



MINISTRY OF EDUCATION  
AND TRAINING LESOTHO

# Lessons & Recommendations from Implementation of a CFS (Child-Friendly-School) Model in The Kingdom of Lesotho

*An Initiative of the Ministry of Education & Training to Enhance Education in Lesotho  
Facilitated by the UNICEF-Lesotho Country Office*

**Promoting Accountability & Learning Lessons:**

**Evaluation of the Implementation of a Child Friendly  
School (CFS) Model in The Kingdom of Lesotho**

***(Job ID #2740399)***

## REVISED INCEPTION REPORT

**(Based on the First Mission of 9<sup>th</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> November 2018)**

**Dr. Cream Wright  
Evaluation Consultant  
18<sup>th</sup> February 2019**



# Contents

Abbreviations & Acronyms.....	4
List of Tables & Charts .....	5
1. Introduction and Overview: .....	6
1.1. Background and Context of CFS in Lesotho: .....	6
1.2. Sources for this Inception Report:.....	7
1.3. Design and Priorities of the CFS Model:.....	7
1.4. Precursors to the Current CFS Implementation Efforts:.....	8
2. Interpreting the Terms of Reference: .....	9
3. Preliminary Insights on CFS Implementation: .....	10
3.1. Broad Implementation Strategies:.....	10
3.2. Main Implementation Modalities: .....	10
3.3. Typical Implementation Activities in Schools: .....	10
3.4. Implementation Barriers & Bottlenecks: .....	11
3.5. Insights into The Underlying Theory of Change:.....	11
4. Issues & Hypotheses to be Explored in the Evaluation: .....	12
4.1. Existential Status of the CFS Model in Lesotho: .....	12
4.2. The Context & Dynamics for CFS Implementation: .....	12
4.3. Perceptions & Interpretations of CFS: .....	13
4.4. Potential Enablers & Barriers for Implementation of CFS:.....	13
4.5. Preparations for CFS Implementation: .....	14
4.6. Patterns of CFS Uptake in Schools: .....	14
4.7. Supervision & Management of CFS Implementation: .....	15
5. Proposed Approach and Methodology:.....	16
5.1. A 2-Pronged Approach to Analyzing CFS Implementation:.....	16
5.2. A Heuristic Methodology for Understanding CFS Implementation: .....	16
6. Proposed Sampling and Evaluation Instruments: .....	17
6.1. Selection of Representative Sample Schools for the Evaluation: .....	17
6.2. Data Sources & Sampling Frameworks for the Evaluation: .....	17
6.3. Selection of Documents for Review & Analysis:.....	19
6.4. Overview of Questionnaires for Principals and Teachers: .....	19
6.5. Overview of Interview Schedules for MoET, UNICEF, & Partners:.....	19
6.6. Checklist for School-Based Assessment: .....	19
7. Proposed Evaluation Activities and Timelines:.....	20
7.1. Annotated List of Proposed Activities:.....	20

7.2.	Proposed Sequencing of Activities:	21
7.3.	Proposed Schedule of Evaluation Activities:	22
8.	Proposed Frameworks for Accountability & Lessons:	23
8.1.	The National Education Framework:	23
8.2.	An Inter-Sectoral Partnership Framework:	23
8.3.	The Education & Development Framework:	24
8.4.	An Evaluability Framework:	25
9.	Expectations and Resource Requirements:	26
9.1.	What is Expected from Lesotho (MoET) and UNICEF?	26
9.2.	Resources for Executing Evaluation Activities:	26
10.	Discerning Accountability & Lessons Learned:	27
10.1.	Who is Responsible for What, Where, and When (The 4Ws):	27
10.2.	Implications of Assigning Accountability:	27
10.3.	Extrapolating Lessons from CFS Implementation:	27
10.4.	Categorizing Lessons Learned in Implementing CFS:	27
Annex 1 – Terms of Reference		28
Annex 2 – Institutions Visited and Officials Contacted		33
Annex 3 – CFS Standards for Analysis in the School Inspection Toolkit		35
Annex 4 – Draft Survey Questionnaire for Principals/Teachers		39
Annex 5 – Interview Schedules for MoET, UNICEF and Partners		42
Annex 6 – Draft Checklist for In-Depth Study of Schools		43
Annex 7 – List of References and Documents Reviewed		44

## Abbreviations & Acronyms

CFS	Child-Friendly School(s)
COL	Commonwealth of Learning
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GoL	Government of Lesotho
HIV/AIDS	Acquired Immuno-Deficiency Syndrome
HRBAP	Human-Rights Based Approach to Programming
LCE	Lesotho College of Education
MoET	Ministry of Education and Training
REC	Research & Evaluation Committee (in UNICEF-Lesotho)
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
ToR	Terms of Reference
TWG	Technical Working Group (set up by UNICEF for CFS Evaluation)
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

## List of Tables & Charts

Table 6.1.	Selection of the Main Pool of Sample Schools	P. 17
Table 6.2.	Selection of Sample Inspection Reports for Macro Analysis	P. 17
Table 6.3.	Selection of Sample Schools for Survey Questionnaires	P. 18
Table 6.4.	Selection of Sample Schools for In-Depth Study	P. 18
Chart 7.1.	Summary Outline of Activities/Actors and Expected Outcomes	P. 21
Chart 7.2.	Tentative Schedule of Evaluation Activities over a 5-Week Period	P. 22
Chart 8.1.	Allocating Findings to Education Level where Action is Required	P. 23
Chart 8.2.	Allocating Findings to Sectoral Partnerships for Action	P. 24
Chart 8.3.	Allocating findings to Development Programmes for Action	P. 24
Chart 8.4.	Allocating findings to Evaluation Theory & Practice for Action	P. 25

## **1. Introduction and Overview:**

The Child-Friendly School (CFS) model was first introduced by UNICEF to Lesotho in 2006, as part of a multi-country effort to increase access and enhance the quality of basic education, in line with principles contained in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). Further to this effort UNICEF-Lesotho initiated a nationally-focused revival of CFS in Lesotho from 2012, dealing more directly with implementing CFS in the schools. UNICEF has now commissioned an evaluation of CFS implementation in Lesotho from 2012 to 2018. This will assess the implementation of CFS and the development of the CFS quality standards. It will also provide learning and make recommendations to guide UNICEF's on-going support to CFS in Lesotho; and where relevant, UNICEF's Child Friendly initiatives globally.

As such, the purpose of this Inception Report is to outline preliminary data reviewed and highlight insights gained by the consultant during the first field visit to Lesotho. It therefore outlines the main proposals for executing the evaluation in line with the Terms of Reference. This includes describing the proposed approach, sampling frameworks, data sources, data collection tools and instruments, etc.; that will be used to collect and analyze a variety of evidence for evaluating CFS implementation in Lesotho. To support these proposals and the general design of the evaluation exercise, this inception report gives an overview of the data sources explored and preliminary insights gained during the initial field visit, which have informed and helped to shape the overall design of the evaluation exercise.

### **1.1. Background and Context of CFS in Lesotho:**

Because of its geographic location and the structure of its economy, Lesotho is characterized by persistent dependency in a lopsided symbiotic relationship with its giant neighbor (South Africa). This takes the form of heavy reliance on remittances from migrant labour in South Africa; as well as market domination of goods and services by South African businesses. However, Lesotho does have an intensive and proud adherence to its rich African culture, heritage, and values. In the recent past the economic situation in Lesotho has been made worse by a high rate of HIV/AIDS infection that has resulted in reduced national productivity and a large orphan population that has eroded the extended family safety net. As a result of these negative developments there has been a deepening of poverty and widening of the gap in wealth distribution.

Nevertheless, Lesotho has taken some bold policy decisions to reverse these negative trends and to provide appropriate care and protection for vulnerable populations (especially children). Such policies include free and compulsory primary education; free school meals; legislation to protect and safeguard the rights of children as regards equitable access to quality services that are critical for their development and well-being.

In these circumstances, Lesotho offers fertile ground for addressing children's rights in education and related areas through a well-designed CFS model. It is therefore opportune that CFS has been introduced in Lesotho to help address the multiple challenges faced by children and vulnerable populations. CFS initiatives that have been implemented so far include development of a set of CFS Indicators for School Inspectors; conduct of CFS Training of Trainers workshops; as well as analysis of the 'child-friendly status' of pre-service courses at the Lesotho College of Education and the National University of Lesotho. A CFS manual for pre-service teacher trainees was also developed during the period 2008-2011. This is the background and context in which the current efforts to design and implement a CFS model is being undertaken since 2011/2012.

## **1.2. Sources for this Inception Report:**

This Inception Report is based on three main sources of insight, information, and knowledge, which combine to provide a platform that can support an effective and efficient evaluation of the implementation of a Child-Friendly School (CFS) model in The Kingdom of Lesotho.

The first source stems from activities conducted by the consultant during the initial mission to Lesotho from 9<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> November 2018. These activities include briefings and discussions with UNICEF officials as well as identification and collection of relevant documents. Importantly also, the consultant had informal interviews with senior officials of the Ministry of Education and Training (MoET) and had a focus group discussion (FGD) with some members of the national CFS Task Team. Exploratory discussions were also held at senior official level with the Lesotho College of Education (LCE). The consultant also made school visits to five sample schools to discuss with school heads, teachers, and students. This provided a sense of factors that may be influencing school-based strategies and activities. During these visits the consultant also used open-ended discussions, informal interviews and focus group discussions with knowledgeable officials to explore issues of adaptation and implementation of CFS in the schools.

The second source of insight, information, and knowledge concerns initial reviews of: the growing literature on CFS as a UNICEF model for promoting rights-based quality education; the general literature on education and development that informs/supports the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); as well as the global literature on evaluation, and official documents on the evaluation function in UNICEF. This diverse set of literature helps with constructing an “external framework” for evaluating the implementation of CFS in Lesotho. Such a framework contributes to accountability by linking lessons from the evaluation with Lesotho’s efforts to achieve the SDGs, as well as with future UNICEF intervention strategies to support the rights of children.

The third source is the set of documents that relate to implementation efforts for the CFS model in Lesotho. These are mainly official reports from MoET and/or UNICEF, on education in Lesotho generally, as well as more specifically on CFS-related policies, strategies, processes, and activities. The expectation is that a review of these documents will help to ground the evaluation in a national education and development context. These reviews will also throw light on the level of uptake, coherence, efficiency, and effectiveness, regarding efforts to implement CFS in Lesotho.

## **1.3. Design and Priorities of the CFS Model:**

Against the background and context outlined above the CFS model for Lesotho was carefully designed in 2011/2012 by reviewing policies, strategies, and plans; and by consultations with key stakeholders. These included learners, teachers, and community members across all districts. The consultations identified problems and barriers in education as well as enablers that support education. More importantly they helped to determine what constitutes child-friendliness in the context of Lesotho. The centerpiece of the resulting CFS model takes the form of the following seven child-friendly pillars within which implementation standards have been organized:

- Pillar 1 - Child-Friendly School Leadership, Planning and Management
- Pillar 2 - Inclusive, Child-Seeking, Access-Enabling
- Pillar 3 - Learner-Centered Teaching and Learning
- Pillar 4 - Health, Nutrition and Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)
- Pillar 5 - Safety, Protection and Psycho-Social Care and Support
- Pillar 6 - HIV and AIDS Prevention, Care and Support
- Pillar 7 - School-Community Partnership and Mutual Support

The design of CFS has also involved a comprehensive set of standards built around these 7 pillars. These standards are central to this evaluation as they provide rough indicators to measure success of CFS implementation.

#### 1.4. Precursors to the Current CFS Implementation Efforts:

The current design of CFS in Lesotho follows earlier efforts to establish the model. UNICEF and the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) formally agreed to collaborate on a project to mainstream CFS into Pre-service and In-service Teacher Education Programmes of Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago), and Zambia on a 2-year capacity development partnership with a focus on:

- (a) “Integrating the CFS model into pre-service and in-service teacher training curricula, training of teachers and other educational personnel on CFS at the universities and teacher training institutions.”
- (b) “Strengthening the CFS capacity of Teacher Resource Centre Managers, Teacher Educators, Head Teachers and other education personnel.”

The overall goal of this earlier project was the improvement of the quality of education in schools through the promotion of quality learning environment (safety and security, sanitation, care and inclusiveness) and child-centered learning-teaching methodologies that emphasize learner participation and inclusion. It was also aimed at enhancing the professional knowledge and classroom practice of teachers and other education personnel. Traces of this earlier incarnation of CFS are evident in the work of the Lesotho College of Education, but in general there may be a disconnect with the current CFS programme. There does not appear to be a flow of CFS-trained teachers from the colleges into the schools. Instead, current efforts to implement CFS rely on in-service training workshops for school principals and teachers. This issue may be tangential, but it will be explored during the evaluation exercise. One of the weak points appears to be inadequate training for implementing CFS in the school system!

## 2. Interpreting the Terms of Reference:

The purpose of the evaluation as outlined by UNICEF-Lesotho (Annex 1) can be summarised as follows:

- (a) To inform the relevant education sector policies, plans and strategies for teacher training in basic education, and strategies that will improve readiness for implementing CFS at the school and community level; as well as strengthening the links with the Life Skills and WASH dimensions of the CFS model.
- (b) To promote accountability of key stakeholders by providing impartial evidence and generating information on how UNICEF, the Ministry of Education and Training (MoET), and other key stakeholders have worked to implement the CFS model in Lesotho.
- (c) To provide an independent assessment of the implementation of CFS in Lesotho *since 2012* and the development of the CFS quality standards. (**Summative**)
- (d) To provide learning and recommendations to guide UNICEF's on-going support to CFS in Lesotho; and where relevant, UNICEF's Child Friendly initiatives globally. (**formative**).

The consultant understands from UNICEF-Lesotho that CFS as a model is not being called into question. Also, the concerns prompting this evaluation are not about the relevance or impact of CFS, but about its implementation. CFS is therefore assumed to be appropriate for promoting rights-based quality education on an equitable basis for children in Lesotho. This is not an unreasonable assumption, given the pedigree of CFS as a flagship model through which UNICEF facilitates rights-based quality education in many countries across the world. So, the evaluation is about examining available evidence to find out which implementation expectations are being met and which are not likely to be achieved in the current context of education in Lesotho. It is also about learning lessons from the way things are being done in Lesotho, so better decisions can be made for successful implementation of CFS. This involves gauging what seems to be working and what is not working, so that Government of Lesotho and UNICEF can learn lessons to guide changes to their strategies and plan better for the future. Based on this understanding the evaluation will focus mainly on the following categories of variables that relate to CFS implementation:

- (a) Variables concerned with interpreting CFS, preparing for CFS, and building capacity for implementing CFS.
- (b) Variables dealing with introduction of CFS in schools, uptake of CFS in the system and the persistence of CFS as part of the school system.
- (c) Variables that concern embedding of CFS in the system, normalizing CFS in schools, and monitoring CFS implementation for quality assurance.

Evidence for level of performance in the implementation of CFS will center around the comprehensive standards developed for each of the 7 CFS pillars and incorporated in the inspection toolkit. These standards therefore offer the main means that Lesotho uses to assess progress with CFS, through the school inspection reports. So, they will be reflected in most of the instruments used to collect evidence from different sources on CFS implementation.

### **3. Preliminary Insights on CFS Implementation:**

The initial visit to Lesotho enabled the consultant to develop some tentative understanding and gain preliminary insights into the various strategies, processes, and activities adopted by partners to implement the CFS model. These insights highlight key factors that can potentially influence the success or failure of implementation efforts. As such, they form the basis for developing some initial hypotheses that feed into the design of the evaluation exercise. A brief insight into some of the main implementation issues is provided in this section, with the more detailed outlines given in other sections of this report.

#### **3.1. Broad Implementation Strategies:**

The consultant discerned 3 broad strategies being used to guide and facilitate the CFS implementation process. First there is the strategy of cascade training (training of trainers) used to train school principals and some teachers, with the expectation that such training would be passed on to others who did not get training directly. The second strategy used schools that had received training as “mother schools”, requiring each one to adopt 2 “sister schools” that they would mentor for CFS implementation. The third strategy provided implementation oversight through school inspections, with the CFS standards incorporated into the school inspection template. The evaluation will collect and analyse data on how far these strategies have helped or hindered the implementation of CFS in Lesotho.

#### **3.2. Main Implementation Modalities:**

Initial consideration of the available evidence suggests that the mode of implementation of CFS was in line with the centralized nature of Lesotho’s education system. Guidance, capacity building (training), standards, operational tools, and resource materials, all emanated from central MoET and went down through district offices/personnel, to the school and community level. But, at the same time, schools appear to be left to their own devices in how they interpret the concept and how they choose to implement the CFS model. Such freedom of choice would be more typical in a decentralized education system and would come with schools being accountable for results.

This duality of schools being left to their own devices in a centralized education system might makes it difficult to ascribe accountability to schools for implementation of CFS. In one school for instance, records were meticulously kept on activities carried out and progress made with each of the 7 CFS pillars. But in another school the consultant listened to narratives of what was being done, and difficulties being encountered, without any record or data as evidence. The explanation given was that the central Ministry does not require schools to keep such records on activities and performance! It seems that school accountability depends on leadership quality and a willingness to take responsibility for various aspects of the CFS implementation process. The evaluation exercise will explore the need for incentives/rewards and penalties that would make schools accountable in a more definitive manner.

#### **3.3. Typical Implementation Activities in Schools:**

Insights gained from school visits suggest that there is no single standard model for implementing CFS in the schools. Schools prioritize the 7 CFS pillars differently, depending on the conditions and problems prevailing in each school. Some of the following are typical activities reported by schools implementing CFS:

- (a) Undertake community visits to enquire about children absent from school and sensitize parents on the need to send children to school regularly and punctually.

- (b) Assign responsibility for each pillar to a selected teacher who would oversee and report on what was being done or achieved in the areas covered by the pillar.
- (c) Award prizes to learners for exemplary contribution made in one of the areas covered by the 7 CFS pillars, thereby stimulating healthy competition and improved performance by learners as they strive to succeed with the CFS model.
- (d) Organize school events and invite community members to participate, so they can learn more about what goes on in the school and decide how they can help. In this way parents and communities gain appreciation for the work of the school and learn more about the importance of education for their children.
- (e) Set up and maintain production units in the school to grow and market crops as well as to raise poultry for sale. Funds raised are often ploughed into a tuck shop that helps to support children who are orphans.

### **3.4. Implementation Barriers & Bottlenecks:**

The following are some of the CFS implementation barriers and bottlenecks described to the consultant during the visit to schools and in discussions with senior officials of the MoET:

- (a) Poverty in its various manifestations was a ubiquitous barrier to CFS implementation. But it was difficult to nail down the specific aspects of poverty involved, and why this could not be overcome.
- (b) Learners and their parents/guardians do not avail themselves of poverty alleviation support from the Social Welfare Ministry. This is typically because they do not have the required documents (birth certificate, death certificate of parents, etc.) to prove entitlement for this form of government support.
- (c) Guardians of orphaned children are usually reluctant to go the extra mile to secure and safeguard the child's right to quality education; and schools lack the extra resources to help the learners in such circumstances.
- (d) Many teachers have a weak understanding of the concept of CFS and a poor grasp of what is required of them in its implementation. The typical claim is that they need to receive direct training in CFS if they are to contribute to implementing it. This has cost implications for the present pattern of in-service training workshops financed by UNICEF. The evaluation will explore more tenable solutions such as fully embedding CFS training in all pre-service teacher education and training courses.

### **3.5. Insights into The Underlying Theory of Change:**

The evaluation exercise will involve reviewing any explicit theory of change that was developed during the design of the Child-Friendly School model for Lesotho. In the absence of an explicit theory of change the consultant will attempt to reconstruct an underlying theory of change that probably informed the CFS design process. This reconstruction will be based partly on a review of key documents as well as on interviews with knowledgeable experts from UNICEF, MoET and other partners whose work is relevant to successful CFS implementation. The concern would be with establishing the implicit or explicit assumptions made in the process of designing the CFS model for Lesotho; and mapping out the chain from assumptions to activities and expected outcomes or results.

## 4. Issues & Hypotheses to be Explored in the Evaluation:

The insights and understanding generated during the initial visit to Lesotho have led to a broad set of issues and some tentative hypotheses that can be used to shape the evaluation exercise.

### 4.1. Existential Status of the CFS Model in Lesotho:

Part of the concern expressed by UNICEF-Lesotho in connection with this evaluation is that CFS implementation in Lesotho appears to have stalled. The CFS model has been (is being) implemented in 751 primary schools (i.e. about 50 per cent of primary schools in Lesotho), but further progress is proving to be elusive. Indeed, there are concerns that implementation may be patchy and CFS could be fading, but there has not been stock-taking to ascertain what is going on with implementation of CFS. This issue of CFS stalling was discussed further during a Focus Group Discussion with the CFS Task Team. Some of the hypotheses that emerged are as follows:

- (a) It is not so much that CFS has stalled but there is a lack of a definitive strategy with which to move the implementation process forward to continuously cover more schools.
- (b) The cascade training approach adopted for the project has not worked so far. Principals and some teachers were trained in CFS with the expectation that they will in turn share the training in their schools and districts (cascading), but this has not been happening.
- (c) The CFS dissemination strategy of using “Mother Schools” to mentor “Sister Schools” for the adoption and implementation of the CFS model has not worked in practice; and no action has been taken to fix the operational problems with this mentoring strategy.
- (d) Cadres of practitioners trained in CFS have been transferred or have retired from the system, so the training for such cadres has been wasted in effect. The evaluation will need to check on personnel turnover to see if it is a major factor affecting CFS implementation.
- (e) Whilst senior management personnel in MoET are knowledgeable about CFS they have other competing priorities to deal with. There has not been any imperative for treating CFS as a priority that is more important than other concerns.
- (f) There is no common or shared perception of what CFS is and no authoritative “voice” that speaks for CFS; as such there is a lack of momentum or driving force to take CFS forward.
- (g) The inspection template used to report on schools includes a comprehensive set of CFS items. This offers an effective tool for monitoring progress with CFE and supporting any adjustments or corrections that schools may need to make. The focus of inspections is to “promote child seeking, child-centred, socially responsible, gender-sensitive, inclusive, community-involved, protective and healthy approaches to schooling, leading to quality achievement by learners”. The evaluation will review a representative sample of these reports and explore what actions are typically taken on their recommendations.

### 4.2. The Context & Dynamics for CFS Implementation:

Education systems are bureaucratic “living entities” that are subject to various forces which help to determine how they function to accommodate (or reject) change/innovation. For the CFS model to take root as an innovation and

become established in schools there must be strategies to treat schools as “living bureaucracies” shaped by changing priorities and realities. Some of the tentative hypotheses formed in this area, as a result of the visit, include the following:

- (a) The highest political priority for education currently is to address youth unemployment issues, but CFS is not being portrayed as a relevant model that can contribute directly or indirectly to this political priority.
- (b) The implementation of CFS has been confined to the primary school level, and it is not clear why the model has been constrained in this way. This might inadvertently create a sense that CFS is not important beyond the primary school level. But learners do not forfeit the rights embedded in CFS when they progress from primary to secondary school.
- (c) As education has progressed in Lesotho, new and competing priorities have emerged that should be addressed in implementing CFS. One such priority is the expansion of quality secondary education to cope with increased primary enrolment due to the policy of free compulsory primary education. The World Bank supports this priority with a US\$25m project in 430 schools over 5 years. There is no clear strategy to encourage linkages with CFS, even though the CFS model has much to contribute in this area.
- (d) There are new education policies that are being developed with strong advocacy from UNICEF and other partners, but it is not clear if synergies are being encouraged between such new policies and existing models such as CFS. An example is the education inclusion policy that does not appear to be explicitly linked to CFS, even though it concerns rights of learners with special education needs (LSEN).

The general impression is that CFS is inadvertently being treated as a stand-alone project/initiative. It is confined to the primary school level and lacks clear linkages with other initiatives and priorities in the education system. The evaluation will explore this hypothesis in terms of accountability and lessons to be learned.

#### **4.3. Perceptions & Interpretations of CFS:**

The question “What is CFS?” looms large in this evaluation as it was a recurring issue in most of the discussions and informal interviews during the school visits, as well as in the FGD with the CFS Task Team. As with many innovations CFS appears to have an identity crisis in terms of being variously perceived as: another education project; a new UNICEF initiative; a set of 7 pillars for schools to follow; a new area of work that teachers need to be trained to perform; etc. One of the key tasks for the evaluation therefore will be to explore and document prevailing “Mindsets” on the concept of CFS and its implementation; from school to district, to central Ministry level.

The evaluation will compare these perceptions and interpretations of CFS with child friendly elements derived from the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and designed in line with UNICEF’s Human-Rights-Based Approach to programming (HRBAP). These child-friendly elements include the important principle of “progressive realization” of rights. This stipulates that all rights do not have to be achieved at the same time. It calls for setting priorities based on the realities of social, political, and economic contexts (including resource constraints), that may inhibit facilitation of some rights. But schools do require to persist with pursuit of rights. So, CFS should not be interpreted as a desirable status that schools may or may not achieve. Rather CFS should be regarded as a rights-based pathway to quality education and equity, that schools at all levels should pursue in perpetuity.

#### **4.4. Potential Enablers & Barriers for Implementation of CFS:**

Implementation of CFS will be affected by enablers that facilitate success, as well as barriers that impede progress. A key aspect of the evaluation will involve identifying and assessing the effects of both enablers and barriers on

the implementation process. The school visits yielded anecdotal evidence of both types of factors, and some of the initial hypotheses in this area include:

- (a) Some parents and communities are reluctant to support CFS efforts because of poverty as well as the belief that Government declaration of free and compulsory primary school means that they should no longer contribute to anything in the school.
- (b) Poverty, remote location, and bad weather are some of the factors that make it difficult for parents to send their children to school regularly and punctually.
- (c) Provision of free school meals is an important factor that encourages school attendance.
- (d) CFS and the abolition of corporal punishment have promoted a more cordial relationship between teachers and learners, that is characterized by mutual respect.
- (e) Some parents and communities attach greater importance to the tradition of initiation than to education. As such once learners (especially boys) go for initiation they are unlikely to return to complete their schooling.

A general impression from the visit is that Lesotho offers fertile legislative grounds for implementation of CFS. For instance, the Education Act of 2010 provides for free and compulsory primary education, and the 2011 Child Protection and Welfare Act upholds the right of every child to non-discriminatory access and benefit from quality services that are required for the child's development. In addition, the national constitution of Lesotho recognizes the right of all children to quality basic education.

On the other hand, there was an un-mistakeable impression that conditions in Lesotho present some formidable barriers and obstacles for implementation of CFS in the schools. The very high number of HIV/AIDS orphans coupled with deep poverty are some of the major constraints in facilitating the rights of children to quality education.

#### **4.5. Preparations for CFS Implementation:**

In preparation for implementing CFS, standards were adopted in 2011 and incorporated in the inspection templates in 2011/2012. Training for principals and teachers was also carried out in 2011. Initially, training was provided for teachers from 60 schools, who were all brought to Maseru for training. Later training was based in the regions and provided for principals and teachers from 20 schools in each district. CFS training teams were made up of 6 trainers. These were Senior Education Officers and District Education Managers from the Ministry of Education and Training. The duration of training workshops was 2 days for school principals and 4 days for the teachers. Each school that benefitted from training was designated as a "mother school" and had to adopt 2 schools it would mentor for CFS implementation. The evaluation will document evidence on such preparation and capacity building processes, and compare this with practices used in other countries to prepare for CFS implementation in school systems.

#### **4.6. Patterns of CFS Uptake in Schools:**

The uptake and implementation of CFS in the schools followed a pattern through which principals who had been trained in CFS would train teachers in their schools/districts; as well as having "mother schools" mentor "sister schools". Anecdotal evidence suggests that as the CFS model is being rolled out to schools; principals ask to receive training directly (not through cascade) before they could accept to have CFS in their school. It has also been reported that many teachers ask for direct training and often would remark that they had heard of CFS but need direct training. A tentative hypothesis from these anecdotes is that direct training is treated as an important perk

and this could make it difficult for cascade training and school mentoring to work. The evaluation will explore what has worked in other country contexts (China, Uganda, India) as regards training for the uptake of CFS in schools.

#### **4.7. Supervision & Management of CFS Implementation:**

For supervision and management, there is strong reliance on those principals who have benefited from training to oversee implementation of CFS in their schools. In addition, oversight is provided through school inspections with CFS standards integrated into the school inspection template. The evaluation will review a representative sample of the inspection reports on CFS and explore what happens (feedback/corrective action?) as a result of these reports that are transmitted electronically to the central level of MoET. This will help to construct a picture of CFS progress as seen through the lens of the inspection reports.

## **5. Proposed Approach and Methodology:**

Data collection and analysis for the evaluation will be guided by an approach that combines broad or structured type of data for macro analysis, with immersive, eclectic, and less-structured type of data for micro analysis. Also, in terms of developing understanding and establishing knowledge of CFS implementation, data analysis will involve a heuristic methodology with findings that are repeatedly modified and improved through iterative analysis of data from multiple sources. Both the approach and methodology are described briefly in the sections below.

### **5.1. A 2-Pronged Approach to Analyzing CFS Implementation:**

The consultant proposes to use a 2-pronged approach that will yield different types of data sets for analyzing and understanding issues in CFS implementation. The first of these prongs will elicit broad data from a representative sample of Inspection Reports, as well as from a survey administered to school principals and teachers. These key sources will yield valuable insight, information and data on understanding and interpretation of CFS; attitudes, preferences, and expectations on capacity building for CFS; awareness/responsiveness to child rights; perceptions of roles and responsibilities in CFS implementation; uptake and momentum as factors in CFS implementation; commitment to CFS as a priority; perceptions and expectations on requirements for successful CFS implementation; etc. This first prong will also use other sources to document evidence on: frequency and numbers involved in CFS trainings; cascade training activities conducted; CFS Implementation plans and activities; assessed progress made with CFS implementation (Inspection Reports); etc. Macro-analysis of the data sets collected through this process will help to construct a “big picture” perspective and yield a tentative understanding of various factors affecting the design and implementation of CFS in Lesotho. In a broad sense this process will point out potential accountability and highlight possible lessons for UNICEF as well as the Ministry of Education and Training in Lesotho.

The second prong in this approach will focus on a detailed probe of the implementation process in different institutional contexts. This will involve selecting a small sample of schools (max. 6) for in-depth study of the CFS implementation process. The selection will involve schools that are perceived to be good examples of successful implementation of CFS (strong CFS schools), and schools judged to be performing poorly on CFS implementation (weak CFS schools). These categories of schools will be selected from difficult districts as well as successful districts to capture the variety of conditions in Lesotho. Time will be spent on-site in these schools to collect evidence of the implementation process, and to probe factors that facilitate or hinder CFS implementation. The process will involve analysis of school records, as well as day-long observations and semi-structured / informal interviews with teachers, pupils, school heads, and community members (if possible). The outcome is expected to be detailed insight into the factors affecting implementation of CFS in specific school settings and conditions. This will yield a micro-picture that can enrich analysis when blended with the earlier macro-pictures obtained from the surveys and the Inspection Reports. In turn these factors will point to accountability and lessons learned for MoET and UNICEF.

### **5.2. A Heuristic Methodology for Understanding CFS Implementation:**

The consultant proposes to use a heuristic methodology and reiterative analysis to achieve a blend of outcomes from the macro-analysis and micro-analysis processes described above. It will take several rounds of analysis, during which outcomes from the macro and micro processes are compared/contrasted in a bid to nudge their findings towards definitive conclusions on lessons learned and accountability for UNICEF and MoET. Use of this heuristic methodology assumes that outcomes from the macro analysis and micro analysis will be sufficiently compatible to allow for “blending” and “nudging” their findings into a definitive set of recommendations on lessons learned and accountability, regarding implementation of the CFS model in Lesotho.

## 6. Proposed Sampling and Evaluation Instruments:

### 6.1. Selection of Representative Sample of Schools for the Evaluation:

The District Inspectors are assumed to be the most knowledgeable officials on the performance of schools in their respective districts. These schools include those that are implementing CFS as well as those that are not yet doing so. The expertise located in District Offices will therefore be used to select a representative sample of schools. For this purpose, each district will be requested to recommend sample schools to the consultant based on their expert judgement on which schools are strong CFS schools, weak CFS schools, or Non-CFS schools; as follows:

**Table 6.1. – Selection of the Main Pool of Sample Schools**

Category of School	Number and Category of Sample Schools to be Recommended by each District Office										
	Berea	Botha Bothe	Leribe	Maseru	Thaba Tseka	Mafeteng	Mohale's Hoek	Mokhotlong	Qacha's Nek	Quthing	Total
Strong CFS School	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40
Non-CFS School	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20
Weak CFS School	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>

These 100 schools selected and recommended by the district offices will constitute the main pool of sample schools from which selections will be made by the consultant for various purposes throughout the evaluation exercise.

### 6.2. Data Sources & Sampling Frameworks for the Evaluation:

In conjunction with the sampling framework outlined above, the consultant proposes to use the following as the main sources of data, information, and knowledge for the evaluation exercise:

- (a) **Inspection Reports** for all districts over several years will be a major source of data for the evaluation. For this purpose, the consultant will select 3 schools for each district from the pool recommended by the districts. Those schools with the highest number of Inspection Reports over the period 2012 to 2018 will be selected. Moreover, these 3 schools will be selected such that one is a strong CFS school, the second is a weak CFS school, and the third is a non-CFS school. The consultant will select Inspection Reports for these 30 selected schools (3 per district), covering the period 2012 to 2018, as outlined in the sampling framework below. This shows a potential total of 150 such Inspection reports. However, depending on frequency of school inspections in Lesotho, the sampling frame is expected to yield at least 100 inspection reports. The consultant will consult with REC and TWG to determine a representative sample of inspection reports from this set. For the selected sample of representative reports (20 – 40?), the CFS standards incorporated in the inspection template (Annex 3) will guide data collection and analysis. These CFS standards will also help to develop an initial “macro picture” of progress being made and factors influencing CFS implementation.

**Table 6.2. – Selection of Sample Inspection Reports for Macro-Analysis**

Year	Sample Schools for which Inspectors' Reports over Several Years will be Selected										
	Berea	Botha Bothe	Leribe	Maseru	Thaba Tseka	Mafeteng	Mohale's Hoek	Mokhotlong	Qacha's Nek	Quthing	Total
2012	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
2013		3		3		3		3		3	15
2014	3		3		3		3		3		15
2015	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
2017		3		3		3		3		3	15
2017	3		3		3		3		3		15
2018	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>150</b>

(b) Schools Survey **Questionnaires** administered to Principals/Teachers will be another source of data for the evaluation. The idea is to solicit responses from principals and from one teacher in the school. For this purpose, the consultant will select 10 schools per district such that there are 4 strong CFS schools, 4 weak CFS schools and 2 non-CFS schools. This is in fact the full set of sample schools that are recommended by the district offices as shown in the sampling framework below:

**Table 6.3. – Selection of Sample Schools for Survey Questionnaire**

School Type	Sample Schools in which Questionnaires for Principals & Teachers will be Administered										
	Berea	Botha Bothe	Leribe	Maseru	Thaba Tseka	Mafeteng	Mohale's Hoek	Mokhor-tlong	Qacha's Nek	Qathing	Total
Strong CFS	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40
Non-CFS	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20
Weak CFS	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>

Given the constraints of time and other resources, the intention is to request primary district inspectors in each of the districts to administer the survey questionnaires to the 10 selected schools in their respective districts. This has the advantage of participation and ownership by Lesotho officials, as well as establishing baseline data for future evaluation exercises by UNICEF. If it is not feasible for district inspectors to administer the survey, the consultant will use an alternative strategy of personally administering the survey to a much smaller number of representative schools. This will involve a selection of 2 schools each (1 strong and one weak) from 5 representative districts (including Maseru), to yield a reduced sample size of 10 schools for the survey.

Once the data has been collected, the consultant will analyse the completed questionnaires to yield a second macro-picture of the state of CFS implementation in the schools and districts of Lesotho. In further analysis the consultant will compare this macro-picture with the initial macro-picture from analysis of the inspection reports. Through this iterative process of triangulation, the same issues/variables are analysed with evidence from different sources to edge closer to the reality of what obtains for CFS implementation in the schools and districts of Lesotho.

(c) Valuable data will be obtained from the in-situ and in-depth study of CFS implementation in a small sample of schools through **Observation Schedules**, open-ended **Interview Schedules** and a Basic **Checklist** of data to be collected in each sample school. This exercise will be confined to a small number of sample schools due to constraints of time and other resources. For this purpose, the consultant would seek advice on selection of 3 districts that include the most deprived or disadvantaged district, the most progressive or successful district, and another district that is of special importance to CFS for other reasons. The consultant will select 2 schools from each of these 3 districts, so that one is a strong CFS school and the other is a weak CFS school. So, the schools for this exercise will be selected in line with the following sampling framework:

**Table 6.4. – Selection of Sample Schools for In-Depth Study**

Category of School	Sample Schools by District for In-Situ and In-Depth Study			Total
	Deprived District	Progressive District	Special CFS District	
Strong CFS School	1 School	1 School	1 School	3
Weak CFS School	1 School	1 School	1 School	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 Schools</b>	<b>2 Schools</b>	<b>2 Schools</b>	<b>6</b>

Analysis of the data collected through this in-depth study of a small sample of schools by the consultant will yield a more detailed or micro-picture on progress with (and factors affecting) CFS implementation in different school environments. This micro analysis will help to fill gaps in the macro-pictures from the survey and inspection reports. It will also more generally help to complement and illuminate these earlier macro-pictures of CFS implementation derived from analysis of the inspection reports and the school survey questionnaires.

### **6.3. Selection of Documents for Review & Analysis:**

There is a wide range of documents that the consultant will review and analyse to inform and enrich the evaluation process. Some of these documents are shown in Annex 6, but the consultant expects to unearth many more key documents from the international literature and from school visits, as well as from UNICEF and MoET records. The focus will be on documents that can throw light on the 3 categories of variables with which the evaluation is concerned. As already indicated the key documents will be the selected set of inspection reports for sample schools over the period from 2012 to 2018. The inspection toolkit contains a comprehensive set of standards for each of the 7 CFS pillars developed for Lesotho. The annual reports on school performance in areas covered by these standards will be the central focus of analysis for developing a macro-picture of CFS implementation in Lesotho. Many other documents will complement and enrich the findings resulting from analysis of these inspection reports.

### **6.4. Overview of Questionnaires for Principals and Teachers:**

Survey questionnaire(s) for school principals and teachers will be designed to elicit evidence on the same set of variables that are the main concern of the evaluation. These are reflected in the standards set out in the inspection template. The purpose of the survey questionnaire is to gain evidence from principals/teachers in terms of facts, views, opinions, and judgements that reflect their own knowledge and perspectives regarding many of the same issues and variables captured in the inspection reports. Draft questionnaire(s) are in Annex 4 and will be reviewed by the UNICEF Research and Evaluation Committee (REC) before the consultant develops the final version(s).

### **6.5. Overview of Interview Schedules for MoET, UNICEF, & Partners:**

The consultant proposes to interview senior officials of UNICEF, MoET, and other partners to gain important insight and better understanding of the main variables that are the concern of the evaluation. For UNICEF the officials involved will include those dealing with education, protection, WASH, nutrition, HIV/AIDS etc. The work of these officials has implications for CFS implementation and vice-versa. Officials from partner agencies operating in the areas of protection, nutrition, HIV/AIDS, etc.; will also be interviewed (guided by UNICEF).

All these interviews will help the consultant to establish facts and tap into the knowledge/experience of key officials who can influence various aspects of CFS implementation. The interviews will also support a sense of ownership and participation by these key stakeholders. A draft version of typical questions/items proposed for the interview schedules is shown in Annex 5. This will also be reviewed by the UNICEF Research and Evaluation Committee before a final interview schedule is developed by the consultant.

### **6.6. Checklist for School-Based Assessment:**

The consultant proposes to carry out in-depth studies of a small sample of schools. This will involve use of a checklist of evidence to be collected in each of the schools. The required data will be collected through observations, informal or semi-structured interviews with teachers and pupils (and community members), review of available reports and records in the school, etc. A draft of such a checklist is shown in Annex 6 and will be reviewed by the UNICEF Research and Evaluation Committee before a final version is prepared by the consultant.

## 7. Proposed Evaluation Activities and Timelines:

The evaluation will involve a wide range of activities in support of the data collection process for both the micro analysis and the macro analysis that will yield findings on CFS implementation, as well as highlight lessons learned and accountability. To the extent possible, these activities will also be designed to provide capacity building and ownership by officials of the Ministry of Education and Training. At several stages in the timeline the consultant will make presentations or share progress with the UNICEF Research and Evaluation Committee (REC) for their comments and feedback. Once clearance is granted the draft reports will be shared with the Technical Working Group (TWG) set up for this evaluation, to receive their feedback and guidance.

As already indicated the main activities will be data collection and analysis pertaining to the inspection reports and the completed school survey questionnaires involving principals/teachers. Structured questionnaires for the school surveys will be discussed in detail with district inspectors, who will be requested to administer them in the field to principals and teachers in sample schools. If this option is not feasible then the questionnaires will be administered by the consultant to a limited number of sample schools.

Prior to any data collection the sampling process needs to be completed in collaboration with MoET HQ and the district offices. In parallel with work on the survey exercise and the inspection reports, the consultant will carry out in-depth studies of the 6 sample schools selected for the exercise. In addition to these activities, the consultant proposes to use Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with key informants, to elicit insights, information and knowledge.

Data for the micro analysis will involve in-depth work in sample schools to decipher elements affecting CFS implementation in different categories of schools. Data will be collected through a series of strategic activities and guidance from the standards in the inspection template. These activities will include observations, semi-structured interviews, questionnaires and checklists. The potential subjects for data collection will be principals, teachers, students, parents, and communities. Data analysis would then entail a heuristic approach to understanding what is working in the implementation of CFS, why some things are not working, and how to improve implementation of the CFS model in different categories of schools in Lesotho!

### 7.1. Annotated List of Proposed Activities:

The following are typical activities in the process of evaluating CFS implementation in Lesotho:

- (a) Work with senior MoET officials and district offices on selection of the main pool of 100 sample schools for the evaluation process. It is assumed that this can be facilitated (remotely) by the Regional Inspectors based in Maseru, without convening a meeting of all district inspectors for the purpose.
- (b) Work with senior MoET officials (Regional Inspectors) to collect an appropriate/representative sample of Inspection Reports that are to be reviewed and analysed by the consultant (100 – 150), as the basis for developing an initial macro-picture of CFS implementation in Lesotho.
- (c) Brief district inspectors and agree with them on timelines for administering the survey questionnaires to school principals of the 10 sample schools in each of their districts. If this is not feasible then arrangements should be made for the logistics of the consultant administering the questionnaires to a limited sample.
- (d) Conduct interviews with UNICEF staff (Education, CP, WASH, etc.); as well as with key MoET officials. Use the opportunity to also plan logistics of field visits for in-depth study of the 6 selected sample schools.

- (e) Share initial analysis of Inspectorate Reports on CFS with the UNICEF Research and Evaluation Committee; and then with the Technical Working Group. Based on this, develop an initial draft of a “big picture” of CFS implementation from the perspective of the Inspection Reports.
- (f) Undertake fieldwork for in-depth study of 6 sample schools (with respective district office staff?) and start analysis of data obtained from this in-situ study. This is best done in phases with 2 schools at a time, so that the consultant can reflect adequately on issues emerging from the data collected in different schools.
- (g) Continue In-depth & On-Site Study of 6 sample schools; as well as analysis of the data obtained from these in-situ studies of the 6 schools (observations, Interviews, discussions, etc.).
- (h) Receive completed questionnaires from district inspectors (or from the consultant) and analyse the data obtained from the school survey questionnaire administered to principals/teachers in sample schools.
- (i) Prepare initial drafts of sections of the evaluation report to discuss with UNICEF Research and Evaluation Committee. Revise these drafts in line with recommendations from the committee and prepare to share with the Technical Working Group set up to deal with this evaluation.

## 7.2. Proposed Sequencing of Activities:

Evaluation fieldwork activities will follow a logical sequence that is pragmatic and supports a 2-pronged approach as well as the proposed heuristic/iterative analysis. The sequence of activities is also designed to facilitate some amount of capacity building, depending on availability of Lesotho officials. On this basis the following sequencing of activities is tentatively proposed for executing the fieldwork and main analysis for the evaluation report:

**Chart 7.1. – Summary Outline of Activities/Actors and Expected Outputs**

No.	Brief Description of Activities ( and Main Actors)	Expected Outputs
1	Select pool of 100 sample schools; sub-sample of 6 schools for in-depth study; and sample Inspection Reports (Consultant + MoET Snr. Inspectors & District Offices).	Agreement on sample schools & sample Inspection Reports.
2	Obtain and start analysis of Inspection Reports on assessment of progress with CFS for the 30 sample schools (Consultant + MoET Senior Inspectors)	Data from Inspection Reports is available for initial analysis.
3	Clear questionnaires (shared earlier) and ask district inspectors to administer in 10 schools each. (REC + TWG + Consultant + District Inspectors + Principals/Teachers)	Survey questionnaires ready for Inspectors OR Consultant to use
4	Conduct 1 <sup>st</sup> round in-depth study in 2 out of the 6 sample schools and start analysis of this data (Consultant + Principals + Teachers + Pupils + District Inspectors)	Detailed notes + analysis of data for 2 schools + tentative findings.
5	Interview key officials from UNICEF, MoET, & other Partners. Brief TWG + REC on progress. (Snr. Officials of UNICEF/MoET/Partners + REC + TWG + Consultant)	Data collected for macro analysis and officials briefed on progress.
6	Conduct 2 <sup>nd</sup> round in-depth study in 2 out of 6 sample schools and start analysis of this data (Consultant + Principals + Teachers + Pupils + District Inspectors)	Detailed notes + analysis of data for 4 schools + tentative findings.
7	Analyse survey data from Inspectors/consultant. Prepare/share Progress Report on evaluation activities & tentative findings with REC + TWG (REC + TWG + Consultant)	Guidance/clearance of progress Report from the REC and TWG.
8	Start iterative data analysis to reconcile and harmonize findings from all data sources – i.e. macro/micro analysis for convergent findings. (Consultant + UNICEF)	New draft of evaluation report to present/share with REC & TWG
9	Conduct final round in-depth study in 2 out of 6 sample schools and start analysis of this data (Consultant + Principals + Teachers + Pupils + District Inspectors)	Detailed notes + analysis of data for 6 schools + tentative findings.
10	Continue iterative data analysis to reconcile and harmonize findings from all data sources – i.e. macro/micro analysis for convergent findings. (Consultant + UNICEF)	Revised draft of the evaluation report to share with REC & TWG
11	Prepare 1 <sup>st</sup> draft of the final Evaluation Report. Present to REC and TWG for review and guidance on approval requirements. (REC + TWG + Consultant)	1 <sup>st</sup> final draft of evaluation report to share with REC & TWG
12	Prepare final draft of the Evaluation Report on Implementation of CFS in Lesotho and submit to UNICEF and MoET. (Consultant + UNICEF Head of Education)	The Final Evaluation Report is submitted to UNICEF & MoET

Successful and timely execution of these scheduled activities will depend on availability of personnel from both UNICEF and MoET to address requirements of the consultancy as and when appropriate. The initial visit did raise some concerns that on-going workload and unforeseen activities (teacher strike) could derail any schedule that is proposed for work on this evaluation. As such the consultant will work closely with the UNICEF team to develop alternatives to the scheduled activities if and whenever execution becomes impractical.

In the same way, the consultant will discuss the scope of this evaluation. The evaluation may be at risk of morphing from an exercise to determine performance on CFS implementation and draw lessons for planning future approach to continuing CFS; into an exercise about conforming with more complex evaluation requirements that go beyond assessing CFS implementation. As a client UNICEF-Lesotho would need to clarify the scope of the evaluation and ensure that it is a fair scope of work in terms of the resources provided for the consultancy

### 7.3. Proposed Schedule of Evaluation Activities:

The consultant proposes to carry out the sequence of activities outlined above over a 5-week period during which the main visit to Lesotho will take place. To facilitate execution of the exercise within this relatively tight timeframe, it would be helpful if preparatory activities can be geared up prior to the start of the visit. For instance, it would be helpful if Inspection Reports can already be located and be ready for selection. In the same way it would help if the district offices are already alerted to the role(s) they would have to play in this evaluation; rather than relying on last minute arrangements to secure their cooperation. Also, efficient arrangements of logistics for transport and alerting schools, as well as securing officials to accompany the consultant on field visits will be critical for success.

**Chart 7.2. Tentative Schedule of Evaluation Activities over 5-Week Period**

BRIEF OUTLINE OF ACTIVITIES	WEEK 1	WEEK 2	WEEK 3	WEEK 4	WEEK 5
Present & Discuss Inception Report issues with REC and TWG	xxx				
Select pool of 100 sample schools with MoET & District Offices	xxx				
Select sub-sample of schools for survey and for in-depth study	xx				
Finalize approved instruments for survey, FGDs, in-depth study, etc.	xxx				
Obtain and analyze the selected Inspection Reports on CFS	xxx	xxxx	xxxx		
Conduct in-depth studies of the selected 6 sample schools		xx	xx	xx	
Administer survey questionnaires to principals of sample schools		xxx	xxx	x	
Present/Discuss Draft Reports of Evaluation Report to REC & TWG		xx	xx	xx	xx
Interview key officials from UNICEF, MoET, and Partners			xxx	xx	
Collate and analyse the initial data collected from all sources	x	xxx	xxxxx	xx	xxx
Carry out iterative data analysis to reconcile/harmonize findings			xxx	xxxxxxxx	xxxxxxxx
Prepare and share 1 <sup>st</sup> draft of final Evaluation Report for review				xxxx	xx
Prepare final draft of Evaluation Report and submit to UNICEF/MoET					xxxxxx

## 8. Proposed Frameworks for Accountability & Lessons:

The consultant proposes to use several frameworks to assess how findings on CFS design and implementation fit into key internal/external reference frames. Each framework will provide an appropriate focus for relating the findings of the evaluation to the local, national, or external context. The frameworks will therefore enable accountability and lessons learned to be linked to education and development in Lesotho; as well as to facilitation of child rights by UNICEF, and inter-sectoral partnerships for achieving the SDGs; etc. For this purpose, findings of the evaluation will be split in terms of four stages: Design of CFS; Preparation for implementing CFS; the roll-out of CFS and the on-going implementation of CFS. The frameworks outlined in this section can determine relevant and important areas for action, based on the findings (accountability / lessons learned) from the evaluation. This is not part of the ToRs for this exercise, but the consultant sees it as a logical step to link findings of the evaluation into the broader concerns of education and development. As such this additional exercise will be discussed with REC and TWG to ascertain that this will be of value to the deliverables of this consultancy. It will only be carried out if the client indicates that this will be appreciated as an additional deliverable proposed by the consultant.

### 8.1. The National Education Framework:

CFS is concerned with influencing change in Lesotho’s education system through a rights-based approach to facilitating quality education with equity. It involves the whole of the education system from the level of schools, through district level entities, up to the central Ministry level. The framework in Chart 8.1. is designed to allocate findings from the evaluation exercise to the most important level where action needs to be taken.

**Chart 8.1. – Allocating Findings to Education Level where Action is Required**

LEVEL	Design of CFS	Prep. for CFS	Up-Take/Roll-Out of CFS	CFS Implementation
SCHOOL LEVEL			E.g. Mother schools mentor sister schools. (Note accountability & lessons learned on this mentor model)	
DISTRICT LEVEL				E.g. Inspection tool used to measure progress with CFS. (Note findings on accountability and lessons learned)
CENTRAL MINISTRY LEVEL		E.g. Preparation of CFS Manual & other Resources (Note findings on accountability & lessons learned)		

### 8.2. An Inter-Sectoral Partnership Framework:

As a rights-based model for facilitating quality education with equity, CFS entails contributions from various sectors through inter-sectoral partnerships. Sectors that typically collaborate with education on CFS include: Health & Nutrition; Water & Sanitation; Protection & Welfare; Safety & Hygiene; etc. Inter-sectoral collaboration and partnership for CFS is between the Ministries in Lesotho; as well as between sectors in UNICEF; and between the specialized external partner agencies working in Lesotho. This framework will allocate findings on accountability and lessons learned to the most appropriate level of inter-sectoral partnership for attention and action.

**Chart 8.2. – Allocating Findings to Sectoral Partnerships for Action**

SECTOR	Design of CFS	Prep. for CFS	CFS Roll-Out	Implementation
SECTORS WITHIN LESOTHO				
SECTORS WITHIN UNICEF				
SECTORS ACROSS PARTNER AGENCIES				

**8.3. The Education & Development Framework:**

Education contributes to development for individuals, communities, nations and the agencies that support them. It is therefore linked to the development agenda of these entities. CFS will have links with development priorities of Lesotho, priorities in the UNICEF Country Program (CPD), and the SDGs. The framework allows findings from the evaluation to be assigned to appropriate development programmes for any necessary action.

**Chart 8.3. – Allocating Findings to Development Programmes for Action**

PROG.	Design of CFS	Prep. for CFS	CFS Roll-Out	Implementation
NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS				
GOALS & RESULTS IN UNICEF CPD				
THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (SDGs)				

#### 8.4. An Evaluability Framework:

This evaluation is limited in scope since it only deals with the implementation of CFS and not with outcomes or impact. Nevertheless, it will be essential to ensure that the exercise conforms to certain expectations regarding evaluation theory generally. It must also conform to key aspects of the evaluation function in UNICEF. The ToRs specify that the evaluation must be responsive to issues of equity, gender and children’s rights. The evaluation is also expected to provide impartial and systematic assessment of the implementation process.

In addition to these general evaluation criteria the evaluation function in UNICEF expects that the exercise will use criteria such as relevance, efficiency, and sustainability. The evaluation exercise should also provide credible and useful evidence-based information to facilitate timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of UNICEF and other stakeholders. The evaluation should help to hold UNICEF accountable, as well as contributing to the learning and decision-making processes that support better results for children. It is also expected that the evaluation should support capacity building in the countries of operation (Lesotho); especially in relation to attainment of the SDGs and the rights of children. The framework below will help to assess how far the evaluation exercise meets these criteria of evaluability in terms of general evaluation principles and the evaluation function in UNICEF.

**Chart 8.4. – Allocating Findings to Evaluation Theory & Practice for Action**

EVAL	Design of CFS	Prep. for CFS	CFS Roll-Out	Implementation
EVALUATION THEORY IN GENERAL				
THE EVALUATION FUNCTION IN UNICEF				

## 9. Expectations and Resource Requirements:

Expectations and resource requirements for executing activities will be discussed fully during the presentation of the Inception Report for review and feedback. A few examples of areas and issues to be discussed are outlined in this section.

### 9.1. What is Expected from Lesotho (MoET) and UNICEF?

- (a) Time and commitment to participate in the required sessions and to support all scheduled activities.
- (b) Time and commitment for district inspectors to administer the survey instruments for macro analysis, OR to facilitate all the logistic requirements for the consultant to administer the survey questionnaire.
- (c) Making official documents and data readily available upon request from the consultant, as well as making suggestions (and providing) additional documents that may be relevant to the evaluation exercise.
- (d) Arranging logistics (transport, accompanying officials, etc.) in a timely manner for the fieldwork involved.

### 9.2. Resources for Executing Evaluation Activities:

- (a) Cost Sharing for workshops, FDGs, and field expenses? Need to discuss a final scope of work in relation to the resources provided for this evaluation.
- (b) If necessary, extending deadlines to ensure a thorough evaluation process that involves in-depth studies in at least 4 schools, as well as more general surveys of practitioners and institutions. In addition, there may be some capacity building elements to be achieved.

## **10. Discerning Accountability & Lessons Learned:**

The evaluation will deal with the issue of accountability by exploring perceived as well as actual roles and responsibilities for decision making and oversight action at various stages of the process of implementing CFS. This approach will however be moderated by taking account of the implications and consequences of assigning accountability to the different entities involved in the implementation of CFS. For instance, schools can only have limited accountability in an education system that is highly centralized, with instructions and decisions coming from central and district level authorities.

### **10.1. Who is Responsible for What, Where, and When (The 4Ws):**

The analysis will involve a pattern of discerning the 4Ws in terms of who is responsible for what, where and when. It will also be important to establish if there is reasonable consensus on such roles and responsibilities by the parties involved.

### **10.2. Implications of Assigning Accountability:**

Assigning accountability assumes that there are clearly defined and widely accepted roles and responsibilities for implementation strategies and activities. The available evidence suggests that this is not likely to be the case for the design and implementation of the CFS model in Lesotho. But assumptions can be made, and the evaluation report can speculate in who ought to have the main responsibility for various aspects of the CFS implementation process.

### **10.3. Extrapolating Lessons from CFS Implementation:**

For lessons learned, the focus will be on such matters as: flawed assumptions underlying key decisions; strategies that did not work; corrective actions that were not taken in time to keep implementation on track; and weakness in oversight/governance of the implementation process. The strength of the recommendations on lessons learned will depend on the extent of corroboration between macro and micro analysis around the lesson in question.

### **10.4. Categorizing Lessons Learned in Implementing CFS:**

The main categories that will be used are lessons learned for UNICEF and lessons learned for the Ministry of Education and Training. For UNICEF these lessons will be about making interventions work for children's rights (CFS in this case). Some lessons will be generic in terms of how to make a general rights-based model work in the real world. This is about the familiar challenges of what has come to be known as Human-Rights-Based Approach to programming. Other lessons will be specific to the context of Lesotho and will address the difficulties of facilitating child rights in very complex situations such as those prevailing in Lesotho.

## ANNEX 1 Terms of Reference (ToRs)

### 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE OR WORK ASSIGNMENT:

#### 2. Evaluation Purpose and Objective

Founded on principles of child rights as expressed in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the 'Child-Friendly School' (CFS) concept is being promoted in an increasing number of countries, as a major initiative promoting the realisation of children's right to quality education and despite its implementation in Lesotho for several years, the coverage is still limited and no evaluation has been undertaken on this initiative.

#### Purpose

UNICEF understands that a successfully implemented CFS framework means that learners feel safe, supported and engaged with a high level of family and community participation and child-centred pedagogical approaches. In preparation for the new UNICEF Lesotho country programme (2019-2023) the findings of this evaluation will inform the relevant education sector policies, plans and strategies for teacher training in basic education and strategies that will improve readiness for implementation at the school and community level as well as strengthening the links with the life skills and WASH dimensions of the framework.

An evaluation of the implementation of the CFS framework in Lesotho would provide impartial evidence and generate information on how UNICEF, the MOET and other key stakeholders have worked to implement the framework. The evaluation will be both summative and formative in purpose. It will be 'summative' in providing an independent assessment of the implementation of CFS in Lesotho since 2012 and the development of the CFS quality standards. It will be 'formative' in providing learning and recommendations to guide UNICEF's ongoing support to CFS in Lesotho and where relevant, UNICEF's child-friendly initiatives globally.

The dual purpose of the evaluation will be to promote accountability and capture learning that informs ongoing programming. First, the evaluation will promote accountability to key stakeholders. To that end, it will provide evidence-based findings on how UNICEF and the MOET worked to implement the CFS framework in Lesotho.

Second, the evaluation will capture learning from the implementation and develop recommendations to inform UNICEF programming and MOET implementation of the CFS framework. To that end, it will provide key findings, conclusions and recommendations aimed at supporting UNICEF's efforts in strengthening and scaling up CFS in Lesotho.

#### Objectives

The proposed evaluation objectives will be as follows:

# Provide an independent assessment of the implementation of the CFS framework in Lesotho since 2012, to promote accountability among key stakeholders.

# Provide evidence-based learning and recommendations to guide future work on the implementation of CFS in Lesotho.

#### Stakeholders and users

The key stakeholders in the CFS framework in Lesotho include the following:

# Governance: MOET, local communities and school management committees, teachers and parents

# Implementation: UNICEF programme sections, MOET including national coordinating staff, district education managers, district resolution teachers, principals, teachers

# People affected: among them intended beneficiary learners (including those with disabilities and affected by HIV & AIDS) and their communities, teachers and parents

The primary audience of the evaluation is UNICEF Lesotho and the MOET and the secondary audience includes multi-sectoral partners that can strengthen the implementation of CFS such as other UN Agencies and line ministries including the Ministries of Health and Social Development.

### 3. Evaluation Scope

The evaluation will focus on the implementation of the CFS framework since the development of the CFS standards. The evaluation can refer to the period since the introduction of CFS in Lesotho (2006) but the focus should be on the period January 2012 to May 2018 (six months of the last country programme; and the ongoing country programme). The geographic scope will be the whole of Lesotho although in-depth field work will be carried out in selected districts representing the geographical zones of Lesotho.

The evaluation will focus on the overarching question: How well has the CFS framework been implemented in schools in Lesotho and how can this be improved? The implementation should be gauged to the extent to which it enabled or constrained results for children.

The evaluation should focus on evaluating the effectiveness of the overall implementation of CFS at national, district and school level and identify key bottlenecks to scaling up the initiative nationally. It is important for the scope of the evaluation to remain limited if these key issues are to be assessed in adequate depth. Many other reviews on the impact and effectiveness of CFS have been undertaken in other contexts and this evaluation can draw on these studies although implementation rather than impact is the primary focus of this evaluation.

As a result of this work, LCO will have evidence-based strategies to improve the implementation of the CFS framework that strengthen cross-sectoral collaboration on key aspects of the framework including protection, WASH, nutrition and HIV and AIDS prevention, care and support. Ultimately, the work will allow UNICEF LCO to improve the quality, efficiency and equity of its own programming and that of the government partners we support through improved technical support.

### 4. Evaluation Framework and Draft Questions

The evaluation will be framed by the usual UN criteria as applied to development interventions, particularly responsiveness to issues of equity, gender equality and children's rights.

The evaluation framework to guide the evaluation will be developed at the inception phase. However, the following questions are suggested:

# How effectively are the currently identified CFS schools implementing the framework?

# Which pillars of the CFS framework are most successfully implemented, which are the most difficult to implement, and why?

# What are the key bottlenecks to implementation of the CFS framework in all schools in Lesotho?

# How can the implementation of the CFS framework be made more effective?

# How can cross-sectoral collaboration be improved to strengthen key elements of the CFS framework (WASH, HIV and AIDS prevention, health and

nutrition)?

The evaluation will apply a child rights and gender lens to all aspects of the evaluation process. Gender, rights and child rights will be addressed most specifically through coverage, which assesses the extent to which specific groups are included, targeted and assisted.

## 5. Methodology and Approach

The evaluation will be conducted in selected Districts having a geographical zone's representation of Lesotho and at National level with Central Government and implementing partners. The exact methodology will be designed in the Inception phase but will include collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data with stakeholders outlined above.

### Step 1: Mapping of CFS in Lesotho and Methodology Design

# Working with UNICEF Lesotho country office staff, key ministries and external partners, the consultant will develop a clear understanding of the Child Friendly School's framework as it is implemented in Lesotho and how it fits with UNICEF Lesotho priority areas of work for children over the coming 3-5 year timeframe. This will include a desk review of materials provided by the office (CPD, strategy notes, Situational Analyses, concept notes, etc.), key informant interviews with core UNICEF colleagues, government counterparts at national and decentralized level, and identification of other outside partners and documents for review.

# The consultant will design and develop the methodology, evaluation framework and instruments to be used during the evaluation.

### Step 2: Field Work

# At this stage and based on agreed upon methodologies the consultant will undertake field work to collect quantitative and qualitative data at district and school level to answer questions outlined in the inception report.

# The data collection should include both schools and districts that are implementing the child friendly schools' framework and those that are not.

### Step 3: Developing Evaluation and Recommendations

# Based on the results of the work in the first two steps and taking into account the parameters outlined above, the consultant will develop an evaluation report including recommendations for a package of interventions that UNICEF can undertake to strengthen the CFS framework in Lesotho.

# The plan should cover how UNICEF should engage on this issue, and should include reflection on the enabling environment, demand and supply. The report should also include consideration of other actors apart from government and UNICEF that can help strengthen this framework in Lesotho.

# Grounded in country needs and contexts, priority issues for children, UNICEF's comparative advantages and opportunities on the horizon, the recommendations should consider:

# The work that is already ongoing that should be continued, replicated and/or scaled up (both within UNICEF and what UNICEF should be supporting others to do);

# The work that is already underway that should be phased out or transitioned to partners;

# Any new work UNICEF should undertake (either directly or in support of others' work) in this area; #

What capacities and resources are needed to undertake the recommended work; and

# What partnerships UNICEF should pursue in order to undertake the work successfully

# The recommendations should Identify priorities for immediate action that can be undertaken/implemented Immediately; it should also include longer term priority areas of work on CFS.

#The evaluation and recommendations should be developed along with key members of the country office In a consultative process. That process should include discussions about the best ways lo assure buy-in and Improved collaboration.

## **DELIVERABLES**

### 6. Deliverables and Work Plan

The length of each deliverable will be negotiated between the consultant and UNICEF Lesotho:

#### Activity

##### Phase 1: Inception

Inception discussions with CO and MOET Deliverable

Meeting notes

Duration

1 week

Inception

Initial data collection and desk review finalization of the evaluation framework, methodology and work plan; development of **data** collection material drafting of inception report.

Deliverable

Draft Inception report.

Duration

3weeks

##### Phase 2: Data Collection and Analysis

# Data collection at national, district and school levels.

#Data analysis, validation and drafting of evaluation report.

Deliverable

Draft report

Duration

4weeks

##### Phase 3: Reporting and Communication of Results

Draft report shared for comments with research and evaluation committee

Deliverable

Report with comments Duration

1 week

Activity

Workshop to discuss findings, conclusions and validating recommendations .

Deliverable

Validation Workshop Minutes Duration

1 week

Activity

Revise evaluation report incorporating comments from committee and validation workshop.

Deliverable

Final draft report

Activity

Revised evaluation draft report shared for comments (more widely). Deliverable

Final comments on evaluation report.

Duration

1 week

Activity

Finalization of main evaluation report, executive summary evaluation report, PowerPoint etc.

Deliverable

Final reports

Duration

1 week

---

**ITINERARY, MODE(S) OF TRAVEL AND STANDARDS OF ACCOMODATION**

---

## Annex 2 – Institutions Visited and Officials Contacted

### ANNEX 2

#### Institutions Visited and Officials Contacted/Interviewed

##### Ministry of Education and Training (MoET) – Senior Management (Maseru HQ)

Teboho Moneri Regional Inspector (Central)

Seriti Morojele Dotoro Regional Inspector (North)

##### National CFS Task Team Members (FGD)

Mopei Selikane District Education Manager (Qacha)

Mabataung Metsing District Education Manager (Botha-Bothe)

Sekhotseng Molapo Manager Tertiary

Lefehola Ralibathali District Education Manager (Maseru)

Seriti Morojele Dotoro Regional Inspector (North)

Teboho Moneri Regional Inspector (Central)

##### Lesotho College of Education (LCE)

Paramente Phamotse Deputy Rector (Academic Affairs)

##### Ministry of Education and Training (MoET) – Senior Staff (Districts)

Makhothalo Mohlori District Resource Teacher (Berea)

Matebello Mosala District Education Manager?? (Leribe)??

##### Ministry of Education and Training (MoET) – School Principals

Makhalaki Tsilo Ag. Principal; Thaabe Primary School -

Maseutioali Morebotsane	Principal; Matukeng Primary School
Mabuthelezi Limedia	Principal; Tsoelo-Pele MoHO Government Primary
Cecilia Makhemi Khooanyana	Ag. Principal; Koali (St. George) Primary School
Theresa Lekhanya	Principal; St. Monica Primary School

**UNICEF-Lesotho Country Office (LCO):**

Nadi Albino	Representative
Fatoumatta Sabally	Deputy Representative
Trine Petersen	Chief of Education
Lati Lerotholi	Education Officer & ECD Focal Point
Babatsang Mpholo	Admin & HR Assistant

## ANNEX 3

### D. STANDARDS FOR CHILD FRIENDLY SCHOOLS

The pillars and standards below are based on pre-determined, desired features of a quality school and on the child friendly school concept which is based on the principles of child rights. The focus of inspections is to promote child seeking, child-centred, socially responsible, gender-sensitive, inclusive, community-involved, protective and healthy approaches to schooling, leading to quality achievement by learners.

#### CFS Pillar 1: CHILD-FRIENDLY SCHOOL LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT

*Effective leadership, in a child-friendly school, involves teachers, community members and learners, in: i) the creation of a common vision and plan for an inclusive, learning-oriented, safe and caring school, and ii) the participatory development, management, and use of resources, enabling the progressive achievement of the same*

#### CFS Standards

- 1.1 Creates a Collective Vision for a Child-Friendly School
- 1.2 Plans and Monitors the achievement of CFS standards
- 1.3 Operates an effective School Board
- 1.4 Monitors Gender Equality
- 1.5 Manages School Finances effectively and transparently
- 1.6 Uses School Data to *achieve quality education for all*
- 1.7 Ensures School Infrastructure is 'child-friendly'
- 1.8 Manages School Resources to achieve CFS objectives
- 1.9 Promotes Ongoing Professional Development
- 1.10 Adheres to a Code of Professional Conduct
- 1.11 Implements Teacher- friendly Practices
- 1.12 Includes Learners in School Leadership & Management

## **CFS Pillar 2: CHILD-FRIENDLY INCLUSIVE OF ALL CHILDREN, CHILD-SEEKING, ACCESS ENABLING**

*A Child-Friendly School, works with the community, to ensure ALL children enroll in school, attend regularly, and engage fully in relevant learning activities – without discrimination on any basis*

### **CFS Standards**

- 2.1 Implements Free Inclusive Education for ALL
- 2.2 Conducts Awareness on Children’s Right to Education
- 2.3 Identifies Out-of-School Children & Barriers to Education
- 2.4 Protects Right of especially vulnerable children to Basic Education
- 2.5 Actively Seeks Children with Disabilities
- 2.6 Creates Disability-Inclusive Learning Environments
- 2.7 Maximizes Learner Safety travelling to and from school
- 2.8 Monitors Attendance and Follows-up Absenteeism
- 2.9 Strives to Eliminate School Drop-out & Minimise Repetition
- 2.10 Practices and Promotes Non-Discrimination and Respect for Diversity
- 2.11 Organises School Schedule to maximize Inclusion

## **CFS Pillar 3: CHILD-FRIENDLY LEARNER-CENTERED TEACHING & LEARNING**

A Child-Friendly School ensures all girls & boys are actively engaged in meaningful learning, developing, literacy, numeracy, life skills, self-esteem & positive attitudes about the future.

### **CFS Standards**

- 3.1 Implements Relevant Holistic Curriculum
- 3.2 Implements Active Learner-Centred Instruction
- 3.3 Implements Gender-Sensitive Teaching & Learning Practices
- 3.4 Effectively Uses Teaching and Learning Resources
- 3.5 Creates Learning-Conducive Classroom Environments
- 3.6 Enables all learners to develop literacy skills
- 3.7 Maximises Learning Time
- 3.8 Enhances Learning through Continuous Assessment
- 3.9 Promotes Pupil Participation & Cooperation
- 3.10 Effectively Manages Multi-Standard Classrooms
- 3.11 Teaches all learners to respect and protect the environment

#### **CFS Pillar 4: CHILD-FRIENDLY HEALTH, NUTRITION, AND WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE**

A Child-Friendly School works with the community and other specialist partners to promote the health and well-being of learners and to assist learners to develop the attitudes, knowledge, skills and practices that promote ongoing good health

##### **CFS Standards**

- 4.1 Develops Integrated School Health Guidelines
- 4.2 Maintains a Clean Environmentally-Friendly School
- 4.3 Provides comprehensive Health Education
- 4.4 Facilitates access to Basic Health Services
- 4.5 Provides First Aid Treatment as required
- 4.6 Promotes Learner Nutrition
- 4.7 Develops School Vegetable Gardens
- 4.8 Provides Reproductive Health Education
- 4.9 Provides Continuous Safe School Water Supply
- 4.10 Provides Appropriate Sanitation Facilities
- 4.11 Reinforces Personal Hygiene Practices
- 4.12 Supports Adolescent Girls' Development

#### **CFS Pillar 5: CHILD-FRIENDLY SAFETY, PROTECTION, PSYCHO-SOCIAL CARE & SUPPORT**

A Child-Friendly School strives to create friendly, welcoming environment where learners feel safe, protected, supported, respected, valued and cared for.

##### **CFS Standards**

- 5.1 Develops Guidelines on Safety, Protection, Psycho-Social Support
- 5.2 Ensures a Safe Physical School Environment
- 5.3 Develops & Implements School Rules
- 5.4 Protects Children from Exploitation, Violence, Abuse
- 5.5 Actively Combats Bullying
- 5.6 Implements Positive Disciplinary Practices
- 5.7 Enables all learners to develop essential age-appropriate Life-Skills
- 5.8 Provides Access to Guidance & Counseling Support
- 5.9 Strives to build self-confidence & self-esteem of all learners
- 5.10 Provides recreation and promotes creativity
- 5.11 Provides Regular Sports and Physical Education
- 5.12 Implements Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy

## **CFS Pillar 6: CHILD-FRIENDLY HIV & AIDS PREVENTION, CARE & SUPPORT**

### **CFS Standards**

- 6.1 Develops School HIV and AIDS Action-Plan
- 6.2 Establishes HIV and AIDs Support Group
- 6.3 Delivers age-appropriate HIV and AIDS Education
- 6.4 introduces health and safety measures to prevent HIV transmission
- 6.5 Provides Care and Support to HIV and AIDS- Affected Learners
- 6.6 Provides Care and Support to HIV and AIDS- Affected Teachers
- 6.7 Combats HIV and AIDS-related Stigma and Discrimination
- 6.8 Implements School HIV and AIDS Clubs

## **CFS Pillar 7: CHILD-FRIENDLY SCHOOL-COMMUNITY PATNERSHIP & MUTUAL SUPPORT**

A Child-Friendly School develops a partnership between teachers, learners, parents, community members and other partners, tapping collective knowledge, skills, resources, in creating (and achieving) a vision for a child-friendly school, that identifies and responds to specific barriers to quality basic education, and overall well-being, for each, and every child

### **CFS Standards**

- 7.1 Develops an Effective School-Community Partnership
- 7.2 Builds network of support with multiple partners
- 7.3 Ensures Full Community Participation in School Management
- 7.4 Communicates effectively with the Parents and the Community
- 7.5 Shares Information, Resources and Facilities with community
- 7.6 Mobilises Community Support for 'Inclusion of all Children'
- 7.7 Mobilises Community Support for 'Quality Relevant Teaching & Learning'
- 7.8 Mobilises Community Support for 'School Health, Nutrition and WASH'
- 7.9 Mobilises Community Support for 'Child Safety, Protection, Care and Support'
- 7.10 Mobilises Community Support for 'School HIV and AIDS Strategy'
- 7.11 Operates an effective Parent -Teachers Association (PTA)
- 7.12 Teaches Respect for Basotho Culture and other Minority Cultures

## ANNEX 4

The school survey is intended to get some basic data on the sample schools, as well as the views, opinions and assessments of the school principal and teachers on progress and setbacks for their school in the area of CFS implementation. Analysis of the resulting data will be used to construct a macro-picture of the state of CFS implementation in the schools. The intention is to compare this with the macro-picture resulting from analysis of the inspection reports. As such, items in this survey questionnaire will be closely related to the items (standards) in the inception report.

The items outlined for the questionnaire are examples and designed to show how items will be in line with the standards outlined in the inspection template. The items will be discussed with the REC and TWG, and the consultant will then prepare (and properly format) a final version.

### 1. Basic Data on the School:

Name and Number of the School: ..... Year Established .....

Name of Principal ..... How long in this Post ..... Years

How long in teaching ..... Years. Been Principal before this school? (Yes/No) ..... How long? ..... Years

Number of staff: ..... Females and ..... Males. Number of pupils: ..... Females and ..... Males

Did Principal get CFS training? (Yes/No) ..... How many teachers got CFS Training? ..... Females & ..... Males

Did Principal pass on CFS training to teachers (Yes/No) ..... If so how? .....; and if not, Why not .....

### 2. Basic Data on CFS in the School:

Is the school implementing CFS? (Yes/No) ..... What year did the school start implementing CFS? .....

Name 3 new things happening in the school as a result of implementing CFS:

(a) .....

(b) .....

(c) .....

**3. Overview of Negative Issues affecting CFS Implementation in the School:**

Name the 3 most important problems that the school has faced in trying to implement CFS over the years:

- (a) .....
- (b) .....
- (c) .....

What are the 3 most important forms of support the school needs to implement CFS successfully?

- (a) .....
- (b) .....
- (c) .....

**4. Assessment of where school stands on performance regarding typical CFS standards:**

(a) How well would you say teachers, learners, and community members know about and share in the vision and plans for an inclusive, safe and caring school oriented to learning?

- i. Very well; ... ii. To some extent ... iii. Not sure .... iv. Hardly or poorly ..... v. Not at all

(b) Are teachers, learners, and community members involved in planning how resources are used to help the school achieve good results?

- i. Not involved at all; ..... ii. Only partly involved ..... iii. Fully involved .....

(c) Indicate how far you agree / disagree with these statements for your school <i>1 = strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Not Sure; 4 = Agree; and 5 = Strongly Agree</i>	1	2	3	4	5
The school has created a vision that is shared by teachers, learners, and the community					
The school maintains its facilities and environment in good order for all learners					
There is a school board that functions effectively in the interest of all groups					
The school actively raises awareness of the right of all children to education					
The school works hard to eliminate drop-out and minimize repetition					
The school shows respect for all learners and does not discriminate against any group					
The school teaches all learners to respect and protect the environment					
The school makes maximum use of learning time to benefit all groups of children					
The school provides First Aid treatment to all learners as required					
The school protects all children from exploitation, violence, and abuse					

**5. Overview of Positive Issues affecting CFS Implementation in the School:**

Name 3 of the best things that have helped the school to implement CFS successfully over the years:

- (a).....
- (b).....
- (c).....

Suggest 3 things that the school needs for it to continue implementing CFS successfully?

- (a).....
- (b).....
- (c).....

**6. Assessment of school’s performance on typical CFS standards:**

(a) How far does the school provide a friendly and welcoming environment for all learners?

- i. Very strongly ..... ii. Fairly strongly..... iii. Somewhat ..... iv. Not very well .....

(b) Are learners made to feel safe, protected, supported, respected, valued, and cared for?

- i. Yes ..... ii. To some extent ..... iii. Not really ..... iv. No .....

(c) Indicate how far you agree/disagree with these statements for your school <i>1 = strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Not Sure; 4 = Agree; and 5 = Strongly Agree</i>	1	2	3	4	5
The school provides recreation and promotes creativity equally for all learners					
The school encourages all learners to develop essential and appropriate life skills					
The school provides nutritious school meals every day for all learners					
The school provides access to safe water supply for learners and teachers					
The school supports the proper development of all adolescent girls					
The school makes adequate provision for safe and appropriate sanitation facilities					
The school has health and safety measures in place to prevent HIV transmission					
The school provides care and support to learners affected by HIV and AIDS (orphans)					
The school mobilizes community support for quality teaching and learning for all					
The school teaches respect for Basotho culture and other minority cultures					

## **ANNEX 5**

The items for these interviews are intended to elicit key data on plans and preparations for CFS implementation. The senior officials to be interviewed have the best insider knowledge of the main strategies and investments relating to CFS design and implementation. Interview questions will therefore be around issues such as:

The main strategy used for the design and implementation of CFS

The focus and driving force for CFS in Lesotho (rationale and purpose)

The pivotal concerns informing the design and implementation of CFS

The approach to advocacy on behalf of CFS in Lesotho

The investment levels and financial commitments made on behalf of CFS in Lesotho

Major steps taken in preparation for the introduction of CFS into schools

The key priorities negotiated and agreed for CFS in Lesotho

Why should Lesotho adopt CFS? Who is committed to this and why?

## **ANNEX 6**

What records do you keep in the school that indicate progress with CFS implementation?

How do you work on implementing CFS in the school?

What role do different teachers play in CFS implementation?

Are the pupils in your school conscious of CFS?

How does CFS affect the daily work routine and learning achievement of pupils in the school?

What does the school environment look like?

Does the school have a good relationship with parents and the community?

How do you involve parents and communities in the work of the school?

## ANNEX 7

### List of References and Documents Reviewed

**Cheng, Y., J. Ko and T. Lee** (2016), “School autonomy, leadership and learning: A re-conceptualization”, *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 30/2, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-08-2015-0108>.

Commonwealth of Learning (2011)– *An Evaluation of the COL-UNICEF Child-Friendly School Projects in Swaziland, Lesotho, Botswana and South Africa*.

Frankowski, A. *et al.* (2018), “Dilemmas of central governance and distributed autonomy in education”, *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 189, OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/060260bf-en>

Government of Lesotho (2010) – *Education Act 2010*. Lesotho Government Gazette – Extraordinary. Vol. XV, No. 20.

Government of Lesotho (2011) – *Child Protection & Welfare Act*. Lesotho Government Gazette

Government of The Kingdom of Lesotho – Education Act, 2010.

M.I. Junaid (May 2011) – Evaluation of the COL – UNICEF Child-Friendly School Projects in Swaziland, Lesotho, Botswana, and South Africa – Commonwealth of Learning (COL).

Ministry of Education and Training – Full Inspection Report Template – Government of The Kingdom of Lesotho.

Ministry of Education and Training – List of Participants at CFS Workshop for Pilot and Sister Schools Principals by Districts.

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 1 – Terms of Reference.

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 2 – Documents Reviewed.

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 3 – Quality Principles.

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 4 – CFS Standards Development Workplan.

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 5 – Child Protection and Welfare Act 2011 (Extracts).

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 6 – Workshop 1 Maseru – Summary of Issues / Responses Identified.

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 7 – Feedback from Learners.

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 8 – Schools Visited x Teachers / Community Members Involved.

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 9 – Feedback from Teachers and Community Members.

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 10 – Summary of Key Issues.

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 11 – Summary CFS Action Areas.

Ministry of Education and Training (August 2012) – Development of Child-Friendly School Standards – Lesotho: Annex 12 – Quality Principles Guiding CFS Development.

Ministry of Education and Training (Nov. 2016) – Inclusive Education Policy (Draft) – Government of The Kingdom of Lesotho.

Ministry of Education and Training (Sept. 2012) – Child-Friendly School Standards – Government of The Kingdom of Lesotho.

**OECD** (2011), “School Autonomy and Accountability: Are They Related to Student Performance?”, *PISA in Focus*, No 9, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/5k9h362kcx9w-en>.

UNICEF (12 April 2018) – Revised Evaluation Policy of UNICEF – U.N. Economic & Social Council.

UNICEF Lesotho - End of Year Review Report for 2015.

UNICEF Lesotho – UNICEF Country Office Annual Report (COAR) – 2017.

UNICEF Lesotho (November 2016) – End of Year Review Report for 2016.

UNICEF Lesotho (November 2018) – Terms of Reference for Technical Working Group on Implementation Evaluation of Child-Friendly Schools in Lesotho.