last 1.5-2 hours each and will be organised in Chisinau. The group discussions will last 1-1.5 hours each and will take place during the site visits in the communities.

At the end of interviews, focus groups and group discussions, the evaluators will thank the participants for their time and feedback.

In line with standard evaluation practices, the interviews, focus groups and group discussions will be attended only by the evaluators and the interviewed people.

GUIDES FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

Interview Guide for UNICEF country office

(management; ECD, Health, Child Protection officers; M&E officer; Financial/Operations officer; Communication officer – multiple interviews; questions will be adapted for each interviewee)

1. What strategic needs and priorities of the country have been addressed by the Project (level, type)?
2. What are the major achievements of the Project that you are most proud of? What was the most challenging in achieving these results? Are there any unplanned effects of the Project with significant contribution towards improvement of service provision for children under three?
3. Did some targeted preschools perform better than others. If yes, how and why?
4. How would you assess the cost-effectiveness of piloted services? (as such and compared to similar services for children under three delivered by other stakeholders)
5. How satisfied are you with the overall project management and implementation i.e. performance of MSIF and CNETIF, timelines, efficiency in utilization of financial and human

resources, monitoring and documenting the model, coherence with other relevant interventions?

6. How would you describe UNICEF's cooperation with MoE, other line ministries (MoLSP, MoH, MoF) and National Council for Child Protection? What about cooperation with stakeholders at community level (LPAs, preschools, NGOs)? What went well? What could have been done better?
7. What difference has UNICEF made via this Project for *vulnerable children (which?)* in terms of: a) access to services; and b) early learning and development outcomes for children? What was the comparative advantage of UNICEF?
8. Looking ahead, which of the achievements of the project are likely to be sustained or expanded without further external support? Which of them will require further support? What measures have you taken to ensure sustainability?
9. In your view, what is the likelihood that LPAs in Moldova will set up/expand services for children under three and ensure/increase coverage of vulnerable children, based on the model developed by UNICEF? What are the favouring/blocking factors?
10. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities of the ECD in Moldova that needs to be addressed in the coming years? Do you see any particular role of UNICEF in addressing these needs?

Interview Guide for MSIF and CNETIF

(management and project teams – separate interviews, one with MSIF and one with CNETIF)

1. What priorities of the country and needs of children under three and their parents/caregivers have been addressed by the Project?
2. What are the major achievements of the Project that you are most proud of? What was the most challenging in achieving these results? Are there any unplanned effects of the Project with significant contribution towards improvement of service provision for children under three?
3. In your view, what was the impact of the Project on *vulnerable children and their parents*? To the best of your knowledge, have the new services avoided child institutionalisation?
4. Did some targeted preschools perform better than others. If yes, how and why?
5. *(only for MSIF)* How would you assess the average value per rehabilitated preschool compared to similar rehabilitation works of educational infrastructure you organisation did in the country?
(only for CNETIF) Which capacity building activities and mechanisms used by the Project were the most / least successful and why? What was the effect of trainings, counselling and mentoring provided by the Project on: a) preschool education professionals; b) parents/caregivers? How measured/evaluated?

Was there any link between the modelling of services and the other two components in your PCA with UNICEF?

Average value per crèche-group (capacity building + salaries)

6. What monitoring mechanism have you used to ensure smooth implementation of Project activities?
7. How would you describe the cooperation of your organisation with UNICEF country office? What about cooperation with LPAs, preschools and other service providers (health, social protection) in targeted communities? What went well? What could have been done better?
8. What measures have been taken to ensure the sustainability of services for children under three piloted by the Project? What is the likelihood that they will continue to be provided in the future without further external support?
9. In your view, what is the likelihood that LPAs in Moldova will set up/expand services for children under three and ensure/increase coverage of vulnerable children, based on the model developed by UNICEF? What are the favouring/blocking factors?
10. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities of the ECD in Moldova that needs to be addressed in the coming years? Do you see any particular role of UNICEF in addressing these needs?

Interview Guide for line ministries and National Council for Protection of Child Rights

(Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family, Ministry of Finance)

1. What was the role of your organisation in the implementation of the Country Programme between UNICEF and the Government of Moldova 2013-2017, if any?
2. Are you aware of UNICEF's initiative to model services for children under three in 10 communities? *(If yes, continue with questions 3 and 4, as well as 5 in case of MoE. If not, go to question 6)*
3. Did you have any particular role in the modelling process?
4. Are you aware of any significant achievements of this UNICEF initiative in the target communities?
5. *(only for MoE)* Are the curricula and guides developed by UNICEF to support the capacity building of educators and parents/caregivers of children under three in the target communities compliant with the existing quality standards in education?
6. The purpose of modelling of these services was to provide evidence on the benefits of such services for children under three and their families, information and know how on the process of their setting up and running, costing etc. with a view to their scaling up at national level. In your view, what would be the main prerequisites that need to be in place for this scaling up?
7. In general, to what extent do you think that children under three in Moldova and their families require early learning and development services? Who is providing such services in the country? Are the needs covered by the existing service provision?
8. To the best of your knowledge, are there any systemic obstacles impeding the enrolment of Roma children and children with developmental delays and disabilities in preschool education?

9. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities of the ECD reform in Moldova that needs to be addressed in the coming years? Do you see any particular role of UNICEF and your organisation in addressing these needs?

Interview Guide for international development partners/donors

(UNDP, UN Women)

1. What kind of assistance is your institution providing in Moldova in the field of education, in particular early childhood education and development?
2. Are you aware of UNICEF's initiative to model services for children under three in 10 communities?
If yes, continue with questions 3 and 4. If not, present the modelling and its objective and then ask question 5.
3. What is your opinion about this initiative in terms of relevance for children and their parents/caregivers and of its results?
4. Was UNICEF's modelling of services for children under three complementary to your work in the field of early childhood education and development? Were there any coordination meetings?
5. In your opinion, is UNICEF's initiative relevant for the needs of children and their parents/caregivers? Please motivate your answer.
6. According to the best of your knowledge, what would be the main prerequisites that need to be in place for scaling up this model at national level?
7. In your view, which are the top three priorities of the early childhood development and education reform in Moldova that needs to be addressed in the coming years? Do you any role of UNICEF and of your institution in this process?

Interview Guide for CSOs (community level)

(NGOs running centres for early development)

1. What kind of assistance is your organisation providing in this community in the field of early childhood education and development?
2. Are you aware of UNICEF's initiative to model services for children under three in this community? *(If yes, continue with questions 4 and 5. If not, present the modelling and its objective and then ask question 6)*
3. What is your opinion about this initiative in terms of relevance for children and their parents/caregivers and of its results?
4. Was UNICEF's modelling of services for children under three complementary to your work in the field of early childhood education and development? Were there any coordination meetings?
5. In your opinion, is UNICEF's initiative relevant for the needs of children and their parents/caregivers living in this community? Please motivate your answer.

6. What would be the main prerequisites that need to be in place for scaling up this model?
7. In your view, which are the top three priorities of the early childhood development and education reform in Moldova that needs to be addressed in the coming years? Do you see any role of UNICEF and CSOs in this process?

Interview Guide for parents/caregivers of children under three (target communities)

1. Would you be so kind and tell us a bit about yourself and your family? (*civil status, occupation of parents, family size, no. of children/age, etc.*)
2. How did you learn about the new crèche in your community?
3. Have you faced any challenges in enrolling your child in the crèche?
4. Would you have enrolled your child in the crèche if you were requested to pay a contribution?
5. Are you/Have you been satisfied with the duration of the daily programme and the quality of child care in the crèche? Why? Would you recommend these services to other parents who are in a similar situation like you?
6. What was the most tangible benefit to your child and family life that you would highlight as a result of child enrolment in the crèche?
7. Are you/Have you been involved in the crèche activities and/or in monitoring the quality of learning and development services in the respective kindergarten? Please detail.
8. Have you benefitted of any training or counselling from the educators in the crèche?

(*if yes*) To what extent have you used the knowledge and skills acquired during the training/counselling in interacting with and caring your child?
(*if not*) Would you have needed such training or counselling? Why?
9. Do you have any particular additional needs in relation to your child (children) under three? If yes, how could you be supported to address them in the future?

Interview Guide for parents/caregivers of children under three (control group)

1. Would you be so kind and tell us a bit about yourself and your family? (*civil status, occupation of parents, family size, no. of children/age, etc.*)
2. Are you taking care yourself of your child/children under three? Is anybody else helping you with the child?
3. Have you encountered any difficulty in taking care of your child (*e.g. health, nutrition, communication/interaction with the child, child with special needs, lack of time because of job, etc.*)?

4. If yes, to what extent have you managed to overcome these difficulties? Would you have needed any advice/counselling/training on how to take care of your child? Please motivate your answer.
5. Assuming that a crèche is set up in your community, would you enrol your child there? Please motivate your answer.
6. Would you enrol your child in the crèche if you are requested to pay a contribution?
7. If enrolled in a crèche, how many hours per day would you leave your child there?
8. Do you have any particular additional needs in relation to your child (children) under three? If yes, how could you be supported to address them in the future?

Interview Guide for LPAs (target communities)

(representatives of local public administrations)

1. How do you see your role in the process of improving access to pre-school education, particularly with regards to children under three?
2. What are the measures taken by your institution to support the process of improving access to pre-school education of children under three? What challenges have you faced, if any?
3. Has UNICEF's initiative of setting up a crèche in your community supported your efforts? Have you been consulted about the selection of your community?
4. To what extent has this crèche covered the needs of parents/caregivers of children under three living in your community?
5. What do you think have been the biggest achievements of this initiative in your community? Would it have been possible to achieve these changes (if any) without UNICEF's support?
6. Are the services of the crèche currently provided on a regular basis? Are they institutionalised?
7. Has your institution ensured funds for the continuation of the functioning of the crèche? If yes, in what way? Do you see any responsibility of central authorities and parents in ensuring the financial sustainability of such services?
8. How would you assess cooperation with UNICEF and its partners i.e. MSIF and CNETIF in the setting up and running the crèche? Were there any alternative options to ensure better results? If yes, which would have been these options?
9. In general, what are the challenges ahead in terms of supporting children under three and their families and possible ways to overcome them? What would be the role of your institution?

Interview Guide for LPAs (control group)

(representatives of local public administrations)

1. How do you see your role in the process of improving access to pre-school education, particularly with regards to children under three?
2. What are the measures taken by your institution to support the process of improving access to pre-school education of children under three? What challenges have you faced, if any?
3. Have you received any support in overcoming these challenges? If yes, from whom and in what manner?
4. Would a crèche set up within an existing kindergarten be able to cover the needs of parents/caregivers of children under three in your community? Please motivate your answer.
5. If yes, would the municipality be willing and able to cover the rehabilitation, endowment and running costs of the crèche?
6. Do you see any responsibility of central authorities and parents in ensuring the financial sustainability of such crèche?
7. In general, what are the challenges ahead in terms of supporting children under three and their families and possible ways to overcome them? What would be the role of your institution?

Interview Guide for rayon education inspectors (target communities)

(inspectors from Rayon Education Directorates, ideally those who benefited of training provided by the Project)

1. How do you see your role in the process of improving access to pre-school education, particularly with regards to children under three?
2. What are the measures taken by your institution to support the process of improving access to pre-school education of children under three, especially of vulnerable children? What challenges have you faced, if any?
3. In this regard, has UNICEF's initiative of setting up a crèche in one of the rayon communities supported your efforts?
4. To what extent has the crèche covered the needs of parents/caregivers of children under three living in the respective community?
5. In your view, have the capacity building activities managed to effectively increase the knowledge and skills of educators and parents/caregivers to ensure child stimulation from a socio-affective, cognitive and motor perspective? What evidence do you have to substantiate your answer?
6. Are the curricula and guides developed by the Project to support the capacity building intervention compliant with the existing quality standards? Could they be used with confidence in case the services provided by the crèche are institutionalised and the model piloted in your rayon is scaled up at national level?

7. Have you benefitted of training provided by the Project? If yes, to what extent are you able to use the knowledge and skills acquired as a result of training in your everyday professional life?
8. What do you think have been the biggest achievements of this initiative in the respective community? Would it have been possible to achieve these changes (if any) without UNICEF's support?
9. How would you assess cooperation with UNICEF and its partners i.e. MSIF and CNETIF in the setting up and running the crèche? Were there any alternative options to ensure better results? If yes, which would have been these options?
10. In your view, who should ensure the financial sustainability of such services?
11. In general, what are the challenges ahead in terms of supporting children under three and their families and possible ways to overcome them? What would be the role of your institution?

Interview Guide for rayon education inspectors (control group)

(inspectors from Rayon Education Directorates)

1. How do you see your role in the process of improving access to pre-school education, particularly with regards to children under three?
2. What are the measures taken by your institution to support the process of improving access to pre-school education of children under three, especially of vulnerable children? What challenges have you faced, if any?
3. Have you received any support in overcoming these challenges? If yes, from whom and in what manner?
4. Would a crèche set up within an existing kindergarten be able to cover the needs of parents/caregivers of children under three in the communities of your rayon? Please motivate your answer.
5. If yes, would you be willing and able to support this initiative? (*expertise, financial, quality assurance, monitoring and supervision, etc.*)
6. In your opinion, who should cover the costs of setting up and running of such services?
7. In general, what are the challenges ahead in terms of supporting children under three and their families and possible ways to overcome them? What would be the role of your institution?

Interview Guide for preschool principals (target communities)

(principals of preschools, ideally those who benefited of training provided by the Project)

1. What was the role of your kindergarten in the process of setting up and running the crèche group for children under three supported by UNICEF?

2. Have you been consulted about the decision to host a crèche in your kindergarten?
3. What challenges have you faced in setting up and running the crèche group?
4. What are the major achievements that you are most proud of? Would it have been possible to achieve these results without UNICEF's support?
5. What is the profile of children in the crèche (family background, special needs, etc.)? What enrolment policy have you used to ensure equal access of children?
6. In your opinion, to what extent has the crèche covered the needs of parents/caregivers of children under three in your community?
7. How would you assess the cooperation with UNICEF and its partners i.e. MSIF and CNETIF in the implementation of new services for children under three in your kindergarten?
8. In your view, have the capacity building activities managed to effectively increase the knowledge and skills of educators and parents/caregivers to ensure child stimulation from a socio-affective, cognitive and motor perspective? What evidence do you have to substantiate your answer?
9. Have you benefitted of training provided by the Project? If yes, to what extent are you able to use the knowledge and skills acquired as a result of training in your everyday professional life?
10. Is the crèche still functioning? If yes, in the same parameters (staffing, daily programme, number of children, etc.)? If no, why?
11. In your view, who should ensure the financial sustainability of such services? What other prerequisites are needed for these services to become institutionalised?

Interview Guide for preschool principals (control group)

(principals of kindergartens)

1. To the best of your knowledge, what are the needs and priorities of parents/caregivers of children under three in your community?
2. Are there any service providers in your community to address their needs as far as children under three are concerned? What are the gaps?
3. Would a crèche be able to cover these needs? If yes, what could it be set up within an existing kindergarten or there are better options?
4. If in an existing kindergarten, what prerequisites (financial, human, infrastructure, etc.) would be needed to be put in place to ensure its setting up and running? What would be the challenges?
5. In your view, how could such crèche ensure equal opportunities in the access of children under three, in particular of those vulnerable?

6. Would you be willing and able to support the setting up of a crèche in your kindergarten? Please detail how.

ROUND TABLE WITH CSOs – DISCUSSION POINTS

1. CSOs in Moldova active in the field of education, in particular early childhood education and development. Significant achievements.
2. UNICEF model services for children under three in 10 communities: relevance for children and parents/caregivers; results; complementarity with similar initiatives of CSOs in the area of ECE; prerequisites for scaling up
3. Priorities for ECD and education reform in Moldova for the coming years. Role of UNICEF and CSOs.

FOCUS GROUPS GUIDES

Guide for Focus Group with educators (target communities)

(educators working in the preschools supported by the Prohject, who benefited of training and mentoring)

Introduction

1.1. *Presentation of the research topic*

1.2. *Presentation of the evaluator*

1.3. *Discussion rules:*

- *honest answers;*
- *there are no wrong or right opinions, just different points of view;*
- *ensuring confidentiality;*
- *need for audio recording; getting the participants' recording consent;*
- *time allocated for the Focus Group.*

1.4. *Information about the respondents (age, how long he/she holds this position)*

I. Perceptions on the achievements of the preschool institution

1. What, according to you, are the three main achievements of your institution within the last four years?
2. What has changed during the last four years in your institution? What changes had the strongest impact?

II. Children's access to the kindergarten's crèche

1. What is the capacity of the crèche set up in your preschool institution? How many children attend the crèche? To what extent the crèche meets the needs existing in your community?
2. What kinds of families, children that do not attend the crèche, come from? Why do you think they do not attend the crèche?
3. How long can it take to enrol the child to the crèche once the parents have expressed their interest to send him to this institution?
4. Do you think that all children from your community have equal opportunities to attend the crèche? What makes you say that? If there are any disadvantaged categories, which are these? Which are the advantaged ones?
5. How much do you think, are parents interested in their children attending the crèche?
6. What measures are taken now by your institution to encourage children from vulnerable groups attend the crèche? What do you think it needs to be done for these children to attend crèche?
7. Speaking about children with special needs/disabilities, do you think they should attend crèche together with other children?

8. What is your opinion about safety of your children within the crèche?

III. Achievements within the framework of the UNICEF Project

1. What can you tell us about the Project supported by UNICEF and implemented in your institution? What does it involve? What actions have been taken in the framework of this Project?
2. What do you think are the benefits of this Project? But the shortcomings, difficulties?
3. What changes have you noticed after the setup of the crèche-groups in your institution?
4. What is your opinion about the impact of the Project and the setup of crèche on:
 - Children, on socioemotional, cognitive and physical development, nutrition, health (please give two examples on each of these five aspects to prove the impact on children)
 - Parents, according to their knowledge and abilities to encourage children's socioemotional, cognitive and physical development, nutrition and health (as a result of training and counselling provided within the Project)
5. To what extent, do you think, the training and mentoring provided by CNETIF contributed to the development of knowledge and new skills to foster children's development and your communication with their parents? Do you use these new skills and knowledge in your daily activities? (please give an example)
6. What teaching materials the crèche-groups from your institutions have benefited from? How would you assess their quality and practicability?
7. What lessons should be learnt from this Project according to you?
8. Has your institution benefited from other projects, grants? What they were about? Which one you think had the strongest impact on your institution?

IV. Future perspectives

1. What do you think are the three main aspects to be changed in the crèche from your kindergarten?
2. Who do you think can actually solve them? How?
3. If you were the representative of a funding institution, what actions would you take primarily to improve access of children under three from your community to preschool education?

Guide for Focus Group with educators (control group)

(educators working in the preschools)

Introduction

1.1. *Presentation of the research topic*

1.2. *Presentation of the evaluator*

1.3. *Discussion rules:*

- *honest answers;*
- *there are no wrong or right opinions, just different points of view;*
- *ensuring confidentiality;*
- *need for audio recording; getting the participants' recording consent;*
- *time allocated for the Focus Group.*

1.4. *Information about the respondents (age, how long he/she holds this position)*

I. Perceptions on the achievements of the preschool institution

1. What according to you are the three main achievements of your institution within the last four years?
2. What has changed during the last four years in your institution? What changes had the strongest impact?

II. Children's access to the kindergarten

1. What is the capacity of your institution? How many children attend the kindergarten? To what extent, do you think, the kindergarten meets the needs of your community?
2. What kinds of families, children that do not attend the kindergarten, come from? Why do you think they do not attend the kindergarten?
3. To what extent, do you think is necessary to open crèche-groups in your institution? What makes you say that?

4. What do you think are the advantages of opening crèche-groups? But the disadvantages?
5. What would the setup of crèche-groups mean for your institution? But for pre-schoolers under three? How important would this service be for the parents?
6. How long can it take to enrol the child to the kindergarten once the parents have expressed their interest to send him to this institution?
7. Do you think that all children from your community have equal opportunities to attend the kindergarten? What makes you say that? If there are any disadvantaged categories, which are these? Which are the advantaged ones?
8. How much do you think, are parents interested in their children attending the kindergarten?
9. What measures are taken now by your institution to encourage children from vulnerable groups attend the kindergarten? What do you think it needs to be done for these children to attend the kindergarten?
10. Speaking about children with special needs/disabilities, do you think they should attend kindergarten together with other children?
11. What is your opinion about the safety of your children within the kindergarten?

III. Future perspectives

1. What do you think are the three main aspects to be changed in your kindergarten?
2. Who do you think can actually solve them? How?
3. If you were the representative of a funding institution, what actions would you take primarily to improve access of children under three from your community to preschool education?

Guide for Focus Group with parents/caregivers (target communities)

1.1. *Presentation of the research topic*

1.2. *Presentation of the evaluator*

1.3. *Discussion rules:*

- *honest answers;*
- *there are no wrong or right opinions, just different points of view;*
- *ensuring confidentiality;*
- *need for audio recording; getting the participants' recording consent;*
- *time allocated for the Focus Group.*

1.4. *Information about the respondents (age, occupation, family size, how many members of preschool age and their age)*

I. Perceptions and attitudes towards the local kindergarten with crèche-group

1. Tell us, please, to what extent, are you satisfied with the crèche your child attends? Why?
2. How old was your child when starting to attend the crèche? What made you send him to the crèche?
3. How important, according to you, is for your child to attend the crèche? What makes you think so?
4. But how important is/was it for you the existence of a crèche-group in your community? Why?

II. Children's access to the crèche-group from the community

1. How easy was it for you to enrol your child to the crèche? What problems have you encountered? What did you need?
2. In your opinion, can all the parents from your community send their children to the crèche if they wish that? If not, what stops them?
3. What categories of children from your community, according to you, do not attend the crèche? Why?
4. Do you have to pay a monthly childcare fee? If yes, what do you think of these monthly costs? What do you think, is the majority of parents able to pay this amount of money or not? What makes you say that?

III. Conditions in community kindergartens with crèche-groups

1. What can you say about your children's educators? How prepared do you think they are to work with your children? Have you personally encouraged, in any way, the crèche educators, to make them pay more attention to children?

2. How do you assess the activities your child is involved during the day? How useful do you think they are?

IV. Changes occurred

1. How did you manage to raise, care and educate your other children, when they were younger than three years old, if there was no crèche in your community?
2. What do you think was the impact of establishment of the crèche in your community on your child regarding the:
 - physical development;
 - nutrition and health;
 - emotional development and communication with you;
 - cognitive development?Please, motivate your answer.
3. How would you assess the usefulness of the training and counselling you have received on encouraging your child's development, from the following perspective:
 - physical development;
 - nutrition and health;
 - emotional development and communication with you;
 - cognitive development?Please, motivate your answer.
4. To what extent, you as parents, have involved in improving the conditions from the crèche? Give us, please, some concrete examples?
5. What do you think about municipality's involvement in solving issues faced by the crèche?

V. Suggestions and future perspectives

1. What do you think are the three main aspects to be changed in the crèche your child attends?
2. Who do you think can actually solve these? How?
3. If you were the representative of a funding institution, what actions would you take primarily to improve access of children under three from your community to preschool education?

Guide for Focus Group with parents/caregivers (control group)

1.1. *Presentation of the research topic*

1.2. *Presentation of the evaluator*

1.3. *Discussion rules:*

- *honest answers;*
- *there are no wrong or right opinions, just different points of view;*
- *ensuring confidentiality;*
- *need for audio recording; getting the participants' recording consent;*
- *time allocated for the Focus Group.*

1.4. *Information about the respondents (age, occupation, family size, how many members of preschool age and their age)*

I. Perceptions and attitudes towards the kindergarten from the community

1. What can you say about the kindergarten from your community? At what age do you intend to enrol your child to the kindergarten? Why?
2. In your opinion, how important would it be for your child to attend the kindergarten? What makes you think so?

II. Children's access to the crèche

1. If there were a crèche-group in your community, at what age would you enrol the child? Under what circumstances would you enrol the child to the crèche?
2. What costs would you be able to pay monthly for crèche childcare in case a contribution would be required from parents? What do you think, is the majority of parents able to pay this amount of money? On what grounds are you saying that?

III. Changes that may occur

1. What do you think it would have changed in your life if there were a crèche-group in the community? But in your child's life?
(the question is designed to parents that have children under three but also parents with older children that have not benefited from nursery services)
2. What do you think would be the impact of establishment of the crèche in your community on your child regarding the:
 - physical development;
 - nutrition and health;
 - emotional development and communication with you;
 - cognitive development? Please, motivate your opinion.
3. *(for the employed mothers)* Who takes care of your children when you are at the work? If you had to choose between the crèche and the person taking care of your child, what would you choose? Why?
4. *(for the unemployed mothers)* Would you decide to find a job or to turn back to your previous workplace if there were a crèche in your community?

IV. Suggestions and future perspectives

1. To what extent, you as parents, would be able to get involved in setting up crèche-groups within the kindergarten? Give, please, some concrete examples, how?
2. What other services for children under three, you think, would be useful for their development?
3. Who else in the community might be involved in setting up crèche-groups?

GUIDES FOR GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Group Discussion Guide for interdisciplinary working groups (target communities)

(members of the working groups: health, social and education professionals)

Introduction

1.1. *Presentation of the research topic*

1.2. *Presentation of the evaluator*

1.3. *Discussion rules:*

- *honest answers;*
- *there are no wrong or right opinions, just different points of view;*
- *ensuring confidentiality;*
- *need for audio recording; getting the participants' recording consent;*
- *time allocated for the Group Discussion.*

1.4. *Information about the respondents (institution, position, working experience)*

1. Please give a brief description of your inter-sectoral team (mandate, objectives, membership, procedure). What results have you achieved so far related to education and early childhood development in your community that you are proud of?
2. Tell us, please, what has changed in the preschool institution(s) from your community within the last four years? What were the most beneficial?
3. Enlist, please, the strengths and weaknesses of the kindergarten from your community?
4. In your opinion, what the establishment of the crèche-groups meant for your community? Please, motivate your opinion.
5. How did you manage to set up these crèche-groups? What was interdisciplinary team's contribution? Who else was involved?
6. To what extent, did, the institution you represent, supported the establishment of the crèche-groups? How?
7. How children to attend the kindergarten are selected? Are there enough places in the crèche-groups? If not, what are the demands?
8. Do you think that all children from your community have equal opportunities to attend the kindergarten? On what grounds are you saying that? If there are any disadvantaged categories, which are these? Which are the advantaged ones?

9. What measures are taken now to ensure the access of children from poor families or children with special needs/disabilities to preschool institutions? But to the crèche? What do you think it needs to be done for these categories of children?
10. How do you assess the endowment of the preschool institution with equipment and teaching materials (we refer here also to games, etc.)?
11. In your opinion, how important was the establishment of crèche-groups for the children? Have you noticed any changes related to child's physical and cognitive development? What about changes related to nutrition and health condition? What makes you think so?
12. In your opinion, how important was the establishment of crèche-groups for the parents? Have you noticed any changes? If yes, what changes? Can you give some concrete examples?
13. What are your plans (prospects) for the next year regarding the preschool institutions from the community? Do you intend to take any steps to improve children's access (for example to set up new crèche-groups) or infrastructure (repairs, endowment with teaching materials, furniture, etc.)?
14. If you were the representative of a funding institution, what actions would you take primarily to improve access of young children (under three years old) from your community to preschool education?
15. As a local leader representing a public institution, what would you change in the system of early childhood education for children under three? To what extent, the multidisciplinary team you belong to, may have a role in this process?

Guide for Group Discussion with the interdisciplinary working groups (control group)

(members of the working groups: health, social and education professionals)

Introduction

1.1. *Presentation of the research topic*

1.2. *Presentation of the evaluator*

1.3. *Discussion rules:*

- *honest answers;*
- *there are no wrong or right opinions, just different points of view;*
- *ensuring confidentiality;*
- *need for audio recording; getting the participants' recording consent;*
- *time allocated for the Group Discussion.*

1.4. *Information about the respondents (institution, position, working experience)*

1. Please give a brief description of your inter-sectoral team (mandate, objectives, membership, procedure). What results have you achieved so far related to education and early childhood development in your community that you are proud of?
2. Tell us, please, what has changed in the preschool institution(s) from your community within the last four years? What were the most beneficial?
3. Enlist, please, the strengths and weaknesses of the kindergarten from your community?
4. In your opinion, do you think it would be necessary to set up crèche-groups in your community? Is there any demand from the parents?
5. Do you plan to set up some crèche-groups? If yes, when? What activities/measures are to be taken? What other needs do you have? If *not*, why?
6. In your opinion, what would it mean the establishment of the crèche-groups for your community?
7. How could the institution you represent be involved setting up crèche-groups? But the multidisciplinary team you belong to?
8. Who else, do you think, might be involved? How?
9. In your opinion, how important would be the establishment of the crèche for children with regards to their physical, cognitive development, nutrition and health? But for the parents? What makes you think so?
10. What are your plans (prospects) for the next year regarding the preschool institutions from the community? Do you intend to take specific actions to improve children's access to education and early development (for example to set up new crèche-groups, repair some spaces, endowment with teaching materials, furniture, etc.)?

11. If you were the representative of a funding institution, what actions would you take primarily to improve access of young children (under three years old) from your community to preschool education?
12. As a local leader representing a public institution, what would you change in the system of early childhood education for children under three? To what extent, the multidisciplinary team you belong to, may have a role in this process?

STRUCTURED OBSERVATION GRID

01	Community	
02	Municipality	
03	District	

I. Questions for LPA representatives

LPA1.	Population (year)	Total number of persons
1. Number of people in the community:	Total	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Male	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Female	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
2. Number of people employed	Total	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Male	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Female	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
3. Number of the unemployed	Total	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Male	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Female	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
4. Number of migrants (estimation)	Total	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Male	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Female	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
5. Number of children left behind	Total	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Male	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Female	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
6. Families with children with disabilities	Total	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Male	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Female	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
7. Single-parent families	Total	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Children raised by father	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Children raised by mother	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
8. Households with 3 and more children		_ _ _ _ _ _ _
9. Number of live births (in 2015):	Total	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Male	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Female	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
10. Number of children (0-3 years old)	Total	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Male	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Female	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
11. Number of children (0-3 years old) attending the kindergarten	Total	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Male	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
	Female	_ _ _ _ _ _ _
12. Number of children with disabilities	Total	_ _ _ _ _ _ _

(0-3 years old) in the community	Male	_ _ _ _ _
	Female	_ _ _ _ _
13. Number of Roma children (0-3 years old) in the community	Total	_ _ _ _ _
	Male	_ _ _ _ _
	Female	_ _ _ _ _

LPA2. Services available	Total
1. Number of preschool institutions with crèche-groups	_
2. Number of preschool institutions (3-6 years old) in the community	_
3. Number of community centres, centres for children aged 2-4 years old	_ _ _ _
For community centres for children	
4. Number of children attending community centres	_ _ _ _
5. Number of children with SEN attending community centres	_ _ _ _
6. Number of Roma children attending community centres	_ _ _ _

LPA3. Specify the situation in the community regarding the following indicators:	Total	Roma people
1. Number of new jobs created in 2013	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
2. Number of the unemployed registered with the Territorial Employment Agency	No. of men	_ _ _ _ _
	No. of women	_ _ _ _ _
3. Total number of people in the community without steady employment, that do not have a land plot (estimation)	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
4. Beneficiaries of social aid at the moment	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
5. Beneficiaries of material aid, during the last 12 months	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
6. Allowance for the cold period of the year	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
7. Guardianship, adoption (children cases 2015)	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _

LPA4. Is there any valid Strategic Plan for the socio-economic development of the community?

1. Yes (if there is one, it should be analysed) 2. No

LPA5. What early childhood projects were carried out in your community within 2012-2015?		
Project	Activities	Who implemented

LPA6. What is the share of local budget expenditures allotted to preschool education services?

|_|_|_|_|_|

Thereof allotted to:

1. Salaries for employees of preschool institutions	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
2. Current repairs of preschool institutions	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
3. Capital repairs	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
4. Facilities for children with SEN	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
5. Teaching support for children with SEN/ support staff	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
6. Heating the kindergarten	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
7. Kindergarten power supply	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
8. Kindergarten furniture	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
9. Playground maintenance	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _
10. Teaching support	_ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _ _

II. Questions for representatives of preschools

The indicators will be selected for 2 types of preschools: a) institutions that benefited from Project support; b) institutions from the control group

IÎ1. Please assess the situation existing in the institution according to the following indicators (from the annual report, accurate data)			2012		2013		2014		2015	
			Total	Vulnerable children	Total	Vulnerable children	Total	Vulnerable children	Total	Vulnerable children
1. Number of children attending the kindergarten (all ages)	Total	Children	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _
	Male	Children	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _
	Female	Children	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _
	Under 3	Children	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _
	Roma children	Children	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _
2. Enrolment rate		%	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _
3. Educators		Number	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
4. Number of educators attending the training /lectures on early education during the year and the average length of the training /year		Number	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
		Hours	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
5. Caregivers		Number	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
6. Auxiliary staff		Number	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
7. Teaching support for children with SEN		Number	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
8. The average temperature in preschool during the cold season		Celsius degrees	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
9. Type of heating system: 1- autonomous; 2 - central; 3 - stove, 4 - other		Code	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
10. Sources of heat: 1 - gas; 2 - coal; 3 -		Code	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	

wood, 4 – alternative sources, 5- other										
11.Children with special needs or disabilities attending the kindergarten (0-3 years old)	Total	Children	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
	Male	Children	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
	Female	Children	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
	Enrolment rate	%	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
12.Roma children attending the kindergarten (0-3 years old)	Total	Children	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
	Male	Children	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
	Female	Children	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
	Enrolment rate	%	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
13.Children of vulnerable families ¹² attending the kindergarten (0-3 years old)	Total	Children	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
	Male	Children	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
	Female	Children	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
	Enrolment rate	%	_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _		_ _ _	
14.Number of community children (0-3 years old) that do not attend the kindergarten	Total	Children	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _
	Male	Children	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _
	Female	Children	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _	_ _ _
15.Furniture suitable for children aged 0-3 years old	Old-fashioned beds	Yes _	No _							
	Old separate	Yes _	No _							

¹² Include the term 'vulnerable families' in the note

	Old tables	Yes __	No __	
	New tables	Yes __	No __	
16.Furniture/teaching materials adjusted to children with SEN aged 0-3 years old	Books adjusted for children with SEN	Yes __	No __	
	Educational toys	Yes __	No __	
	Adjusted play tables	Yes __	No __	
	Adjusted playground	Yes __	No __	
	Adjusted beds	Yes __	No __	
	Adjusted toilet	Yes __	No __	
17.Teaching materials purchased for children aged 0-3 years old	Cărți	Yes __	No __	
	Educational toys	Yes __	No __	
	Soft toys	Yes __	No __	
	TV set	Yes __	No __	
	Stereo system	Yes __	No __	
18.Infrastructure adjusted to children with SEN aged 0-3 years old	Slope	Yes __	No __	
	Floors/number of stairs	Yes __	No __	
	Grab rails	Yes __	No __	
	Safe furniture for children with disabilities	Yes __	No __	

	Special equipment for children with SEN	Yes __	No __	
	Toilet areas adjusted for children with disabilities	Yes __	No __	

Annex 6 – Documents Consulted during Evaluation

- Committee on the Rights of the Child (2009), “Concluding observations: Republic of Moldova”, Fiftieth session, CRC/C/MDA/CO/3
- Council of the European Union (2009), “Council Conclusions on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training (ET2020)”, Brussels
- Database of Ministry of Education, Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family and Directorate General for education, youth and sport of Chisinau municipality
- Engle, P. (2011), “Early child development: Why should we invest in the health and development of young children?” in Early Child Development: What Parliamentarians Need to Know and Do, UNICEF
- European Commission (2011), “Early Childhood Education and Care: Providing all our children with the best start for the world of tomorrow”, Communication from the Commission, COM(2011) 66 final, Brussels, 17.2.2011
- Heckman, J., Moon, S.H., Pinto, R., Savelyev, P.A., Yavitz, A. (2009), “The Rate of Return to the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program”
- Hill, C. (1999), “Early Learning, Later Success: The Abecedarian Study”, Highlights of the Age 21 Follow-up Study: University of North Carolina, FPG Child Development Center
- Government of the Republic of Moldova (2014), Strategy for the Development of Education 2014-2020 “Education 2020”
- Government of the Republic of Moldova (2013), “The Third Millennium Development Goals Report. Republic of Moldova”, Chisinau
- Government of the Republic of Moldova, UN Moldova, “Towards Unity in Action. United Nations – Republic of Moldova Partnership Framework 2013-2017”, Chisinau
- Ministry of Economy (2014), “2013 Poverty in Moldova. Brief Note”,
- National Bureau of Statistics (2015), “Education in the Republic of Moldova 2014/2015”, Statistical publication, Chisinau
- National Bureau of Statistics (2015), “Situation of children in the Republic of Moldova in 2014”, Chisinau
- Popescu, C. (2015), “The Reform of the Leave for raising the children aged 0-3/3-6: shorter, better paid, followed by good crèche/kindergarten services”, Expert-Grup, Chisinau
- PricewaterhouseCoopers (2016), “Assessment of the preschool education system and definition of the costing methodology for childcare and education services in the Republic of Moldova” (draft February 2016), Chisinau

- Project documentation: Rolling Workplan UNICEF-Ministry of Education; Project Cooperation Agreements; Progress reports; Resource utilization reports; Grant Agreements; Trip reports; Field monitoring reports; Project deliverables; Assessment reports; Reports of training courses; Mentoring Reports; .
- Reynolds, A., Rolnick, A., Englund, M. & Temple, J. (2010), “Early childhood development and human capital”
- Shonkoff, J., Boyce, W. T., and McEwen, B. S. (2009), “Neuroscience, Molecular Biology, and the Childhood Roots of Disparities: Building a New Framework for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention. Summary of Essential Findings”, in JAMA, 3 June 2009, Vol. 301, No. 21, pp. 2252–2259
- Stern et al (2012), “Broadening the range of designs and methods for impact evaluations”, DFID, Working Paper 38
- Strategies and legislation of the Republic of Moldova relevant for the object of evaluation
- UNDP (2015), “Human Development Report 2015. Work for Human Development”, New York
- UNDP (2013), “Report on the Mapping of Roma densely-populated communities in the Republic of Moldova”, Chisinau
- UN Moldova (2013), “Roma in the Republic of Moldova living in Roma densely-populated communities”, Chisinau
- UN Women, UNICEF (2013), “The Demand and Supply of Early and Pre-School Education Services from the perspective of women’s employability (the case of the Republic of Moldova), Chisinau
- UNEG (2008), “UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System”
- UNESCO (2010), “Early Childhood Care and Education”, Regional Report Europe and North America
- UNICEF (2014), “Republic of Moldova. Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2012”, Final Report, Chisinau
- UNICEF (2004), “UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards”, Evaluation Office
- UNICEF Moldova (2010), “National Survey on Early Childhood Care and Development: Family Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP)”, Chisinau
- UNICEF Moldova (2015), Report “Participatory Evaluation of Barriers for Roma Children and Their Families to Access Services”, Qualitative Sociological Study, Chisinau
- UNICEF Moldova (2015), “Situation of children and women in Moldova”, Update for the Mid-Term Review of the UNICEF and Republic of Moldova Country Programme 2013-2017 (internal document)

- UNICEF, “Working for an Equal Future. UNICEF Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Girls and Women”, New York, May 2010
- United Nations Development Group (2003), “Human Rights-Based Approaches to Development Cooperation and Programming”
- United Nations Development Group (2011), “Results-Based Management Handbook”

Internet resources

- IDAM <http://www.mec.gov.md/ro/content/indicatori-social-economici-pe-localitati>
- National Bureau of Statistics, www.statistica.md
- <http://www.heckmanequation.org/content/resource/invest-early-childhood-development-reduce-deficits-strengthen-economy>
- <https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/documents/Experimental%20Methodology%20Table.pdf>
- World Bank country overview, <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/moldova/overview>

Annex 7 – People Consulted during Evaluation

No.	Name	Position/Function	Institution/Organisation
UNICEF			
1.	Margarita Tileva	Deputy Representative	UNICEF Moldova
2.	Larisa Vîrtosu	ECD Officer	UNICEF Moldova
3.	Elena Laur	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	UNICEF Moldova
4.	Sergiu Rusanovschi	Child Protection Officer	UNICEF Moldova
5.	Angela Capcelea	Health Officer	UNICEF Moldova
6.	Angela Munteanu	Communications Officer	UNICEF Moldova
Ministries, other government bodies			
7.	Maria Vranceanu	Early Childhood Consultant	Ministry of Education
8.	Liliana Nicolaescu Onofrei	former Deputy Minister of Education	Ministry of Education
9.	Galina Morari	Deputy Director of Department of Hospital Care	Ministry of Health
10.	Rodica Moraru	Head of Unit for Family Policies and Social Assistance for Children	Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family
11.	Svetlana Mirca	Senior Consultant	The Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Child Rights Protection
12.	Raisa Ghilan	Deputy Director, Department of Finance in Education	Ministry of Finance
13.	Oxana Soclea	Head of Department, Department of Finance in Preuniversity Education	Ministry of Finance
International development partners			
14.	Corneliu Eftodi	Head of Programmes Department	UN Women Moldova
Project implementing partners			
15.	Natalia Zotea	Director	CNETIF
16.	Larisa Arhip	Accountant	CNETIF
17.	Efimia Musteata	Trainer/mentor	CNETIF
18.	Lilia Novac	Trainer/mentor	CNETIF
19.	Viorica Pelivan		Directorate General for education, youth and sport of Chisinau municipality
20.	Mircea Esanu	Executive Director	MSIF
21.	Gheorghe Munteanu	Director of Department for Technical Monitoring and	MSIF

		Evaluation	
22.	Tatiana Socolov	Former Project Manager	MSIF
Civil Society Organizations and think-tanks			
23.	Mariana Ianachevici	Board Member	Alliance of NGOs active in the field of Child and Family Social Protection
24.	Parascovia Munteanu	Social Services Development Manager	Keystone Moldova
25.	Ivan Puiu	President	Centre of Early Intervention "Voinicel"
26.	Liliana Rotaru	President	CCF
27.	Angela Crudu	Programme Coordinator	Lumos
28.	Constanta Popescu	Programme Director	Expert-Grup
29.	Vera Stahi	Program coordinator	FCPS Moldova
Kindergartens			
30.	Maria Capadi	Principal	Kindergarten Beșelma
31.	Natalia Olaru	Principal	Kindergarten Bălți
32.	Elena Boinea	Principal	Kindergarten Cărpineni
33.	Maria Viernic	Principal	Kindergarten Petrești
34.	Lilia Leșan	Principal	Kindergarten Coșnița
35.	Viorica Razvan	Principal	Kindergarten Bălți
36.	Vera Cristieva	Principal	Kindergarten Baurci
37.	Natalia Irimca	Principal	Kindergarten Pârlița
38.	Tatiana Cociu	Principal	Kindergarten Nisporeni
39.	Domnica Popa	Secretary	Kindergarten Telenești
40.	Sofia Bordeianu	Principal	Kindergarten Mingir
41.	Stratan Rodica	Principal	Centre 'Dorinta', Călărași
42.	Silvia Dodon	Methodist	Kindergarten no.2, Călărași
Rayon Education Directorates			
43.	Maria Panciuc	Senior specialist	Hâncești
44.	Raisa Anton	Senior specialist	Telenești
45.	Nina Sterpu	Head of Directorate	Nisporeni
46.	Parascovia Lupea	Senior specialist	Nisporeni
47.	Maria Filimon	Senior specialist	Ungheni

48.	Ecaterina Prepeliță	Senior specialist	Călărași
49.	Cebotari Maria	Senior specialist	Cahul
50.	Natalia Bacioi	Senior specialist	Dubăsari
51.	Svetlana Pastuhina	Senior specialist	Comrat
52.	Valentina Guzun	Senior specialist	Boșcana
53.	Trifon Aurelia	Senior specialist	Strășeni
Local public administrations			
54.	Mihai Mircos	Deputy Mayor	Mingir
55.	Oxana Gușun	Secretary	Mândrești
56.	Cristina Moldovan	Secretary	Nisporeni
57.	Grigorii Robu	Mayor	Nisporeni
58.	Valeriu Oboroc	Mayor	Hulboiaia
59.	Alexandru Pascaru	Mayor	Bucovăț
60.	Ludmila Manole	Mayor	Inești
Other professionals (multisectorial teams)			
61.	Tatiana Gaitur	Social worker	Coșnița
62.	Natalia	Medical assistant	Cărpineni
63.	Alina Casian	School psychologist	Cărpineni

Note:

The list above does not include the educators and parents who participated in the focus groups and the vulnerable parents who were interviewed.