



EU Children of Peace
EUROPEAN UNION:
RECIPIENT OF THE 2012
NOBEL PEACE PRIZE®



EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT TO CHILDREN AFFECTED BY CONFLICT (ECHO/CHD/BUD/2013/01003)

END OF PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT



August 1, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
Terms and Abbreviations	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE DISPLACEMENT	- 1 -
2. KEY ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	- 2 -
2.1 OBJECTIVES	- 2 -
2.2 KEY EVALUATION ISSUES	- 2 -
3. EVALUATION METHODS	- 3 -
3.1 STUDY LIMITATIONS	- 3 -
4.FINDINGS	- 5 -
4.1 COVERAGE AND QUALITY	- 5 -
4.2 RELEVANCE/ APPROPRIATENESS	- 7 -
4.3 COHERENCE	- 9 -
4.4 EFFECTIVENESS	- 11 -
4.5 EFFICIENCY	- 14 -
4.6 IMPACT	- 15 -
4.7 SUSTAINABILITY	- 17 -
5. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES	- 19 -
6. RECOMMENDATIONS	- 19 -
6.1 CONTEXT	- 19 -
6.2 COVERAGE AND QUALITY	- 20 -
6.3 RELEVANCE	- 21 -
6.4 COHERENCE	- 21 -

6.5 EFFECTIVENESS - 21 -

6.6 EFFICIENCY - 22 -

6.7 IMPACT - 23 -

6.8 SUSTAINABILITY - 23 -

7. ANNEXES..... - 24 -

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The End of Project Evaluation was supported by LWF/DWS South Sudan Program. I would like to thank LWF/DWS staff – Cavine Anek-Deputy Programme Coordinator; who provided insight and expertise that greatly assisted the evaluation exercise, not forgetting LWF/DWS staff in Juba, Maban and Ajoung Thok for their over whelming contributions during data collection, in arranging for several meetings within short notice and in extending their support beyond mandated working hours.

I am grateful to Jockshan Foryoh, Associate Education Officer, United Nation High Commission for Refugee Maban for in-depth knowledge that he provided on education situation in respective refugee camps in Maban, Elsie Yaokumah, Community Services Officer for UNHCR-Ajoung Thok for healthy and informative meeting in their offices that have greatly improved information regarding Child Protection and in enriching this evaluation report.

I would also like to show my gratitude to other implementing partners' staff from International Rescue Committee Ajoung Thok, African Humanitarian Affairs, and DRC in Ajoung Thok – Unity State Save the Children, and ACTED in Maban-Upper Nile State for sharing their pearls of wisdom with us during the course of this evaluation.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Annie Mutua for reviewing the draft reports and all those who provided me the possibility to complete this report. A special gratitude to teachers, children and young people whose contribution in providing information about the project successes during FGD and wishful suggestions that have informed the recommendations for improvement in this report.

Furthermore I would also like to acknowledge with much appreciation the crucial role of IMANI Consult Ltd staff. Special thanks go to my team mate, Gena George, and Charles Wabwire, who helped me to assemble the parts of this report by providing suggestions on its presentation.

Finally I would like to appreciate Mr. Mabek Them, County Education Director of Parieng in Unity State for providing in-depth information regarding the status of education and child protection in his area of jurisdictions, and all leaders at camp levels and Jamjang Payam for their participations during the evaluation exercise.

Bernard Onen Okeny
IMANI Consult Ltd.
Integrated Management Initiative
Humanitarian & Social Development Consultants

TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACTED	Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development
AHA	African Humanitarian Affairs
ALP	Accelerated Learning Program
(BPRM)	Bureau of Population, Refugees & Migration
(CoS)	Church of Sweden
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
(ECHO)	European Commission -Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection
FGD	Focus group discussions
FGM	Female Genital mutilations
IDPs	Internally displaced persons
IRC	International Rescue Committee
LWF/DWS	Lutheran World Federation Department of World Service
MDF	Maban Defense Force
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
SAF	Sudan Armed Forces
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation
SPLA-N	Sudan People Liberation Army North
SSP	South Sudan Pound
SOP	Standards Operating procedures
QASO	Quality Assurance and Standards Officer
UASC	Unaccompanied and separated children
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
(UNICEF)	United Nations Children Fund

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LWF-DWS implemented the ECHO funded “Educational Support to Children Affected by Conflict” in 12 schools in Yussif Batil and Kaya camps in Maban County of Upper Nile State, and in Ajoung Thok camp in Unity State. The project was intended to increase access to education and protection and to promote protection in the camps through the establishment of safe school environment. The main objective of the end term evaluation was to provide an independent assessment of the performance of project and to identify and document significant project experiences with potential to inform subsequent future programming. A purposive sampling with participatory consultative evaluation approach was used to include reviewing documents and the project data bases, project sites’ visits, 21 interviews with key informants and 13 focus group discussions with project beneficiaries and stakeholders.

A total of 8387 beneficiaries (34% female) were reached by the project including double counting for both result one and two. The main project target included 3,109 (40% girls) vulnerable and disadvantaged refugee children and young people aged 14 to 18 years who accessed education through ALP and rights protection services. The project also directly benefited 77 ALP teachers (13% female) who were recruited from within the community, 141 members of SMC (29% female), 24 senior teachers (50% female) in the primary schools who were trained in guidance and counseling, 250 formal school teachers (16% female) who were trained in identifying and responding to protection concerns in the schools, 3510 learners (40% girls) in the formal primary and ALP schools who benefited from the desks procured under the ALP project, 335 children (50% girls) participated in the child rights club and 941 (593 boys and 348 girls (37% girls) were supported through the child help desks established at schools.

The project provided a range of services to address identified barriers to access and quality education and child protection. These included providing access to basic primary instruction through the Accelerated Learning Programme approach. Teaching and learning materials were issued as well furnishing classrooms with desks and chalkboards. Other services included recreational extra-curricular activities; establishment of rights awareness and protection response forums including Child Rights Clubs, Child Protection Committees and child help desks with linkages to the joint referral pathways; recruitment and training of teachers on ALP instructional methodology, school management as well as prevention and responding to protection concerns; training of School Management Committees on prevention and responding to protection concerns, mobilizing communities on education and child protection as well as School Management Support; provision of teaching and learning materials, school uniforms and classroom furniture.

The project responded to protection barriers by raising awareness on child rights and strengthening mechanisms for identifying and responding to protection issues affecting children and young people at school and in the community.

This evaluation concluded that the integration of formal primary school, ALP approach and child protection activities is an effective strategy to create lasting benefits to the refugee children, young people and community at large. Each of the activities above are complimentary to each other and when jointly implemented they provide double edge benefits in learning and safety of beneficiaries.

The practical relevance of the project was in translating the aspirations of the South Sudan General Education Plan 2012 – 2017, the South Sudan Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies to the education and protection needs of children and young people in the refugee camps. In compliance with

INEE standards, participatory needs assessments were conducted and a response strategy agreed in consultation with government and other stakeholders with the project formulated as per education and protection needs of children and young people as identified in the refugee camps.

Cluster coordination mechanisms were in place, and community members participated actively in analysis, planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project. However, in the setting and implementation of the vulnerability criteria for identification and recruitment of beneficiaries, these did not adequately meet the INEE Standard 3: Monitoring, particularly paragraph 3 on defining the affected population.

At the time of its design, the project was relevant to the assessed needs of the target group. The assessment had reported a large number of over age children and youth who did not adequately benefit from the formal primary school system. The objectives, results and activities of the Action are still valid and there is need for the project to be scaled up. The population in need of project intervention has greatly increased following renewed fighting in Sudan and the outbreak of war in South Sudan heightening further the projects relevance.

The design of the project was logically coherent and its implementation was consistent with the framework of the safe school environment concept. Structures and measures for prevention, reporting and responding to protection concerns of children and young people were put in place including the child protection help desk, training teachers and SMC/PTA on child protection, establishing CPCs and CRCs. These structures were linked to education functions of the schools and the measures were implemented hand in hand with the conduct of teaching and learning. The sequencing of activities was designed to strengthen both internal and external project coherence during implementation with frequent coordination meetings to address emerging issues with stakeholders through already existing structures in the camps.

The Joint Referral Pathway for unaccompanied children and GBV survivors strengthened the coordination of protection support with other service providers. A collective awareness raising on children rights and mobilization drive for education and protection was supported by various agencies in the camps and was implemented by children and youth through child rights clubs and other school groups.

By the time of End of project evaluation 670 children/young people in Maban had either joined the primary section because timing for Primary lessons in morning are much favorable for them contrary to ALP afternoon sessions or for other reasons based on the assumption that Primary teachers are better than ALP teachers. The enrolment of learners in Ajuong Thok exceeded the dropout in Maban County. In improving safety environments, 12 Child Help Desks were established and were actively involved in monitoring, reporting and following up of cases of children at risks. The total cases reported and followed-up were 941 (593boys and 348girls (37% girls)

The simultaneous outbreak of two wars created a big influx of refugees and IDPs who sought safety in the refugee camps creating strain on project resource. Camps were inaccessible by road and supplies could only be airlifted to project sites. This increased the cost of project supplies and movement of personnel thereby undermining efficiency. Without a pre-arranged contingency plan, the project was taken by surprise, especially by the war in South Sudan. There was a momentary delay in putting in place effective remote project implementation and monitoring mechanisms. Other factors that disrupted the timely implementation of the project included evacuation of re-locatable staff at the peak of the war.

LWF/DWS adopted resource pooling approaches that lowered project costs. Notable among these were the water and electricity supply shared among various agencies in Ajourng Thok refugee camp. Needs assessments and child protection awareness raising and training activities were jointly conducted with common training manuals.

The project has good potential to significantly and positively impact upon the wellbeing of beneficiaries in both education and protection outcomes. There is unquestionable agreement among respondents that the desks have improved learning environment and set a precedent standard for desirable classroom conditions in the camps. Age appropriated segregation of learners with morning formal primary and afternoon ALP is reported to have reduced over-crowding in classes and further contributed to the improvement in the classroom environment.

FGD respondents were of the view that the project made significant contribution to the promotion of peaceful coexistence in the community. They argued that as a result of refugee children from different ethnic groups participating in joint recreational activities such as games music, dance and drama, harmony between children and youth from different ethnic communities in the camps has improved. Children and youth are gradually overcoming prejudicial sentiments that they reportedly held against people from different ethnic communities. There were significant psychosocial outcomes for beneficiaries including unaccompanied children placed under foster care that can be confidently attributed to this project. Socializing with peers seems to have provided an opportunity for learners to confront and begin to come to terms with the predicament of circumstances surrounding their displacement.

The basic structures for sustaining the project impact, namely School Governance are in place. These structures play a pivotal role in school management and in creating awareness, mobilizing communities as well as detecting and responding to protection concerns both at school and in the community. The community may continue to benefit from ALP approach as long as modalities for sustaining teacher incentives and replenishing supplies like text books and desks are put in place. Teachers will need additional training on participatory methodology. It is strategic to work towards integrating the financing of the refugee schools in the government budget, as the ultimate responsibility for financing and managing education rests with government while at the same time looking for durable economic solutions among the refugee households to contribute towards the needs of their children.

The targeting of children for child protection and education services (ALP) based on age group 14-18 years worked well. This makes it possible to address real needs of age group 14-18 years who are timid to mix with younger learners in same class.

Community involvement and feedback guided the design of the project based on needs Coordination was good and properly done and encouraged ownership of schools.

Cost sharing practices on over head expenditures being practices exhibited in Ajourng Thok can be replicated in other locations. UNHCR and DRC provide electricity and water respectively; this could free good amount resources that can be realigned for project supports where there are gaps.

It took long for community to understand and accept ALP due to lack of involvement and understanding of all stakeholders to understand the ALP which was a new programme in Ajourng Thok. It recommended that awareness creation on new education model should be embarked on at the beginning of the project to enable buy in and ownership to mitigate risk of non acceptance of the project and save time.

The evaluation made a number of recommendations to inform LWF/DWS South Sudan refugee programmes. Key among these is that LWF/WS needs to:

- Develop a contingency strategy to respond to unplanned increasing number of learners and sudden escalation of security threats.
- Develop clear written criteria defining priority vulnerabilities such as disability, unaccompanied status, HIV/AIDS status, child parenthood and child involvement in household livelihood strategies to guide field teams in targeting beneficiaries. The criteria should be developed in consultation with key stakeholders.
- Eliminate delays in procurement and delivery of project materials such as text books and desks. Exploring possibilities of local sourcing of available firms could be done early enough and in coordination with education partners such as DFID and EDC on procurement of ALP text books to save time as well ensure the appropriate materials.
- Extend the duration of ALP teachers training to ensure adequate grounding in both ALP concept and pedagogy to deliver content effectively. An initial three weeks training could be provided and then followed by a two-weeks training on methodology in subsequent school holidays. Involving county education inspector to monitor teachers' performance should also be integrated in project design and implementation. Explore the possibility of engaging existing and volunteer teachers to support ALP interventions. Enhance the impact of learning of children and youth, through capacity building of ALP teachers in both Ajoung Thok and Maban who did not undergo the teachers' professional development, In-service training program for teachers should be instituted to add skills and subject matter for teachers while safeguarding quality of education, this can be supported with teachers' forum for experience exchange on pedagogical skills with qualified teachers.
- Scale-up the project to reach more beneficiaries with a dedicated quota for host community for improved coverage. Establish a separate adult literacy component for the over 18 age category. This strategy will also ensure host community children are adequately included to benefit from the project in order to further ease tension between refugees and host community and also to strategically ensure greater potential for government investment in the schools.
- Advocate to the government to reopen the host community schools, pay the teachers so that the refugee schools are not over stretched. LWF and other partners can support the government to rebuild up the revamped schools. Strengthen M&E system to enhance timely monitoring of project activities.
- This includes revising log frame, developing appropriate tools; periodic data capture and use of M&E data to improve project implementation and reporting.
- Diversify project funding base to guarantee continuation of the project so that enrolled learners complete a full cycle of ALP for lasting impact.



EU Children of Peace
EUROPEAN UNION:
RECIPIENT OF THE 2012
NOBEL PEACE PRIZE®



I INTRODUCTION

I.1 BACKGROUND TO THE DISPLACEMENT

The Lutheran World Federation Department for World Service (LWF-DWS) South Sudan Program established operational presence in South Sudan in Jonglei state in 2004. Operations started with interventions in food security and livelihoods, WASH, education and peace building and reconciliation. Following the 2011 outbreak of armed conflict between Sudan Armed Forces (SAF) and South Sudan Peoples' Liberation Movement in the North (SPLM-N) and the ensuing displacement of large populations into the region, LWF/DWS expanded humanitarian interventions in response to the needs of refugees to Upper Nile and Unity State.

LWF-DWS Upper Nile and Unity State humanitarian emergency response has focused on protection and education for children and young people with activities in community based psychosocial support, vocational skills training and literacy training. LWF-DWS has been operating in Gendressa, Yussif Batil and Kaya camps in Maban - Upper Nile State, and in Ajuong Thok camp in Unity State. The introduction of Accelerate Learning Programs (ALP) and improvement in safe school practices was deemed necessary to strengthen the protection of and relevance of education for children and young people in refugee camps in Upper Nile and Unity State of South Sudan.

LWF supports 15 primary schools in the Upper Nile Maban Refugee camps with 6 in Yussif Batil, 4 in Gendressa and 5 primary schools in Kaya camp, in addition to 3 primary schools in Ajuong Thok camp in Unity State. The programme also supports 2 secondary schools with one in Maban and the other in Ajuong Thok. The programme supports 21 Early Childhood Development (ECD) centers in Maban with 12 in Yussif Batil and 5 in Kaya and 4 in Gendressa. Each ECD centre is associated with a Child Friendly Space (CFS). There are 8 CFS in Ajuong Thok.

LWF's works with community structures in the implementation of activities in support of the refugees through a community based program approach. Community structures include Child Protection Committees (CPC), Child Rights Clubs (CRCs), School Management Committees (SMCs), Parents Teachers Associations (PTAs) and other volunteer workers all established within refugee camps in Ajuong Thok, Kaya and Yussif Batil.

LWF's programs in Unity State and Upper Nile State refugee camps are funded by ECHO, UNHCR, BPRM, UNICEF and Church of Sweden (CoS). ECD are funded UNICEF, formal school support activities are funded by UNHCR, ALP school activities are funded by ECHO, BPRM and UNHCR with ECHO funding furniture, teacher incentives, training and instructional materials while UNHCR and BPRM funded infrastructure development and school uniforms; Vocational training activities, secondary school support activities are funded and the Community Based Child Protection activities are funded by UNHCR, CoS/SIDA and BPRM focusing in different camps.

	Camp	ECD	Primary Schools	ALP Centers	Vocational Training	Secondary Schools	Community Based Child Protection
Upper Nile State Maban	Yussif Batil	• UNICEF	• UNHCR	• ECHO • UNHCR	• CoS/SIDA	• CoS/SIDA • UNHCR	• UNHCR • CoS/SIDA
	Kaya	• UNICEF	• UNHCR	• ECHO • UNHCR	• CoS/SIDA	•	• UNHCR • CoS/SIDA
	Gendressa	• UNICEF	• UNHCR	• BPRM	• CoS/BPRM	•	• UNHCR • BPRM
Unity State	Ajuong Thok	• UNICEF	• UNHCR	• ECHO • UNHCR	•	• UNHCR	• UNHCR • BPRM • CoS/SIDA

In December 2013, LWF/DWS secured Euro 600,000 funding from ECHO to implement the 18 months project in response to the education and protection needs of children affected by conflict in the refugee camps in Unity State and Upper Nile State of South Sudan. The objective of the project was to contribute to the protection and education of children and youth in refugee camps in South Sudan. The project ended in May 2015. Inbuilt within the project design was an end term evaluation. LWF/DWS commissioned this study therefore to take stock of project performance, potential for beneficiary impact and learning for subsequent programming.

2. KEY ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

2.1 OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of the end term evaluation were:

- To provide an independent assessment of the performance of the **ECHO funded “Educational Support to Children Affected by Conflict”** project in response to the education and protection needs of children and young people in the refugee camps in Upper Nile and Unity States of South Sudan.
- To identify and document significant project experiences with potential to inform subsequent programming.

Specifically, the consultant was required to:-

- Assess the project coverage and quality, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability of the benefits.
- Identify the value added through coordination and collaboration with other agencies working in the refugee camps.

2.2 KEY EVALUATION ISSUES

The evaluation was guided by the questions detailed in the attached ToR and summarized under the following themes.

Coverage and Quality: Assess the range and quality of services provided and the extent to which LWF/DWS reached the most vulnerable and disadvantaged groups of the target population including in

terms of gender and disability among both refugees and for host population; as well as the range of barriers identified and addressed in terms of access to and quality of education and protection,

Relevance/ Appropriateness: Assess the relevance of the objectives, results, approaches and activities of the Action in view of the contextual dynamics, capacities and needs assessment.

Coherence: Evaluate the level of collaboration and complementation with stakeholders and the involvement of beneficiaries particularly children and youth during the design and implementation phases of the project, as well as adherence to relevant national guidelines and international standards of good practice.

Effectiveness: Determine the extent to which planned outputs and outcomes have been achieved, the attribution to the project interventions and added benefit, if any, of integrating education and protection in consolidating transferable skills for children and young people.

Efficiency: Assess the extent to which project resources were deployed to achieve an appropriate balance across cost of inputs, timing and quality as well as quantity of outputs and outcomes.

Impact: Identify the changes in wellbeing of beneficiaries and host community both foreseen and unforeseen, as well as intended and unintended since the start of the project, the extent to which these changes are attributable to the project and how the adverse outcomes were addressed.

Sustainability: Assess the capacities (structures / resources) in place to ensure the community continues to benefit from the changes realized during the project and recommended measures to strengthen sustainability of project benefits Document project innovations and analyze their potential for replication.

3. EVALUATION METHODS

The evaluation was conducted between June and July 2015 in Yussif Batil and Kaya refugee camps in Maban County of Upper Nile State and in Ajuong Thok refugee camp in Unity State where LWF-DWS implemented the ECHO funded Educational Support to Children Affected by Conflict project.

A participatory consultative approach was used to gather qualitative¹ and quantitative information relating to project design, management and performance. This included review of relevant documents and the project data bases, field visits to project sites, 21 interviews with key informants and 13 focus group discussions with project beneficiaries and stakeholders. Purposive sampling² was used to identify respondents from among beneficiaries, stakeholders and community structures that had been established to support the project. The selection was guided by accessibility of the location within security time limits and representativeness of the respondent categories. Children and young people who had benefited from the project in the target refugee camps and host community, LWF/DWS staff, local partners, cluster members, government officials and community members were consulted (See details in **Appendix 2**).

3.1 STUDY LIMITATIONS

The evaluation was implemented within security and logistic constraints occasion by the context of armed hostilities prevailing in the region.

¹ According to Cresswell (1994) A qualitative study is defined as an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting.

² Qualitative and Evaluation Research Methods Patton QM (second edition) 1990, Sage Publications Inc.

Distances between LWF/DWS field base offices and evaluation sites in Kaya, Yussif Batil in Maban County Upper Nile State and Ajoung Thok in Unity were long yet it was not possible to set off very early in the morning or delay departure from the field for security reasons. Approximately 3.5 daylight work hours were forgone each field day to ensure compliance with security operating procedures and linking from one state to the other. This limited the number of consultation sessions that could be conducted with full participation of the consultant on each day. Multiple interviews and FGD sessions were scheduled concurrently with the consultant participating in part of some sessions to fit in the limited time available.

According to initial plan the consultant was scheduled to return from Upper Nile to Juba on 3rd July, but this schedule was altered and in turn delayed the schedule for Unity State. The time left for data analysis and report compilation had to be adjusted, as a result the schedule for data analysis, compilation and submission of evaluation report were delayed. Some of the key informants were out of duty station at appointed times and the schedule had to be altered in order to meet them. Despite measures put in place to meet all Key informants, the consultant was not able to meet the ECHO project focal person, the Local Camp leader in Ajoung Thok and the County Education Director in Maban.

Due to incompleteness and inconsistency of data available in different camps and the LWF/DWS project database, it was not possible to undertake comprehensive informative disaggregation of beneficiaries by various vulnerability characteristics other than gender.

4.FINDINGS

4.1 COVERAGE AND QUALITY

4.1.1 Geographical and Beneficiary Coverage

The project was implemented in twelve existing primary schools in three refugee camps of two schools in Unity State in Ajuong Thok (Morowe and Sapata); and in Upper Nile State in six schools in Yusuf Batil (Bau, Werak, Mendasol, Gamak, Blue Nile and Goldek) and four schools in Kaya (Kalo, Dalmo, Sodalum and Kayuu). ALP sessions were conducted in the afternoon after the formal primary school sessions which ran in the morning had closed.

Teachers for ALP were recruited from among the refugee community. The newly recruited ALP teachers, existing formal primary school teachers, SMCs and PTA were trained and co-opted to support project activities. Learners were recruited mainly from among overage refugee children enrolled the formal primary school.

Altogether 7954 direct beneficiaries (39% female) were reached against the project target of 5,157. The project reached include 3,109 (41% girls) vulnerable and disadvantaged refugee children and young people aged 12 to 17 years who gained accessed education through ALP and rights protection services, against a target of 3,500. The project also directly benefited 77 ALP teachers (13% female) against a target of 70, recruited from within the community; 141 members of SMC (30% female) against a target of 132 in the 12 schools; 24 senior teachers on target (50% female) in the primary schools who were trained in guidance and counseling, 250 formal school teachers on target (16% female) who were trained in identifying and responding to protection concerns in the schools and ,3510 learners against a target of 1,455 (40% girls³) in the formal primary schools who benefited from the desks procured under the ALP project.

The child help desks handled protection support cases related to child rights violations in the camps from 941 (593boys and 348girls (37% girls) ALP learners and 335 (50% girls) children participated in the child rights clubs

Summary of Beneficiaries Reached

	Total Beneficiaries			Female Beneficiaries	
	Target	Reached	Performance	Reached	% Female
Result 1	5,157	6837	1132%	2,821	39%
ALP Teachers	70	77	110%	10	13%
APL Learners	3,500	3,109	89%	1,246	40%
ALP Desk Beneficiaries (Maban 2,280 + A/Thok 1230 = 3510)	1,455	3,510	241%	1404	40%
SMCs	132	141	107%	42	30%
Result 2	3,906	3528	90%	1,350	37%
Primary (-ALP Teachers)	250	250	100%	40	16%

³ Estimated at 40% based the average for total beneficiaries without this entry

Senior Teachers	24	24	100%	5	21%
ALP Learners	3,500	3,109	89%	1,246	40%
SMCs	132	141	107%	49	29%
CRC	360	335	93%	168	50%

The identification and selection of beneficiaries was conducted through pre-existing refugee community leadership and administration structures. Needs assessments targeted refugees excluding IDPs and host community. Targets for gender participation were not set out during project design but were subsequently included in project monitoring and reporting.

It was not possible to consistently identify the proportion of beneficiaries who were children and young people with disability, unaccompanied, refugees or from the host community across the project. This was due to non-disaggregation of these categories in the data base as vulnerability criteria were not systematically set-out and prioritized to include age group and gender targets during project design and implementation. There were no clear written criteria for identifying and prioritizing vulnerabilities during beneficiary selection. In Ajuong Thok there was an effort to document host population participation in the project. There are 45 learners (9 female) from the host community constituting at 2% of ALP enrollment. In Maban where there was tension between the host community and NGOs due to non representation of host population in humanitarian interventions, however all refugee schools are open for access by the host community.

4.1.2 Range of Services Provided

The project provided a range of services including access to basic primary instruction through the Accelerated Learning Programme approach. Teaching and learning materials were issued as well furnishing classrooms. Other services included recreational extra-curricular activities such as games, sports, music and dance; establishment of rights awareness and protection response forums including Child Rights Clubs (CRCs), Child Protection Committees (CPCs) and child help desk with linkages to the joint referral pathway; recruitment and training of teachers on ALP instructional methodology, school management as well as prevention and responding to protection concerns; training of School Management Committees (SMCs) on prevention and responding to protection concerns, mobilizing communities on education and child protection as well as School Management Support; provision of teaching and learning materials, school uniform and classroom furniture.

Through these services, LWF-DWS actively addressed identified barriers to access and quality for education and protection. The main focus of the project was the age barrier to education access among overage refugee children and young people. This barrier is being addressed through segregation of overage learners in separate ALP cohort attending lessons in the afternoon while younger learners continue to attend lessons under the mainstream formal school arrangement in the morning. Separation of learners by age and conducting lessons in separate morning and afternoon sessions reduced congestion and opened space for more children to enroll in the formal school. It also enhanced quality of learning especially for the younger children whose participation in learning was dominated by the over age learners. The training of teachers on pedagogy contributed to the quality of teaching and learning.

Besides providing access to education, the project responded to protection barriers by raising awareness on child rights and strengthening mechanisms for identifying and responding to protection issues affecting children and young people at school and in the community. This included the training of Child protection Committees (CPCs) in community and School Management Committees (SMCs) on

child protection issues , establishment of Child Rights Clubs (CRCs), and setting up protection response structures including Child Help Desks in schools linked to the Joint Referral Pathway as well implementing Foster Care arrangements for unaccompanied children.

Notwithstanding this effort barriers to education and protection have not been adequately addressed. Following the renewed influx of refugees and IDPs into the project after project design, the number of people in need of intervention of the project escalated dramatically and government capacity to respond to the needs has been completely eroded by civil war. Many government schools have closed due to non-payment of teachers.

The number of school age refugee children and young people (5 to 17 years) accessing education in both ALP and formal primary schools in Ajuong Thok stands at 8,467 (3,424 female) out of total age group population 10,589. Maban County has a school age refugee population of 31,461 (15,748 female) children and young people aged 5 to 17 years of whom 12,960 (6,453 female) are accessing education in both ALP and formal primary schools. The demand for education remains immense.

Child marriage remains entrenched in the community and poverty is widespread among both refugees and host communities. The ALP has provided an opportunity for some of the mothers to attend school given a number that participate in these in Ajuong Thok. There is chronic food shortage with families depending on humanitarian food rations. There are many children who cannot afford clothing and therefore choose to stay away from school. Involving children in domestic work, vending and herding boys to support households supplement humanitarian food rations is widespread. Married girls and child mothers missed out completely as they were not targeted by the project.

4.2 RELEVANCE/ APPROPRIATENESS

The practical relevance of the project was in its translation of the aspirations of the South Sudan General Education Plan 2012 – 2017, the South Sudan Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies to the education and protection needs children and young people in the refugee camps. In view of the context of the children and young people in the refugee camps, there was no better modality for addressing their education and protection needs than the integrated ALP and protection approach.

4.2.1 Policy Relevance

The South Sudan General Education Plan 2012 – 2017⁴ recognizes ALP as a strategic intervention of choice to address education needs of out-of-school children including those affected by emergencies. The plan calls for partnership in coordination of emergency responses in the education sector. The project was designed and implemented in consultation with government authorities at county and state level and in coordination with humanitarian agencies implementing other interventions in the refugee camps. Participation of government authorities in project monitoring was limited in extent due to weak functionality of state institutions.

The South Sudan Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies⁵ recognize ALP as one of the response strategies to enhance the quality of educational preparedness, response and recovery; to increase access to safe and relevant learning opportunities for all learners, regardless of their age,

⁴ South Sudan General Education Plan 2012 – 2017; Promoting Learning for All. Juba, Republic of South Sudan, 2012.

⁵ South Sudan Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies; Contextualized from the *INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*. Education Cluster South Sudan, 2012

gender or abilities; and to ensure accountability and strong coordination in the provision of education in emergencies through to recovery. In compliance with INEE, participatory needs assessments were conducted and a response strategy agreed in a transparent consultation with government and stakeholders. The project was formulated following various extensive assessments of the education and protection needs of children and young people in the refugee camps⁶. Cluster coordination mechanisms were in place and leveraged to support alignment of the project with interventions by other stakeholders. Community members participated actively, transparently and without discrimination in analysis, planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of education responses. Teachers, SMCs and CPCs were identified, mobilised and involved to implement age-appropriate learning opportunities for young people. Learning environments were secure and safe, and promoted the protection and the psychosocial well-being of learners, teachers and other education personnel.

Development and implementation of vulnerability criteria necessary for identification and recruitment of beneficiaries did not adequately meet the INEE standards. Education facilities promoted the safety and well-being of learners, teachers and other education personnel and learners were linked to health, psychosocial and protection services. The nutrition needs of learners were however not adequately addressed. The project was also not able to mobilize a sufficient number of appropriately qualified teachers, and did not adequately reflect the diversity and equity of the beneficiary population in terms of disability, unaccompanied status, child parenthood and other barriers to protection and access to education. Support & supervision mechanisms for teachers did not function effectively as is evident in inadequate clinical⁷ supervision and documentation of teacher performance and the limited involvement of government authorities in teacher supervision. The limited involvement of education authorities is likely to undermine project continuity and sustainability of impact after LWF/DWS phase-out particularly if the intervention is not integrated in government funding mechanisms.

The project was consistent with DG ECHO strategic response priorities on non-structural activities aimed at reducing the risk for and mitigating the impact of human-generated violence, coercion, deprivation and abuse in the context of the humanitarian crisis in South Sudan⁸

Based on the contextual analysis and needs assessments conducted to inform project design, the objectives, results and activities of the Action are still valid and more so relevant to the context, which has since seen escalation of conflict, influx and therefore need for the project to be scaled up.

The activities and outputs of the project were consistent with the project goal and its objectives. At the time of its design, the project was relevant to the assessed needs of the target group. The assessment reported a large number of over age children and youth who did not adequately benefit from the formal primary school system. The barriers to education and protection were identified through various participatory education and child protection needs assessments, risk assessment and conflict sensitivity assessment.

Children in the refugee camps are excluded from school by economic barriers at the household level leading to non enrolment or dropping out of school as children play a central role in household economies, or families cannot afford to send children to school. There are also widespread cultural barriers arising from negative attitudes and traditions about the education of girls and the stereotype role of females in society. These include FGM and child marriage. School based barriers include poor

⁶ Educational Support to Children Affected by Conflict ECHO/CHD/2013/01003

⁷ **This is the measurement of teacher preparation, delivery and evaluation of learning against set professional standards.**

⁸ http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/funding/decisions/2013/HIPs/sudan_south_annex_en.pdf

quality of infrastructure, congestion and teacher behavior. Gender based violence, age-lapse among the pupils, early pregnancy and child-to-child violence as well prejudicial mistrust across ethnic divides were also alluded to during consultation with respondents. Awareness of child rights in the community was reportedly low. Education for children with disabilities was not prioritized. Children with disability face the challenge of walking long distances to school, stigma at school and at home. Children with disability were commonly considered burdensome and costly to send to school. The project did not have specific criteria to ensure target identification, recruitment, monitoring and reporting on children with disability.

Among all categories of respondents, lack of food at home was a frequently cited challenge affecting children's attendance. The widespread poverty and limited livelihood opportunities among the refugee and host community populations has lowered the prioritization of education and contributed to child neglect and abuse.

The overall approach adopted by LWF/DWS is substantially addressing the identified education and protection needs for the refugees. The needs of the Host Community were not fully addressed by the intervention. Decades of war and armed rebellions in South Sudan have had a serious impact on the country's education system. Education management systems are not functional beyond the County level. School infrastructure is hardly existent. Due to non-payment of salaries, teachers have abandoned schools. Many schools have shut down all together. The poor school facilities, unsafe learning environment, unhygienic sanitation facilities and lack of water were said to discourage children from attending schools outside the camps, hence the relevance of the project to host population.

Providing children and young people an opportunity to access age-appropriate education in flexible timing allowed learners to undertake livelihood activities without foregoing schooling. The project responded to financial limitations of the target group by meeting the costs of text books and scholastic materials.

Besides the opportunity to access education, the establishment and training of SMCs improved mobilization and establishment of CRC helped to identify protection issues and vulnerable children in the community. Recreational and extra-curricular activities such as games, sports, clubs, music and dancing "brought joy and unity" and effectively communicated awareness messages to the community. This was a useful strategy for educational, psychosocial and mobilization value. Games and sports attracted the learners to the schools. Child Right Clubs training heightened awareness of child rights and enabled children to express their experiences. The training of teachers improved teaching methods which in turn enabled learners to acquire numeracy and literacy skills, particularly in English language. Desks improved the classroom environment not only for ALP learners, but also for the formal primary school learners. Life skills acquired by learners will certainly improve the ability to cope with the trauma of war and to promote peaceful co-existence in the challenging camp environment. Foster families were engaged in taking care of unaccompanied and separated children.

The population in need of project intervention has greatly increased following renewed fighting in Sudan and the outbreak of war in South Sudan. This has heightened the relevance of the integrated education and protection intervention.

4.3 COHERENCE

Educational Support to Children Affected by Conflict was designed to contribute to the protection and education of children and youth in refugee camps in South Sudan. The project was intended to deliver

two complementary results, to increase access to education and protection and to promote protection in the camps through the establishment of safe school environment.

4.3.1 Internal Coherence

The safe school concept is a child protection strategy championed by UNHCR for the protection of children in refugee contexts. The strategy demands that schools guarantee learning environments that are safe, secure and free of violence⁹. The design of the project was logically coherent and its implementation was consistent with the framework of the safe school environment concept.

Structures and measures for detecting, reporting and responding to protection concerns of children and young people were in place including the child protection help desk, training teachers and SMC/PTA on child protection, establishing CPCs and CRCs. These structures were linked to education functions of the schools and the measures were implemented hand in hand with the conduct of teaching and learning. The improvement of school infrastructure and provision of instructional materials demonstrates effort to ensure that quality teaching and learning took place in the schools and the recreation activities were promoted to enhance the psychosocial wellbeing of learners. In so doing the two main elements of the project, namely to increase access to education and protection and promotion of protection of children in the camps were complementary and inherently reinforced each other and in turn the internal coherence of the project.

The sequencing of activities was designed to strengthen internal project coherence. This was however undermined by inadequate initial mobilization of the community to subscribe to the project, delays in procurement of critical project inputs such as ALP textbooks and desks, delays in recruiting adequate ALP teachers, teacher strikes and high staff turnover. The project design promotes the narrative of child protection as an integral part of the school curriculum, a function of the school and a responsibility of the school community. Education was both a strategy for advancing protection and a milestone in the realization of child protection.

4.3.2 External Coherence

The extensive consultation and coordination with both beneficiaries and stakeholders during the designing and implementation of the project was found to strengthen its external coherence with other education and protection interventions in the camps. It was noted for example that LWF/DWS was running the formal primary school before and ALP activities were implemented within existing primary schools which created opportunity for sharing infrastructure, instructional materials and school management structures. This minimized duplication of resources and created a multiplier effect for promotion of protection awareness in the community. The project was particularly coherent with the UNHCR funded and LWF/DWS implemented Child Protection Program through protection case management, foster placement of unaccompanied children and Child Friendly Spaces activities, fencing and renovation of schools and opening-up primary education opportunity.

It was established during FGD and KII consultations that participatory assessments were conducted with different groups of beneficiaries who were involved in identifying and planning interventions. This contributed to identifying underserved areas and to aligning the project with interventions implemented by other agencies as well government priorities in the camps to prevent duplication of services. To strengthen external coherence during implementation, frequent coordination meetings to

⁹ http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/INEEcms/uploads/1041/Safe_Schools_and_Learning_Environments_Key.PDF

address emerging issues were held with stakeholders through already existing structures in the camps such as RPWG, CPWG, Education Working Group meeting, Health Working Group, WASH Working Group meetings.

The Joint Referral Pathway for unaccompanied children and GBV survivors strengthen the coordination of protection support with other service providers. A collective awareness raising on children rights and mobilization drive for education and protection was supported by various agencies in the camps and was implemented by children and youth through child rights clubs and other school groups.

The training of PTA, SMCs, CRCs and CPCs on protection issues was conducted jointly by LWF/DWS, SCI and JRS. UNHCR was the overall camp planning and coordination lead and supported improvement of school infrastructure in the primary schools as well as the operation of secondary schools in the camps. ACTED and MEDAIR provided water and contributed towards improvement of school sanitation facilities while AHA, MEDAIR and IMC focused on the health needs of the community including learners in the schools. IRC played a complementary role in the GBV awareness raising, prevention and response component of child Protection. Samaritan Purse with WFP responded to food distribution needs of beneficiaries in the communities. Awareness raising and case referrals were jointly supported by all partners. Coherence of interventions among implementing partners was mainly guided by INEE and SPHERE standards.

South Sudan is a country that is still affected by conflict and coordination function of government was very weak. The structures mechanisms for coordination were effective between implementing partners, but the government was not adequately involved. The mechanisms for coordination provided a common ground where partners planned across activities and are implemented together.

4.4 EFFECTIVENESS

The principle objective of the project was to contribute to the protection and education of children and youth in refugee camps. The project was to increase access to education and protection and to promote protection in the camps through the establishment of safe school environment. The project reached and exceeded most of its key performance targets in terms of beneficiary reach (see annex 5). The study was not able to evaluate teacher performance on ALP approaches as there was no data available for this measurement.

4.4.1 Result 1

3,500 children and young people have access to educational and life skills to advance to age appropriate classes in Ajuong Thok, Kaya and Yussif Batil refugee camps

The project implemented ALP in 12 schools with 2 schools in Ajuong Thok; 6 schools in Yussif Batil and 4 schools in Kaya as was planned. Against a target of 3,500 learners, the project enabled 3,109 over age children and young people (40% girls) access education. Overall the project fell short of its enrolment target by 11%.

The number of learners in Maban dropped from 2,525 to 1,446 while in Ajuong Thok, it increased from 1,000 to 1,663. The drop in enrolment is mainly attributed to low quality of ALP teachers that forced some of the pupils to enroll in formal primary schools. 24 (2 girls and 22boys) learners also enrolled in secondary schools after entry exams, while others dropped out to seek employment opportunities in the near-by oil field in Palochi and the government sorghum plantation in Renk. By the

time of project evaluation 670¹⁰ children/young people in Maban had either joined the primary section. The increased enrolment in Ajuong Thok was driven by the high influx of new arrivals including relocations from Yida camp. Against a set target of 75% (2,625) out of 3,500 enrolled students completing their ALP cycle, 81% (2518 out of the enrolled 3,109) completed the first cycle of ALP and transited to the subsequent levels. In terms of gender representation girls comprised 40% of enrolled learners being girls.

The project established Child Rights Clubs (CRCs) in all the 12 ALP schools with 30 members in each club. The CRC enlisted a total membership of 335 against a set of 360 learners. Of the 312 members, 93% were active, while 7% did not actively participate in the CRC activities as they opted for other extra curriculum activities such as the Child Friendly Spaces (CFSs) that they found more appealing.

Against a target of 70, the project recruited 77 teachers and all underwent training on core aspects of the accelerated learning programme (ALP) methodology.

In each of the 12 project school a fourteen-member School Management Committee was established and members trained on school management support, community mobilization, awareness raising on retention of children in school and also addressing key child protection concerns and identification of referrals cases. Out of the 12 committees and 141 members recruited and trained, 106 members from 10 committees (75%) were actively involved in school support management roles and responding to ALP and protection issues relating to their schools.

Due to insecurity and divergent facilitation expectations between LWF/DWS and MOEST, only one of the 3 planned joint project monitoring visits was conducted successfully with MoEST.

While it was planned to procure and issue 1,455 single-seat desks, the project procured 585 – three seat desks with seating capacity of 1,755 learners all of which were delivered to the schools. Ajuong Thok received 205 desks with capacity to seat 615 learners; Maban School received 380 desks with capacity to seat 1140 ALP learners. Besides ALP learners who attend school in the afternoons, the desks are also used by 1755 formal primary schools learners in the morning session.

4.4.2 Result 2

Children and youth are protected in the camps through the establishment of 'safe school environments'

All 12 planned Child Help Desks were established one in each school, operational and actively monitoring, reporting and following up of cases of children at risks. This included cases of child abuse and unaccompanied children in the community and school.

The Child Help Desks received and followed-up on 941 (593boys and 348girls) reported cases. Of these 60 cases were reported in the first six months of the project while the rest 881 cases were reported in the last twelve months of the project. The project had anticipated to receive and handle 350 cases.

In terms of direct implementation staffing, the project hired 1 expatriate Education Coordinator who resigned one month to the closure of the project. However, a senior Education officer was mandated

¹⁰ Source; LWF/DWS Database

to act in order to bridge in the gaps | Project Compliance Accountant was also hired. ,In place of the planned second National Education Coordinator, two Assistant Education Officers (nationals) were recruited to strengthen engagement with teachers whose qualifications were relatively low especially in Maban.

The project was launched with a publicity workshop involving LWF country and field staff as well representation of implementing agencies with activities in camps and camp opinion leaders. A news letter was published to announce to the general public about the intervention.

As planned 250 teachers in the host primary schools (40 female) were inducted on the professional code of conduct as well as basic helping skills for girls and unaccompanied minors and separated children registered in the schools, as planned.

The planned 24 senior teachers (12 Female) were identified and trained on basic counseling skills and guidance for all children affected by conflict with a special focus on teenage girls.

RESULT 2: BENEFICIARIES TARGET: 3,906; RESULT 2: BENEFICIARIES REACHED: 3,628

	Total			Targ et	Performa nce	Female			
	Ajuo ng Tho k	Maba n	Reach ed			Ajuo ng Tho k	Maba n	Reach ed	% Fema le
Result 2			3,628	3,906	93%			1,298	36%
Primary (-ALP Teachers)	20	230	250	250	100%	3	37	40	16%
Senior Teachers	4	20	24	24	100%	2	10	12	50%
ALP Learners	1,663	1,446	3,109	3,500	89%	494	752	1,246	40%
SMCs	20	121	141	132	127%	7	42	49	
ALP Teachers	20	57	77	70	110%	3	7	10	13%

The beneficiaries expressed satisfaction with the quality of services delivered, and would wish to see continuation of the project. There was however a feeling that the scope of the project needs to be scaled-up – in extent to reach more learners and in strategy to include tackling the wide spread poverty and food deficiency among the refugee and host community.

In CRC members and ALP learners FGD sessions, there was consensus that resources like benches, desks, Teachers, Classrooms, Uniforms were good but not adequate. They also held a view that the quality of teaching was good, notwithstanding the contrary revelation that some learners had abandoned ALP for formal primary school sessions on account of better teaching in the formal school among others.

Providing uniforms and text books was a necessary intervention to meet the needs of children who would otherwise have stayed away from school for lack of clothing. CRC members and learners were also of the opinion that resources reached intended beneficiaries and were used properly.

SMC, CPC and PTA members commented that the community was happy with the services and resources were successfully delivered to the learners. Their recommendation was that in future LWF should scale-up services like provision of shoes and clothes to vulnerable children. They noted that availing desk was a good initiative which should be scaled up to all classes in the schools. They also noted the changes in schools as a result of more learning spaces being established. The classrooms were constructed by complementary intervention to this project. During the project period, water and latrines increased. These were also availed to the school by another implementing partner.

Teachers reaffirmed that the resources were used by learners and they as teachers made sure services were rendered as required. Text books and teachers' guides were not enough and in some school inappropriate textbooks were supplied. They also noted that the blackboards were enough but very small in size. They further observed the need to improve delivery of ALP text books on time in the future.

The project however seems to have underestimated the effect of poverty and deprivation of the target beneficiaries. The shortage of food and the dire need for clothing which come out as a major pre-occupational issue for the respondents were not adequately addressed. While these do not squarely fit in the implementation activities of the project, they present a risk to attaining project results and could therefore be integrated as advocacy objectives.

LWF/DWS has put in place Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for data collection, filing and utilization. Training was conducted to enable LWF/DWS staff in Maban Programme in Upper Nile implement these procedures and a Program Technical Quality Manager recruited to support technical teams and to roll out the SOPs in Ajuong Thok. The LWF SOPs is anticipated to strengthen internal accountability and transparency within LWF and externally with donors and other stakeholders. It also anticipated to bridge gaps in timely entry of data and data verification by respective departmental officers and coordination between the field offices and technical program team in Juba.

In Ajuong Thok, an ICT technical staff was recruited but he is implementing a Save the Children designed Child Protection Information System (CPIS) which is different from the LWF SOPs being implemented in Maban.

4.5 EFFICIENCY

Efficiency was assessed by examining the extent to which project resources were deployed to achieve an appropriate balance across cost of inputs, timing and quality as well as quantity of outputs and outcomes. The simultaneous outbreak of two wars created a big influx of refugees and IDPs who sought safety in the refugee camps creating strain on both project and host community resource and escalating community tensions. Lawlessness and insecurity ensured rendering some camps inaccessibility for prolonged periods of time besides, inaccessible roads meant that supplies could only be airlifted to project sites. This increased the cost of project supplies and movement of personnel thereby undermining efficiency.

Efficiency was also undermined by delays in delivery of supplies to project sites occasioned both by weakness in LWF/DWS's procurement / supply chain management and queuing for airlifting services. Cases cited were delays in both procurement and in delivery of desks to schools, as desks were imported, and airlifted to the field site for assembling and distribution to schools. Another significant delay was in the procurement and delivery of ALP text books which was compounded by procurement and delivery of inappropriate books to the schools.

Other factors that disrupted the timely implementation of the project included outbreaks of conflicts among beneficiaries and evacuation of re-locatable staff at the peak of the war followed by teaching staff strikes. The project also experience high staff turn-over which caused delays in implementation and inefficiencies in project monitoring and documentation as result of institutional memory loss with staff who departed without proper hand over of records.

Without a pre-arranged contingency plan, the project was taken by surprise, especially by the war in South Sudan. There was a momentary delaying in putting in place effective remote project implementation and monitoring mechanisms.

The project experienced initial challenges in securing community support for the ALP project component due to low understanding of ALP among the community. There were delays in recruiting adequate numbers of teachers in Maban County due to the shortage of eligible candidates. This affected teaching in some schools until teachers were relocated from Ajuong Thok. The poor quality of teaching that had ensured in Kaya and Yusuf Batil resulted into a loss of confidence in the ALP component among beneficiaries who decided to revert to the formal school.

The project could have been more efficient if security, logistics and personnel management risks had been anticipated during project design. This oversight led to unwarranted delays in delivery of inputs – which inputs were critical for effective delivery of project outputs and winning the confidence of the community.

Airlifting of goods and personnel was expensive and since this had not been anticipated at project design, it ate into funds which could have been used to strengthen direct service provision to beneficiaries.

LWF/DWS adopted resource pooling approaches that lowered project costs. Notable among these was the water and electricity supply shared among various agencies in the camps. Needs assessments and child protection awareness raising and training activities were jointly conducted with common training manuals.

4.6 IMPACT

The project has good potential to significantly and positively impact upon the wellbeing of beneficiaries in both education and protection outcomes. There is unquestionable agreement among respondents that the desks have improved learning environment and set a precedent standard for desirable classroom conditions in the camps. Age appropriated segregation of learners with morning formal primary and afternoon ALP is reported to have reduced over-crowding in classes and further contributed to the improvement in the classroom environment.

When asked what impact the project had on their lives one PTA member stated as follows:

“There are more schools which were not there before and there is increased number of children and youth attending school in the camps. Education was ignored but now it is so strong in the camp. Learning environment improved with desks and some Learners have transited to next levels. In the beginning up to now children are impressed to learn. On arrival children did not know how to speak English but over the project period, learners are now able to speak and write in good English.

Adult learners were separated from the young ones to catch up and they have learnt how to read and write in English“

Having a fees-free school, free uniforms, scholastic, books, pens, shoes and clothing among others for learners and for vulnerable children enabled many children who would have otherwise foregone schooling to enroll.

While it may be too early to celebrate the impact of the education component of the project for beneficiaries, it was evident from the enthusiasm of respondents that the opportunity for children and young people has created an atmosphere of hope and anticipation of possibility in life after displacement. Learner literacy in the English language was reiterated variously as a skill that has potential to unlock opportunities for further learning.

Peace and Conflict Management Committees involving the leadership of refugees, host communities, were set up before the onset of this project to work with humanitarian agencies and government to manage community tensions and conflicts over resources.

Notwithstanding the above, FGD respondents were of the view that the project made significant contribution to the promotion of peaceful coexistence in the community. They argued that as a result of refugee children from different ethnic groups participating in joint recreational activities such as games music, dance and drama, harmony between children and youth from different ethnic communities in the camps has improved. Children and young are gradually overcoming prejudicial sentiments that they reportedly held against people from different ethnic communities.

While the reduction in intercommunity tension and hostilities which prevailed during the project period may not entirely be attributed to this project, there is a widely held view among FGD respondents that the project made significant contribution to the promotion of peaceful coexistence among different refugee ethnic communities and between refugees and the host community. During a

FGD session with SMC and PTA members, one respondent pointed out that when host community children were denied access to ALP, there was no harmony, but when the education project component enrolled children from the host community the relationship between host community and refugee children improved.

The reduction in conflict between the refugees and host community was also attributed to the provision of alternative water sources at the schools. The provision of water though not funded under this project, was a result of good coordination and programming coherence between LWF/DWS and other implementing agencies in the camps.

The project doubtlessly provided much needed employment for members of the refugee community who were recruited and trained as teachers, and others who were engaged as guards at the schools. The income from incentives and recognition as significant contributors to public wellbeing has elevated their esteem in the community.

There were significant psychosocial outcomes for beneficiaries including unaccompanied children placed under foster care that can be confidently attributed to this project.

Socializing with peers seems to have provided an opportunity for learners to confront and begin to come to terms with the predicament of circumstances surrounding their displacement.

“Child Right Clubs training has enabled children to express their experiences; they have gained awareness of support alternatives presented by the joint referral pathway and they know where to access protection support through the protection reporting mechanism. The project has created proper understanding as we have known our rights. Every child has opportunity to Education. There is corporation, respect, encouragement, peace and working together which is bringing good security for all the people”.

4.7 SUSTAINABILITY

The basic structures for sustaining the project impact, namely School Governance Structures (PTA/SMCs,) are in place. These structures play a pivotal role in school management and in creating awareness, mobilizing communities as well as detecting and responding to protection concerns both at school and in the community. These structures need to be strengthened if they are to sustain the benefits brought about so far as a result of this project. Strengthening linkages between these structures and the traditional school functions and securing government recognition of their role could be one way of strengthening them.

The project has trained CPC, CRCs, and senior teachers on protection. Though the quality of teaching is still poor, there is potential for improvement with additional training. The Joint referral pathway for identifying, reporting and responding to protection issues is in place. There is a change in mind set with growing improvement in community awareness on the value of education and acceptance of ALP. Integration of host community children in the refugee school is yielding improved relationship between refugee and host community. All these factors create an environment for collective community involving in sustaining school activities.

With funding from other donors, LWF established school infrastructure which shall continue benefiting more children after the project phases out; Desks provided under the project shall be used beyond the project period and the community will continue sending children to existing schools.

The teachers employed and trained on ALP Methodology to support ALP have skills and shall continue to benefit learners and to benefit the community. The training of teachers conducted under the project for both formal and ALP teachers is thought to be a lasting investment in the quality of education in the settlement, provided the system retains the trained teachers. The training is reputed to have improved teaching skills among teachers which is anticipated will sustain improvement in the quality of teaching and learning in the camps.

The community may continue to benefit from ALP approach as long modalities for sustaining teacher incentives and replenishing supplies like text books and desks are put in place. Teachers will need additional training on participatory methodology.

PTA/SMCs have been established and trained on their roles and responsibilities and may with skills acquired during the training continue to manage the schools in transparent, accountable and participatory manner which creates space for children and young people to be heard.

Awareness raising skills developed in the community about the importance of education shall continue to be used. Community participation in school activities shall continue and community shall continue sending boys and girls to school.

The main threat to sustainability of project benefit is the lack of reliable sustained funding to pay teachers' incentives and salaries, to replenish school supplies such as books and furniture and to carry out routine maintenance of school infrastructure. While it is not likely that adequate funds could be mobilized immediately from parents to meet these costs, it would have been worthwhile to initiate a spirit of contribution in cash and in kind from the community. This could include in terms of labour, materials or know how as resource persons in various school activities. As LWF intends to improve livelihood among refugees starting in 2016 (LWF/DWS Country Strategy 2016 – 2021), parents should be prepared to assume an increasing role in the management of education. It also would have been strategic if the financing of the refugee schools was integrated in the government budget, as government holds the ultimate responsibility for financing and managing basic and primary education within its borders.

5. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

- The Child Rights Clubs (CRCs) were an important approach in raising awareness to children and parents on child rights. They embodied both a medium for awareness raising and a platform for peer led monitoring, identification and response to child protection concerns at home and at school.
- Community participation encouraged ownership and participation of School property. It improved participation and promoted sustainability of the project
- The participation of different stakeholders and refugee community aggregated into age groups and sexes e.g. children, women, men and youth plus humanitarian agencies demonstrated advantages of generating diverse perspectives and information on needs and intervention strategies, this was one of the best practices which should be carried on.
- Cost sharing practices on over head expenditures being practices exhibited in Ajourng Thok can be replicated in other locations of LWF/DWS. UNHCR and DRC provide electricity and water respectively; this could free good amount resources that can be realigned for project supports where there are gaps. The Maban Team can explore the same avenue with their neighbours in Doro base offices with Save the Children and DRC.
- Eliminating unanticipated operational challenges due to insecurity and bad roads and supplies had to be imported, thus resulting to programme implementation delays local available resource vents need to be identified for instance desk can be procured in Ajourng Thok.
- Awareness creation on new education model i.e. ALP, the importance of education to host community and refugee should be embarked on at the beginning of the project to enable a buy in and ownership to mitigate risk of non acceptance of the project and save time.
- The over-age learners need qualified teachers to ease management and administration. The training designed to address low capacity of ALP teachers was not adequate considering their low and diverse levels of academic qualification. The inadequate skills provided to ALP learners have led to poor management and administration, a lot indiscipline cases in Schools.
- ALP education is different from formal Primary education therefore; ALP teachers need separated and intensive classes as opposed to formal primary teachers.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 CONTEXT

- Considering the large and rapidly growing population with immense thirst for education, the project needs to be scaled-up to improve project coverage for significant impact on the population. This will involve investing in expanding school infrastructure and increasing the number of teachers. The training of teachers needs to be re-structured to accommodate their low and diverse academic backgrounds if high quality of teaching is to be sustained and enhanced. The project will also need to strengthen its existing partner coordination with other implementing partners to ensure that the non-educational needs of learners such as food and clothing are addressed to ensure that the learners are enabled to come to school regularly and in a “ready to learn” state of mind. Targeting criteria needs to be defined in future programmes and streamlined to deliberately target the various categories of education and protection vulnerability among children, other than age. This

should inform development of a robust database consistent with the various categories of education and protection vulnerabilities needs to be established.

- LWF/DWS needs to develop a contingency strategy to respond to unplanned increasing number of learners and sudden escalation of security threats.

6.2 COVERAGE AND QUALITY

- LWF/DWS needs to review its funding strategy with a view to establishing a diverse and sustainable funding to match surges in the number of learners with confidence to sustain a complete cycle of quality ALP for all beneficiaries.
- It is recommended that awareness creation on the new education model i.e. ALP, importance of education to the host community and refugees should be embarked on at the beginning of the project to enable buy-in and ownership among beneficiaries, to mitigate risks of non-acceptance of the project and to save time.
- There is a need to strengthen procurement management processes to ensure timely delivery of project inputs. Future projects should have pre-qualified suppliers both locally and internationally within East Africa incorporated as part of the procurement plan prepared at inception of the project. To avoid delays in delivery of project materials such as quality-text books, and desks, local sourcing of available firms needs to be done early enough, however, there is a need for coordination with education partners especially DFID and EDC, on ALP text books would save time as well the right content and right quality are obtained for future projects.
- Although the project reached and exceeded some of the planned targets, there were no clear criteria for targeting beneficiaries besides age. As a result, extremely vulnerable children like unaccompanied children, children with disabilities etc. missed the opportunity to enrol in the programme. Future interventions LWF/DSW should have written clear criteria for targeting beneficiaries and the criteria should be developed in consultation with key stakeholders. Develop clear written criteria defining priority vulnerabilities such as disability, unaccompanied status, HIV/AIDS status, child parenthood and child involvement in household livelihood strategies to guide field teams in targeting beneficiaries. The criteria should be developed in consultation with key stakeholders.
- There is a need to improve the quality of teaching and teacher training. Extend the duration of ALP teachers' training to ensure adequate grounding in both ALP concept and pedagogy to deliver content effectively. An initial three-week training could be provided and then followed by a two-week training on methodology in subsequent school holidays.
- Capacity building of County education staff and involving county education inspectors to monitor teacher performance should also be integrated in project design and implementation. Explore the possibility of engaging existing and volunteer teachers to support ALP interventions. Enhance the impact of learning of children and youth through capacity building of ALP teachers in both Ajoung Thok and Maban who did not undergo the teachers' professional development. In-service training programs for teachers should be instituted to add skills and subject matter for teachers while safeguarding the quality of education, this can be supported with teachers' forums for experience exchange on pedagogical skills with qualified teachers.
- In terms of coverage, there is a need to scale-up the project to reach more beneficiaries with a dedicated quota for the host community. Establish a separate adult literacy component for the over 17 age category.

- Establish a separate adult literacy component for the over 18 age category. This strategy will also ensure host community are adequately included to benefit from the project in order to further ease tension between refugees and host community and also to strategically ensure greater potential for government investment in the schools
- LWF/DWS should embark on strengthening installed structures within refugee camps such as CPC, CRC and PTA/SMC to carry out child rights advocacy, check on the quality of interventions carried in community, and support foster care system to provide adequate services to vulnerable children under care.

6.3 RELEVANCE

- Both in Ajourng Thok and Maban contextual analysis and needs assessment must part and parcel mean to inform project design and implementation, as well inform projects staff on indicative objectives, results and activities of ALP classes and child protection actions to be valid; since there is continuous influx of new cases of refugees and IDPs in Refugee camps? This calls for fund raising to extent the project period as well as expand to new places to cater for refugee and host community.
- Design a catch up program for ALP teachers separate from the formal school teachers to enable the low qualified ALP teachers to benefit effectively from the training. Given that ALP learners are unique category of over age children and the need for accelerated learning to recover lost time, and missed opportunities to learn other vital life skills, this calls for separate and specialised training programmes for ALP teachers to include all components needed for adolescent youths for instance sex education and reproductive health. It is further recommended that in future projects to increase the duration of training of ALP teachers to ensure that they have adequate capacity to deliver content effectively.
- When designing new integrated education and child protection project it is recommended to incorporate a sizeable recreational activities to strike a code with the children and youth that shall provide opportunities to organize, mobilize and manage peer networks and social structures.

6.4 COHERENCE

- There is need for LWF/DWS to engage beneficiaries in setting priorities and strategies through participatory assessment to ensure that beneficiaries are knowledgeable of the project purpose and objective, meanwhile linking various project objectives to work together to deliver change for beneficiaries.
- LWF/DWS needs to strengthen internal collaboration and referral path way between child protection and education sectors to increase impact. Schools are best entry point for child protection interventions when teachers and structures working in Schools are inducted on code of conduct and important of protecting children in order to create lasting safety impacts on children and young people wellbeing

6.5 EFFECTIVENESS

- LWF/DWS needs to re-assess operational risks and to review the security, logistics and personnel management in view of the volatile working environment. Early warning indicators of risk escalation and critical levels to trigger specified management response should be established. Project inputs

such as desks and ALP appropriate text books should be mobilised and secured early as per operational plan.

- The Government of South Sudan Republic should be involved to support the schools through payment of teachers' incentives and salary. It is recommended that UNHCR/LWF/DWS and Government work out a modalities to reactivate Government support to schools neighbouring Ajoung Thok and Maban camps in order to take care of over whelming children population.
- There is need to Strengthen M&E system to enhance timely monitoring of project activities. This includes revising log frame, developing appropriate tools; periodic data capture and use of M&E data to improve project implementation. In Ajuong Thok, focus should put to enter data into the M&E system instead of customizing CPIS-child protection information systems, the current staff recruited should be supported on his routine works, maintaining a consistent approach to data collection, reporting and management in close collaboration with Maban team or Program Technical Quality Manager to maintain consistency and accuracy in data being entered into the system.
- Strengthen of capacity of personnel to deliver the project effective, timely deployment and replacement of technical staff etc. this shall include personnel capacity to handle M&E system to enhance timely monitoring of project activities. This includes revising log frame, developing appropriate tools, periodic data capture and use of M&E data to improve project implementation and reporting
- At Juba level, its recommended that coordination between field team, department of LWF/DWS and programme management team should ensure that Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) on data collection and data management as well as ethics in data management are translated into practice, where possible a monthly meeting on developed unified approach be conducted at respective field location to inform Juba on the development more frequently till data collection and data management for the Refugee Programme are up and running.
- There is also need to work with stakeholders to explore use of existing teachers and volunteer teachers to support ALP interventions. For example, an initial three weeks training could be provided and then followed by a two-weeks training on methodology in subsequent school holidays. Involving county education inspector to monitor teacher performance should also be integrated in project design and implementation.

6.6 EFFICIENCY

- Joint implementation of project activities to complement each other agencies should be continued to avoid duplication of the same services in the refugee camps by pooling resources and strengthening coordination with other agencies implementing activities to the same population.
- Importation of goods should be done only if local procurement is not possible. On site production of desks could have helped to speed up furnishing the classrooms. Importation of goods should be done only if local procurement is not possible. On site production of desks could have helped to speed up furnishing the classrooms.
- Eliminate delays in procurement and delivery of project materials such as text books and desks. Exploring possibilities of local sourcing of available firms could be done early enough and in coordinated with education partners such as DFID and EDC on procurement of ALP text books to save time as well ensure the appropriate materials.

6.7 IMPACT

- In order to create impact on learning of children and youth, there is need to build capacity of ALP teachers in both Ajourng Thok and Maban since they did not undergo teachers' professional development; its therefore recommended that in-service training program for teachers be instituted to add skills and subject matter for teachers while safeguarding quality of education, this can be supported with teachers' forum for experience exchange on pedagogical skills with qualified teachers.
- The project should be continued so that enrolled learners complete a full cycle of ALP and link them for entry to formal education at higher grade for lasting impact.
- Improved literacy and benefits to the children/youth, the effectiveness of the community based structures such as the SMCs, CRCs CHD etc are needed to create additional knowledge and skills on children rights and complement with children responsibilities. The duo are complimentary in the growth and development of young people, and this shall have lasting impact on the lives of the new generations.
- Linking ALP classes to existing formal primary school, integrating ALP approach with child protection activities is an effective strategy to create lasting benefits to the refugee children and young people and community at large. Each of the activities above are complimentary to each other and when jointly implementing they provide double edge benefits in learning and safety of beneficiaries.

6.8 SUSTAINABILITY

- Inclusions/involvement of all stakeholders in elaborate awareness and planning is important for proper buy-in into the project. LWF/DWS should continue to strengthen community structures for school management (PTA, SMCs, and Teacher training) and protection enforcement.
- Joint Referral Pathway, resource sharing and coordination mechanism among implementing agency with education and protection interventions is recommended because these limit duplication of resource utilization, thus enabling sustainability.
- Host community children should be adequately included to benefit from the project in order to ease tension between refugees and host community and also to ease advocacy for government investment in the school.
- While it is not likely that adequate funds could be mobilized from parents to meet these costs, it would have been worthwhile to solicit community contribution in terms of labour, materials or know how as resource persons. Implementing an integrated programme with livelihood components to address poverty related barriers at home would have good potential for freeing children and young people to enrol and meaningfully participate in a complete cycle of schooling.
- LWF/DWS should work towards integrating the financing of the refugee schools in the government budget, as the ultimate responsibility for financing and managing education rests with government.
- Diversify project funding base to guarantee continuation of the project so that enrolled learners complete a full cycle of ALP for lasting impact.
- Involve the Government to support the schools through initial commitment to integrate the teacher in the government payroll and later to effect payment of teachers' incentives and salary. LWF/DWS should work towards integrating the financing of the refugee schools in the government budget, as the ultimate responsibility for financing and managing education rests with government

7. ANNEXES

APPENDIX I: FIELD WORK SCHEDULE

Fri 26 th - Sat 27 th June		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature Review
Monday 29 June	Entebbe – Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LWF Office – schedule & expectations agreement, discuss tools (Anek & Alexandra) ECHO – courtesy call + expectations
Tuesday 30 June	Juba – Maban	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel to Maban De-Briefing Security briefing by Julius Tiboia and Mosisa Kena Train Enumerators Maban (Wednesday site 1 6people)/ per camp: 2 education and 1 child protection. Staff not involved in training can arrange the mobilisation for the following days.
Wednesday 1 st July Maban	Maban (Site 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning together with the team: Testing Tools with team FGD - Children, Teachers, Camp Mngt + Child Protection Committees, Parents, SMCs School observation visits (School materials, curriculum, furniture, infrastructure – classrooms, latrines etc) KII – CRRA, NGOs, LWF, JRS, Save the Children, ACTED, List of the names and contacts, Country Education Director
Thursday 2 nd July	Maban (Site 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collection FGDs – Children, Teachers, Camp Mngt + Child Protection Committees, Parents, SMCs KII - State Ministry of Education, Camp Commandant, UNHCR School observation visits
Friday 3 rd July	Maban – Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KII – UNHCR Travel to Juba Interview LWF/DWS staff Meeting UNHCR – Education Officer
Saturday 4 th July	Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compile inception report (Anek and Annie)
Monday Juba 6 th July	Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compile inception report CRAA – Juba available
Tuesday 7 th July	Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel from Maban to Juba Submit inception report
Wednesday 8 th July	Ajuong Thok (Unity State)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel Juba – to Unity State De-Briefing Security briefing by Cathy and Anne Mwaura Data collection – KII IRC
Thursday 9 th July	Ajuong Thok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data compilation and analysis-Maban
Frid 10 th - Sat 11 th July	Ajuong Thok (Unity State)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Train Enumerators Ajuong Thok KII - Camp Commandant 10:00am KII - State Ministry of Education/County Education Director, UNHCR FGDs – ALP Teachers (2FGDs); ALP Learners (3FGDs), Camp Mngt, , SMCs/ Parents
12 th -13 th Jul 2015		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LWF team Ajuong Thok School observation visits Travel Ajuong Thok to Juba: Pariang County
Sat 14 th - Wed 17 th July	Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data compilation and analysis- Report Writing
Thu 17 th July	Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exit Debrief Travel to Entebbe
22 nd July 2015	Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of Draft Report
25 th July 2015		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration of comments and submission of Final Report

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS' RESPONDENTS

EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT TO CHILDREN AFFECTED BY CONFLICT PROJECT

END TERM EVALUATION (ECHO/CHD/BUD/2013/01003)

MABAN REFUGEE CAMP

No.	Name	Title	Organisation	Tel. No.	E-mail
1.	Wani George	Senior Education Officer	LWFDWS	+211927662465	-
2.	Alhaj Mammur	Deputy Head Teacher	WERAK PS	+211921386534	-
3.	Arafa Nasar Tigiral	Senior Woman Teacher	Dalmo PS	-	-
4.	Taban Anantas Idro	Camp Chairperson	Batim	-	-
5.	Kteran King	Team Leader	IRC	-	-
6.	Biniam Okbay	Camp Coordinator	DRC - Gendrasa	+211927026009	biniam.okbay@acted.org
7.	Ali Hussein	Camp Manager	DRC	-	cm.batil@drc-ssudan.org
8.	Jockshan Foryoh	Associate Educ. Officer	UNHCR - Maban	+211922405675	foryoh@unhcr.org
9.	Teboa Julius	Child Protection Coord.	LWF DWS	-	-
10.	Vincent Gule	Protection Officer	UNHCR	-	-
11.	Awor Aldik	Camp Chairperson	KAYA	-	-
12.	Saleh Nasir	Teacher	-	-	-

AJOUNG THOK REFUGEE CAMP

13.	Elijah Guor de-Bol	Payam Executive Director	Jamjang	-	-
14.	David Diing	Deputy Manager	IRC	-	David.Diing@yahoo.com
15.	Mabek Them	Country Educ. Director	PARIENG	-	nyokmabek@yahoo.com
16.	Elsie Yaokumah	Community Service Officer	UNHCR	-	yaokumah@unhcr.org
17.	Gabriel Masika	Shelter Manager	DRC	-	Shelter.man.unity@drc-ssudan.org
18.	Mugale Proscovia	Mid-wife, SGBV Focal Person	AHA	+256-785514909	Prossy.s21@gmail.com
19.	Maven Jinga Cathy	CP – Coordinator, LWF DWS	-	-	-
20.	Annet W. Kiuro	Education Coord. LWF DWS	-	-	-
21.	Anne Mwaura	Team Leader, LWF DWF	-	+8821621202120	-
Total					

APPENDIX 2.2: LIST OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS' PARTICIPANTS

EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT TO CHILDREN AFFECTED BY CONFLICT (ECHO/CHD/BUD/2013/01003) - END OF PROJECT EVALUATION

Date: 2nd July 2015

CAMP: KAYA		LOCATION: MABAN	SCHOOL: DALMO PRIMARY SCHOOL	
FGD for: PTA		Age Group:	25 – 50 years old	
No.	Name	Male (tick)	Female (tick)	
1.	Idriss Eloum Dirik	✓		
2.	Dahiya Kawaja Waifa	✓	✓	
3.	Abdalrahaman Sale Genjar	✓		
4.	Suileman Gifa Odor		✓	
5.	Amna Suileman Ziber		✓	
6.	Amario Al-Awad Idriss	✓		
7.	Mahadi Shawish Alufa		✓	
8.	Manara Jemer Ali		✓	
9.	Awadia Sirdar Ashol			

CAMP: KAYA		LOCATION: MABAN	COMMUNITY: LWF KAYA COMPOUND	
FGD for: PTA		Age Group:	25 – 50 years old	
FGD for: CHILD PROTECTION COMMITTEE		Age Group:	25 – 50 years old	
No.	Name	Male (tick)	Female (tick)	
10	Yusif Fadol Mohammed	✓		
11	Fatna Azaki Bandir		✓	
12	Suileman Gifa Odor	✓		
13	Asha Issa Zida		✓	
14	Abdalbagi Abrahm Mansur	✓		
15	Ziber Al-nima Idriss	✓		
16	Aziza Karaka Farjalah		✓	
17	Abukalam Dafallah	✓		
18	Farah Segerun	✓		

CAMP: KAYA		LOCATION: MABAN	SCHOOL: KALO PRIMARY SCHOOL	
FGD for: ALP Learners		Age Group:	14 – 18 years old	
No.	Name	Male (tick)	Female (tick)	
19	Yusif Jagor Adlan	✓		
20	Umjima Idriss Suileman		✓	
21	Haron Yousif Hassan	✓		
22	Alteib Koly Idriss	✓		
23	Manahil Bashir Jona		✓	
24	Homida Musa Yahiya	✓		
25	Afrah Ahmed Idriss		✓	
26	Gisma Karaka Yasin		✓	

27	Amina Al-teib Komodan		✓
----	-----------------------	--	---

FGD for: CHILD RIGHT CLUB MEMBERS		Age Group:	14 – 18 years old	
No.	Name		Male (tick)	Female (tick)
28	Omar Abdu Alamin		✓	
29	Umjima Amir Hamed			✓
30	Awatif Habash Mohammed			✓
31	Mohammed Ahmed Ishag		✓	
32	Toma Abdalrahaman Zerik			✓
33	Kamal Yousif Fadul		✓	
34	Teiba Yousif Balal			✓
35	Mohamed Miyas Azian		✓	
36	Mustafa Jima Mile		✓	

FGD for: CHILD RIGHT CLUB MEMBERS		Age Group:	14 – 18 years old	
No.	Name		Male (tick)	Female (tick)
28	Omar Abdu Alamin		✓	
29	Umjima Amir Hamed			✓
30	Awatif Habash Mohammed			✓
31	Mohammed Ahmed Ishag		✓	
32	Toma Abdalrahaman Zerik			✓
33	Kamal Yousif Fadul		✓	
34	Teiba Yousif Balal			✓
35	Mohamed Miyas Azian		✓	
36	Mustafa Jima Mile		✓	

CAMP: YUSSIF BATIL		LOCATION: MABAN	SCHOOL: GOLDEK PRIMARY SCHOOL	
FGD for: CHILD RIGHT CLUB		Age Group:	12 – 18 years old	
No.	Name		Male (tick)	Female (tick)
37	Faiza Abdalla			✓
38	Bashir Abushok		✓	
39	Saba Ajab			✓
40	Alemavo Hamiap			✓
41	Sourua Abdulliy			✓
42	Amna Shawen			✓
43	Haram Goljon		✓	
44	Ashaik Jadin		✓	
45	Sihamna Mohammed			✓
45	Zabala Alfil			✓
46	Walah Awool			✓

Date; 1 st July 2015			BLUE NILE PRIMARY SCHOOL	
FGD for: ALP Learners		Age Group:	14 – 18 years old	
No.	Name	Male (tick)	Female (tick)	
47	Fatma Adow		✓	
48	Anour Ibriham	✓		
49	Asha Noun		✓	
50	Daula Timsa Abdres		✓	
51	Asha Hissan Juma		✓	
52	Mohammed Abakar Salim	✓		
53	Ramadhan Musa Poing	✓		
54	Abdalla Ratham	✓		
55	Khamdan Daffallah	✓		

			GAMAK PRIMARY SCHOOL	
FGD for: ALP Teachers		Age Group:	22 – 30 years old	
No.	Name	Male (tick)	Female (tick)	
56	Alhaj Mamur	✓		
57	Jatui Aluas	✓		
58	Awadalkrim Mamur	✓		
59	Sadam Hamad Ali	✓		
60	Zahal Saninin		✓	
61	Saida Adgel		✓	
62	Abdarhaman Tillim Jerid	✓		
63	Azuber Mohammed	✓		
64	Marwa Sebit		✓	
65	Samia Abdalla		✓	
66	Longman Adam	✓		

			WERAK PRIMARY SCHOOL	
FGD for: Primary Teachers		Age Group:	22 – 30 years old	
No.	Name	Male (tick)	Female (tick)	
67	Ali Blula	✓		
68	Faiza Ahnazir		✓	
69	Majzub Odman Awad	✓		
70	Fatima Ajauari Basom		✓	
71	Imad Rabi Dafallah	✓		
72	Omar Adaeom	✓		
73	Khalda Hassan		✓	

74	Fatima Yousif		✓
75	Marjan Rajab Marjan	✓	
76	Asadig Sati Jam	✓	
77	Sabor Hassan Tatu	✓	
78	Omar Koifa	✓	

CAMP: AJUONGTHOK 10TH JULY 2015		LOCATIO: JAMJANG.	NAPATA PRIMARY SCHOOL.	
FGD for: ALP Teachers		Age Group:	20 – 30 years old	
No.	Name	Male (tick)		Female (tick)
79	Malachi Farouk	✓		
80	Timothy Paul Khamis	✓		
81	Tiali Barnabas	✓		
82	Eklas Atale Salim			✓
83	Amira Markos			✓
84	Stephen Abdusaman	✓		
85	Ayub Stephen	✓		
86	Naji Joseph	✓		
87	Santo Mustafa	✓		
88	Nuninho Hajach			✓
Total				

CAMP: AJUONGTHOK 10TH JULY 2015		LOCATIO: JAMJANG.	NAPATA PRIMARY SCHOOL.	
FGD for: SMC/PTA		Age Group:	25 – 35 years old	
No.	Name	Male (tick)		Female (tick)
89	Ismail Hassan	✓		
88	Samuel Osman	✓		
89	Hessen Kwa	✓		
90	Mamoud Muslim	✓		
91	Asia Tia			✓

CAMP: AJUONGTHOK 10TH JULY 2015		LOCATIO: JAMJANG.	NAPATA PRIMARY SCHOOL.	
FGD for: ALP Learners		Age Group:	14-18 years old	
No.	Name	Male (tick)		Female (tick)
92	Aziz Abudalah Ali	✓		
93	Philemon Silas Tutu	✓		
94	Abjuju Jaden	✓		
95	Aidah Hamza			✓

96	Nawal Jibrin		✓
97	Susan Abass		✓
98	Raila Hassan		✓
99	Stephen Ali Kuku	✓	
100	Salama Kochi		✓
Total			

CAMP: AJUONGTHOK 10TH JULY 2015		LOCATIO: JAMJANG.	NAPATA PRIMARY SCHOOL.	
FGD for: CRC-Child Rights Club		Age Group:	14-18 years old	
No.	Name	Male (tick)	Female (tick)	
101	Isaac Abass Abudalah	✓		
102	Fadina Tia Rahal		✓	
103	Tujad Hassan Tujad	✓		
104	Salma Kuchi Alkulum	✓		
105	Zacharia Arif	✓		
106	Enock Andrew	✓		
107	Ismail Abdulazie	✓		
108	Stephen Ali Kuku	✓		
109	Haida Sheik		✓	
110	Afaf Ahmed		✓	
111	Najima Atahil		✓	
112	Suria Mohammed		✓	
Total		62	50	

APPENDIX 3: REFERENCES

Document
1. Education Support to Children Affected by Conflict project 2013/2015, ECHO proposal,
2. Conflict Sensitivity Assessment. LWF, June 2013
3. Assessment of the education and child protection needs of refugees residing in the Yida refugee camp in Unity State, LWF, February 2013,
4. First Interim Report to ECHO, August 2014
5. SPERE, INEE standards and national guidelines relevant to the project.
6. Refugee Programme Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for Data Collection and Management - Provisional Release, LWF, March 2015
7. LWF Management Monitoring Reports 2013/2015 – Juba and Geneva
8. Mid-year review of implementing partners (IPs), UNHCR
9. Assessment of Education and Protection Needs of Refugees and Host Community in Upper Nile and Unity States of South Sudan – LWF, February 2015
10. Second Interim Report to ECHO, February 2015
11. Education and Child protection cluster meeting minutes during the implementation period (Links will be provided by LWF/DWS)
12. Educational Support to Children Affected by Conflict project 2013/2015, LWF/DWS ECHO Tracking Tool
13. Project Kick-off / Launch report or minutes

APPENDIX 4: DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

Ser No: _____

**LWF/DWS SOUTH SUDAN
EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT TO CHILDREN AFFECTED BY CONFLICT PROJECT
(ECHO/CHD/BUD/2013/01003)
END TERM EVALUATION**

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Date _____

CAMP:.....

Name of Assessor

Person Consulted
Name: _____
Title/role: _____
Telephone Contact: _____

I. COVERAGE & QUALITY :

1. Who has benefited from / participated in this project, who missed, why? _____ _____
2. What criteria were used for inclusion or exclusion in the selection of beneficiaries? _____ _____
3. What are the barriers to <u>access</u> and <u>quality</u> for education? _____ _____
4. What are the barriers to protection of children and young people? _____ _____
5. Which barriers have been / have not been addressed, to what extent, why? _____

6. What could be done to improve project coverage and quality in future?

II. RELEVANCE/ APPROPRIATENESS:

7. What contextual changes were experienced after project design?

8. How did they affect project activities and results?

9. What *activities / approaches* could you change to improve delivery of project services to the different groups of beneficiaries & host community in future?

Why?

10. Which activities showed greater relevance for the different groups of beneficiaries?

Why?

III. COHERENCE:

11. How were stakeholders and beneficiaries involved in the design and implementation of project activities?

12. What structures were in place to facilitate stakeholders / beneficiary involvement, in the design & implementation of this project?

13. How were international (SPHERE, INEE, HAP) standards and national guidelines applied in project design and

implementation?

14. Which standards and guidelines did you find challenges in fulfilling?

15. What structures and mechanisms are in place for national and state level coordination of education and protection interventions?

16. To what extent are these structures and mechanisms for coordination effective?

IV. EFFECTIVENESS:

17. What challenges did you face in implementation of the project and how were they addressed?

18. To what extent have the education and protection activities complementarily enhanced the wellbeing of children and young people in this project?

19. What mechanisms did LWF put in place to effectively reach more indirect beneficiaries; and if so, which beneficiaries?

20. What mechanisms did LWF/DWS put in place for beneficiaries and stakeholders feedback / complaints?

21. What role did LWF/DWS teams in Juba and Geneva offices play in supporting the project?

V. EFFICIENCY:

22. What measures been did LWF put in place to ensure efficient utilization of resources (funding, staff, time, inputs, etc.) without compromising quality results?

23. What other service providers / projects support the different groups of beneficiaries and host community?

24. How does LWF collaborate with other service providers?

VI. IMPACT:

25. What changes have been witnessed in the wellbeing of beneficiaries and host community since the start of this project?

26. What difference have these changes added to people's lives? (children, youth, persons with disability (and other persons)

27. Which of these changes are directly attributed to the project?

28. How were the unforeseen consequences addressed?

VII. SUSTAINABILITY:

29. What capacities (structures / resources) have been put in place to ensure the community continues to benefit from the changes realized during the project?

Ser No: _____

**LWF/DWS SOUTH SUDAN
EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT TO CHILDREN AFFECTED BY CONFLICT PROJECT
(ECHO/CHD/BUD/2013/01003)
END TERM EVALUATION
KEY LESSONS LEARNT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

Date _____

Person Consulted

Name: _____

Title/role: _____ **Location:** _____

Telephone Contact: _____

1. What worked well in the design and implementation of this project?

a) Why did it work well?

b) What impact did this have on the project?

2. What did not work well in the design and implementation of this project?

a) Why did it not work well?

b) What impact did this have on the project?

3. What needs to be done differently next time?

a) What would you recommend to improve in future design and implementation for similar projects in future?

b) What needs to be avoided?

Ser No: _____

**LWF/DWS SOUTH SUDAN
EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT TO CHILDREN AFFECTED BY CONFLICT PROJECT
(ECHO/CHD/BUD/2013/01003)
END TERM EVALUATION**

FGD GUIDE

Date _____

CAMP:..... **LOCATION:** **COMMUNITY / SCHOOL:**

My name is I am/ we are gathering information as part of the LWF/DWS South Sudan-Education support to children affected by conflict project Maban county. You have been identified as key respondents in this exercise. Your views and opinion on performance of education and child services are valuable for this exercise. Any information you give will be treated as confidential and will not be attributed directly to you as a person. Your name may be recorded in order to differentiate your contribution from that of other respondents. Please feel free to give us any information you have about this programme.

Name of Assessor(s)

TYPE & NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS _____ (Male = ___; Female = ___)

NOTE: FGD respondents target is 50% Male, 50% Female. Respondents should include persons with special needs where applicable and should be conducted in local language or any language well understood by all participants.

I. COVERAGE AND QUALITY:

1. What do you know about this education project implemented by LWF in this school?

2. Who has benefited from / participated in this project?

3. Who did not benefit from this project, why?

4. What groups of children / youth do not attend school, why?

5. What issues undermine the wellbeing of children / youth in this community?

6. What could be done for the project to reach more children and young people?

2. RELEVANCE/ APPROPRIATENESS

7. How useful were project activities in addressing the needs of beneficiaries?

8. How might, the project be changed to improve benefits in the future?

9. Which activities showed greater relevance for the different groups of beneficiaries? Why?

3. COHERENCE

10. What role did you play in decisions and activities of this project?

11. What new skills have you gained from this project?

12. How are you using the new skills in daily life?

4. EFFECTIVENESS

13. What challenges did you face in this project and how were they addressed?

14. Who has benefitted from resources the project has provided?

15. What is your opinion about services & resources?

5. EFFICIENCY

16. What other organisations provide support to different groups of beneficiaries and host community in this area?

17. Who has funded this project? (Who funded LWF?)

6. IMPACT

18. What changes have been witnessed in the wellbeing of beneficiaries and host community since the start of this project?

19. What difference have these changes added to people's lives? (Children, youth, persons with disability (and other persons.

7. SUSTAINABILITY

20. How will the community continue to benefit from the changes realized during the project?

APPENDIX 5: PROJECT LOGRAME & LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENTS

	INTERVENTION LOGIC	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS & TARGETS	PERFORMANCE
OBJECTIVES	<p>PRINCIPLE OBJECTIVE To contribute to the protection and education of children and youth in refugee camps in South Sudan</p>	<p># children & young people 12-17 years enrolled under ALP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets: 3,500 • Ajuong Thok, 1,000 • Yussif Batil 1,500 • Kaya 1,000 <p>1,455 non ALP (regular primary & secondary class students) benefiting from desks</p>	<p>3,109 Over age learners were enrolled and supported with ALP. The number of decreased by 11.8% from 3,525 reported in the interim report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yusuf Batil 891 (465 girls) • Kaya 555 (287 girls) • Ajuong Thok, 1,663 (494 girls) <p>3,894 non ALP (regular primary & secondary class students) benefited from desks procured under the ALP project</p>
	<p>SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE Children in targeted refugee camps have increased access to education and protection initiatives in South Sudan</p>	<p>% of enrolled students completing their ALP cycle in Yussif Batil, Kaya and Ajuong Thok refugee camps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: 75% (2,625) out of 3,500 students) 	<p>The number of ALP learners decreased by 11.8% from 3,525 enrolled at the onset of the project to 3,109. The decrease was in Maban from 2,525 to 1,446 (891 in Batil (227M, 465F) and Kaya 555 (268 M, 287 F).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the low quality of ALP teachers some of the pupils enrolled in primary Schools. • Some of the learners enrolled in secondary schools after entry exams and others dropped out to look for employment opportunities in the near-by oil field in Palochi and in the government sorghum plantation in Renk.
		<p>% of children participating in child rights clubs by end of 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: 80% (288 out of 360 children) 	<p>312 learners (155girls) were enrolled and trained on CRC comprising 86.1% of the planned 360.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 93% of the CRC members were active while 7% of learners did not regularly attend the CRC activities as there were attracted to other extra curriculum activities, such as the Child Friendly Spaces
RESULTS	<p>1. 3,500 children and young people have access to educational and life skills to advance to age appropriate classes in Ajuong Thok, Kaya and Yussif Batil refugee camps</p>	<p>% of trained teachers able to identify and demonstrate core aspects of the accelerated learning programme (ALP) methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: 80% (56 of 70 teachers trained) 	<p>77 ALP Teachers were trained to identify and demonstrate core aspects of the accelerated learning programme (ALP) methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ajuong Thok 20 (3F & 17 M) • Maban 57 (Batil 33, 28M, 5F, Kaya 24, 22M, 2F)
		<p>% of ALP learners advance to the next educational level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: 80% (2,800 out of 3,500 students) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67% of learners transited to the next academic level in Ajuong Thok • 78% transited in Yussif Batil • 77% transited in Kaya
		<p>% of School Management Committees (SMC) proactively addressing and discussing the ALP during management meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: 70% (8 of 12 SMC, 132 	<p>Out of 168 SMC members, 83% (10 of 12 SMC) of SMCs were actively involved in addressing ALP issues i.e. community mobilization, awareness raising on retention of children in school and also addressing identified child protection concerns and referrals.</p>

	INTERVENTION LOGIC	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS & TARGETS	PERFORMANCE
		members) # of joint monitoring visits conducted by LWF and the Ministry of Education Science and Technology to assess progress of the ALP • Target: 3 (100%)	One joint monitoring visits was conducted successfully with MoEST to assess progress of APL classes, There was a standoff between MoEST staff and LWF/DWS staff over payments and other visits were also hindered by insecurity
		% of children in primary/secondary day classes utilizing desks • Target: 100% (1,455 children using 1,455 desks)	3,894 non ALP (regular primary & secondary class students) benefited from desks procured under the ALP project •
	2. Children and youth are protected in the camps through the establishment of 'safe school environments'	% of Child help desks are able to monitor, report and follow up of cases of children at risks • Target: 70% (8 out of 12 help desks)	100% (12 out of 12 help desks) actively monitored, report and followed up on protection cases among children
		% of increased number reporting incidents of child protection • Target: 10% increase (350 reports from 3,500)	26% (941 cases reported by 3500 children)
ACTIVITIES	1.1 Recruit project staff - 1 Expat Education Coordinator, 1 local Education Coordinator, 1 ECHO Compliance Accountant)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Expat Education Coordinator • 1 local education coordinator • 1 ECHO compliance Accountant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 expatriate Education Coordinator left one month earlier to the closure of the project. Both ECHO Compliance Accountant and Ag. Education Coordinator was running the field offices. • Local Education Coordinator was not recruited but instead two Assistant Education Officers were recruited provide more supports in the project.
	1.2 Plan and launch a kick-off workshop for the action with HQ and project staff	1 plan & Launch a kick-off workshop for action with HQ and project staff	The kick off workshop was conducted and key action points identified were followed up during the implementation period.
	1.3 Recruit 70 primary school teachers to facilitate the ALP in 12 schools	<p>70 ALP teachers recruited</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ajuong Thok - 20, • Yussif Batil - 30 • Kaya - 20 <p>12 ALP project schools operating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ajuong Thok 2 • Kaya 4 • Yussif Batil 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,455 Desks Issued to schools 	<p>77 ALP (10 Female) teachers were recruited</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ajuong Thok-20 (3 Female) ALP teachers • Yussif Batil 33(5 Female) ALP teachers • Kaya 24 (2Female) ALP teachers • 12 ALP project schools were operating in the Refugee settlement. • Ajuong Thok 2 • Kaya 4 • Yussif Batil 6 • 585 three seats' Desks were issued to the ALP schools

	INTERVENTION LOGIC	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS & TARGETS	PERFORMANCE
	2.1 Conduct training for 132 school management committee members on handling child protection concerns within the school setting and referral mechanism	132 SMC members (12 SMCs) trained <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 in Ajuong Thok, • 4 in Kaya, and • 6 in Yussif Batil 	141 SMC members from 12 SMCs were trained and continued to support school activities in ALP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 121 SMCs in Maban and 20 in Ajuongthok (7 female, 13 male). • *In Maban SMCs were trained on psychosocial skills, Child Rights and child protection and were able to identify issues that affect children and provide basic psychosocial support to children at risk
	2.2 Induct 250 teachers in camp schools on their professional code of conduct, basic helping skills for girls and unaccompanied minors and separated children registered in the schools	250 teachers in camp schools inducted	250 (40 female) primary school teachers were inducted on professional code of conducts in the 12 schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Batil: 143 teachers (20 female); • Kaya: 87 teachers (17 female) • Ajuong Thok 20 teachers (3 female) • The teachers were trained on the code of conduct and child protection policy and were able to identify core aspects of code of conduct in Maban.
	2.3 Train 24 senior female and male teachers on basic counseling skills and guidance for all children affected by conflict with a special focus on teenage girls	24 senior female and male teachers trained <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ajuong Thok 4 • Kaya 8 • Yussif Batil 12 	24 senior teachers were trained and a refreshers training were on basic counseling skills and guidance for all children affected by conflict with a special focus on teenage girls as planned. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ajuong Thok 4 (2 female) • Kaya and Yussif Batil 20 (3 female)

CONSULTANCY FOR END OF PROJECT EVALUATION

Terms of Reference for End Term Evaluation of LWF/DWS Educational Support to Children Affected by Conflict Project (ECHO/CHD/BUD/2013/01003)

December 1st 2013 – May 31st 2015

1. Introduction

The Lutheran World Federation Department for World Service (LWF-DWS) South Sudan Program has been operational in the country since 2004 in three states of Upper Nile, Unity and Jonglei. In Upper Nile since September 2012 and Unity States April 2013, LWF-DWS has been responding to the needs of an influx of Sudanese refugees who fled fighting in mainly Blue Nile and South Kordofan states through child protection and education for children and young people. Following the major crisis that hit the country in December 2013, the contraction of humanitarian and protection space retrogressed progress so far made with the refugee programme in Upper Nile and Unity State calling for the need to maintain humanitarian presence in order to minimise the risks among the refugees. LWF/DWS educational and child protection programs have therefore remained critical for the protection and longer term wellbeing of the refugees. In Jonglei State, LWF-DWS has implemented several projects over the years ranging from livelihood services, the provision of safe water and sanitation, food security, peace building, reconciliation, and education. Following escalating insecurity, armed conflict and rebel activities between Sudan and South Sudan in 2011 LWF shifted its focus in Jonglei State from long term development to emergency response interventions in support of Internally Displaced Persons and the host community. This shift was further exacerbated by the December 2013 crisis, completely changing the operating context to life-saving response programs through 2014 to 2015. There is a likelihood that this will continue to 2016.

The Educational Support to Children Affected by Conflict project has been funded by ECHO and implemented by LWF/DWS South Sudan in upper Nile State in Maban County in two refugee camps of Yussif Batil and Kaya. In Unity State, the project has been implemented in Ajuong Thok Refugee Camp. Spanning for a period of 18 months from December 1st 2013 to May 31st 2015, the project targeted 5791 children, young people and adults directly through accelerated learning program and safe school interventions in the refugee camps with an estimated 30000 indirect beneficiaries. The project total budget under a co-financing agreement is € 631.579,06 out of which 95% (€600,000) was financed by DGG ECHO. In built within the design of the project was an end of project evaluation with an objective of determining the extent to which the action contributed to the protection and education of children and youth in refugee camps in South Sudan

2. Background

Following the outbreak of war between the Sudan Armed Forces (SAF) and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement - North (SPLM-N) in Blue Nile State, (131,331)[1] refugees, mainly women and children have been living in four refugee camps of Doro, Yussif Batil, Kaya and Gendrassa in Upper Nile State. According to UNHCR[2], 60% of the population is under 17 years of age and the majority (63%) is of school going age. In Unity State, South Sudan there are 94,174 refugees who sought refuge in Yida (69,534) and Ajuong Thok (24,640). The refugees in Yida are being reallocated to Ajuong Thok which is an acceptable site by UNHCR and GoSS. The number of refugees in Ajuong Thok has increased from 4000 in 2013 to 24,640 by end of March 2015 indicating 516% increase. While in Maban there were 117,465 registered refugees in 2013 which has increased to 131,331 by end of March 2015 indicating 11.8% increase.

Refugee children and young people have experienced severe disruptions in their normal growth and development, which has resulted in high levels of vulnerability and psychosocial distress. Coming from historically marginalized states in Sudan, the formal education system had suffered leaving high levels of illiteracy amongst children and young people. There is also a high level of over age learners in the early grades (i.e. 17 year old students in grade 2 or 3) and approximately 36% of students in Maban camps at the time of the inception of this project had missed significant amounts of schooling due to war and conflict. Close to 26% of the children and young people in Batil and Kaya camps had dropped out of school, resulting in high protection risks such as early marriage, underage recruitment into the militias, child labour and the adoption of anti-social coping behaviours. Boys 13-18 years of age residing in the Unity State refugee camps are particularly susceptible

to being recruited in to armed conflict by the SPLM-N. Approximately 379 (305 Male 74 Female) children and young people registered by LWF are unaccompanied and separated from their families but have now been placed with foster care families. LWF with support from UNHCR and other donors have been providing child protection and education in Yussif Batil and Kaya camps in Maban, Upper Nile State and Ajuong Thok in Unity State.

A number of assessments conducted prior the onset of the ECHO funded project of Educational Support to Children Affected by Conflict in the Maban and Ajuong Thok camps of focus (Kaya and Yussif Batil) on Conflict Sensitivity and child protection and education identified humanitarian gaps within the host community. Established as a key assessment finding, were the high value placed on education by the refugees and the need for the protection and development of conflict-affected children as initiatives severely underfunded in humanitarian assistance. Additional support to accelerate learning programs and safe school environments for children and young people within refugees' camps in South Sudan also remained an acutely underfunded necessity.

LWF-DWS rolled out its Educational Support to Children Affected by Conflict project with support of ECHO funding to achieve one principle objective of contributing to the protection and education of children and youth in refugee camps in South Sudan addressing the two core result areas:

- Under Result 1: LWF/DWS aimed to increase access to educational and life skills for 3500 children and young people to advance to age appropriate classes in Ajuong Thok, Kaya and Yussif Batil refugee camps
- Under Result 2: LWF-DWS aimed to protect Children and youth in the refugee camps through the establishment of 'safe school environments'.

3. End-Of Project Evaluation Objectives

The main objectives of the end term evaluation (ETE) are:

- (1) to provide an independent assessment of LWF response and its ability to meet the education and protection needs of children and young people targeted under the ECHO Educational Support to Children Affected by Conflict project.
 - a.
- (2) to take stock of experiences that need to be taken forward internally and externally.
 - a. What questions for who

Specific Objectives

Assess coverage and quality, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability and impact of the programme on the beneficiaries and analyse the education and protection implementation strategies;

Identify best practices, areas of learning and recommendations to contribute to future programming, decision making and investment for future interventions among the refugees.

Identify the value added through coordination and collaboration with other agencies working in the refugee camps. (Who is doing what? How did this benefit LWF?)

4. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

i) Coverage and Quality:

- To what extent did the accountability systems adopted by LWF/DWS ensure inclusiveness of the most vulnerable refugees, and disadvantaged refugees in the project and were the most vulnerable members of the target population effectively covered by the project?
- What is the level of equal access to project activities for host population and how engendered is this access?
- Which groups have been assessed and received support from the project and why?
- Has there been any inclusion or exclusion bias in the targeting of beneficiaries?

- Is the LWF-DWS actively addressing identified barriers to access and quality for education and protection?
- What could improve project coverage and quality?

ii) Relevance/ Appropriateness:

- Based on the contextual analysis and needs assessment conducted to inform project design and implementation, are the objectives, results and activities of the Action still valid?
- Were the objectives relevant to the context, has the context changed?
- Are the activities and output of the project consistent with the goal and its objectives (Analyse the causal link)?
- To what extent was the overall approach adopted by LWF/DWS relevant / appropriate to address the identified needs in Education and protection intervention areas for both the refugees and the Host Community?
- Which activities showed greater relevance for the different groups of beneficiaries? Why?
- Are the project interventions relevant to local needs and capacities?
- How can they be strengthened and what recommendations can be made for further improvement and scale up particularly among the host community?
- Were the activities in the intervention areas well enough coordinated among themselves and with other actors to prevent duplications and avoid gaps (particularly –but not only- with reference to coordination with other actors working in the refugee camps and with the host community)?

iii) Coherence:

- Evaluate the level of collaboration with stakeholders, in particular beneficiaries involvement, during the design and implementation phases of the project.
- To what extent did the community and children structures ensure community participation and youth leadership?
- What evidence exists that young people in the camp engaged with service providers and made meaningful input into the project management cycle and were empowered to develop broad range of transferable skills that build their capacity and resilience?
- What transferable skills (communication, facilitation, networking, expanding social networks and enhancing their interpersonal capacity and leadership) were developed among the participants?
- To what extent were relevant Guidelines, international (e.g. SPHERE; INEE Standards), national and provincial considered and integrated in LWF-DWS strategy and implementation?
- To what extent have the National and State clusters been involved in the information sharing and value adding.
- Has there been an effective coordination mechanism established between LWF/DWS and other stakeholders involved in service delivery in the refugee camps and host community?

iv) Effectiveness:

- To what extent have planned outputs and outcomes outlined in the Specific Grant Agreement between ECHO and LWF/DWS been achieved in line with the agreed timeline?
- What is their quality?
- Have the planned activities led to the achievement of these outputs/outcomes?
- Have the interventions effectively contributed towards the achievement of overall objectives?
- What were the main challenges and how have they been addressed?
- Do the indicators and available data provide adequate evidence regarding the achievement of programme outputs and contribution to outcomes?
- Are these indicators sufficient to provide enough evidence?
- How were primary stakeholders involved in the design of the project with respect to all components of the Action?
- How effectively have access to education and protection of children and young people worked together to achieve the project objectives?

- Are interventions well integrated?
- Who is using and benefitting from the resources the project has provided? What are the views of the supported groups and affected populations of the project?
- How effectively was beneficiary participation addressed and included throughout the program?
- Had LWF/DWS put mechanisms in place to reach effectively more indirect beneficiaries and, if yes, which ones?
- Did the project staff have an effective system (Standard Operational Procedures) in place for collecting, compiling, reporting and analysing the data? Any gaps identified?
- To what extent are findings used to adjust on-going activities and incorporated into further planning?
- Is there a feedback / complaints system in place for beneficiaries?
- What has been the level of supportive supervision from LWF/DWS juba and Geneva office and with other stakeholders in Upper Nile and Unity State?

v) Efficiency:

- Has the project efficiently used resources (value-for-money)?
- Is or was there potential for resources to be used more efficiently?
- To what extent have measures been taken during planning and implementation to ensure efficient utilization of funding, staff, time and other resources without compromising on the attainment of quality results?
- Were inputs purchased efficiently in relation to the source of input?
- Are measures in place to ensure resources are used appropriately?
- Was the project sufficiently monitored by senior management to ensure a good implementation and the greatest possible impact?
- What specific recommendations were formulated by senior management during project monitoring and to what extent they have been implemented?
- Did programme activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions?

vi) Impact:

- What are the overall effects of the intervention, intended and unintended, long term and short term, positive and negative?
- What unforeseen outcomes were caused by or contributed to by the intervention, and why did these occur?
- How were these addressed?

vii) Sustainability:

- What measures, and with what success, did LWF-DWS take (at both institutional and community level) to ensure that all interventions were sustainable.
- What could concretely be recommended to ensure sustainability of the action and linkages with other programs in the refugee camps?

5. Evaluation Users

The primary users of the evaluation are:

- DG ECHO – As the donor of this response, the evaluation findings will be submitted to DG ECHO for the purpose of independent verification of results, impact and lessons learnt as part of this response.
- LWF/DWS, Government departments of Education in programme locations, Refugee programme partners in Maban and Ajuong Thok and other relevant Refugee programme partners implementing activities in the refugee camps. The evaluation will be used to determine the effectiveness and impact of activities undertaken. The evaluation will also provide

opportunity for the respective agencies to reflect on lessons learnt and recommendation for future of such emergency response.

6. Methodology

The evaluation will adopt a consultative and participatory approach and is expected to employ mixed methodologies, combining qualitative and quantitative data to capture information relating to project design, management and performance. The information will be collected mainly through desk reviews of project documents and LWF/DWS Data bases and tracking tools, field visits to project sites, key informant interviews and focus group discussions with communities / project's direct beneficiaries (Children and young people) in the target refugee camps and Host community children receiving education and child protection services from the refugee camps supported by LWF-DWS

The review will, therefore, consult a wide range of stakeholders (this should include: LWF/DWS staff, local partners, clusters, government, community members, targeted beneficiaries) and will triangulate information to meet the evaluation objectives. The consultant will formulate in detail the methodology for the End Term Evaluation to be reviewed by LWF/DWS and provide feedback to the consultant before the process initiates. The evaluation will be informed by the key methodological principles below:

- The evaluation is forward-looking and will focus on the design and process aspects while broadly reviewing the results achieved through this ECHO-funded interventions to make evidence-based conclusions;
- The evaluation will adopt a highly consultative, iterative and transparent approach with stakeholders; and triangulation of information and data across groups of stakeholders and individuals will be the key method to validate evidence. The evaluation methods and tools will preferably include some or all of the following, among others:
 - Evaluation matrix relating evaluation issues and questions to, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection;
 - Desk review of reference documents;
 - Individual and group interviews including Checklists or semi-structured interview protocols for each type of interview;
 - Briefing and Debriefing session with the LWF/DWS Field and country offices.

7. Geographical Coverage

The Review will cover the Refugee camps in Maban Upper Nile and Ajuong Thok where LWF-DWS has implemented this ECHO funded project. The representative samples should be able to generate results allowing comparison of inputs and impacts on the intended population in the supported refugee camps.

8. Expected Deliverables

The consultant is expected to produce the following deliverables:

- An inception report outlining his/her understanding of the issues under evaluation including a detailed work plan and an evaluation matrix;
- A first draft report for circulation and feedback from LWF/DWS
- A final evaluation report and presentation;
- The final evaluation report should respond in detail to the key focus areas described above and be logically structured and include:
 - i) An executive summary,
 - ii) Introduction and rationale,
 - iii) Evaluation methodology,
 - iv) Findings
 - v) Conclusions, lessons and specific technical and operational recommendations which are Evidence-based , and;
 - vi) Annexes.

The final report shall be written in English and not exceed 50 pages, double sided (excluding annexes).

9. Phases and Timeframe

The evaluation will be conducted during a period of twenty days (Saturdays included) spread over a period of five weeks to give ample response time on draft deliverables and hence ensuring an inclusive approach with partners. The consultant is expected to be recruited and start work in June 2015. It is expected that a desk review is carried out, followed by an inception and data collection exercise during which the report writing is initiated. Following the completion of the draft report, a review will be conducted by LWF/DWS technical programme teams in Juba, Maban and Ajuong Thok with a subsequent finalization of the report. The evaluator is required to complete at least the following phases:

- Desk review, 2 days after signing of the contract.
- Inception report: - the first deliverable of the assignment is an inception report. The inception report lays out the consultant's understanding of the issues to be addressed in the evaluation, the information available and the methods for data collection. It spells out a detailed work plan. This will be completed about 3 days after receiving the contract.
- Data collection: The consultant will collect data through various means, including desk review, semi-structured interviews, focus group Discussions in the two project locations of Ajuong Thok and Maban
- Data Analysis: The consultant will conduct an in depth analysis of the data gathered through desk review and interviews. The causal linkages between the external and internal factors supporting or adversely affecting the project results will be projected to support what worked well and should be taken forward and what did not work and how to improve it for future
- LWF/DWS meeting on preliminary findings: After the data analysis is finalized a meeting will be organized to present and validate preliminary findings within the following 5 working days after the data analysis.
- Draft report: After LWF/DWS meeting, the consultant should present the first draft report within 6 days of the preliminary meeting;
- Final report: The consultant finishes the report after incorporating the feedback from LWF/DWS in the following 5 working days. The final report is expected to be completed and submitted to LWF/DWS South Sudan by June 10th July 2015 and to ECHO by July 15th 2015.

10. Ethical Considerations:

LWF-DWS will make every effort to ensure there is no conflict of interest on the basis of the evaluators selected in order to guarantee independence and objectivity. Prior approval for evaluation will be taken from relevant State/County administrative authorities, facilitated by LWF/DWS county teams. The evaluation report shall describe mechanisms and measures that were implemented to ensure that the evaluation process conformed to relevant ethical standards including but not limited to informed consent of children and other participants, privacy and confidentiality considerations. The evaluation team would convey purpose of the evaluation clearly to all stakeholders and target groups. Study team will obtain informed consent from the participants. Target groups must be informed of the evaluation purpose, rights and obligations of participating in the evaluation and agree to participate voluntarily. The study team will ensure compliance to child safeguarding policy and other policies of LWF/DWS. The study team will also take care of standards operating procedures for safety and security according to LWF/DWS security guidelines while working in the field. The evaluation consultant/firm is solely responsible for the final product. While maintaining independence, the team will adhere to professional standards and language, particularly that which may relate to the protection of staff and operations. All analytical results and products arising from this assessment will be owned by LWF/DWS.

11. Logistics

LWF/DWS South Sudan will support the consultants with all the logistics to include transportation, accommodation and meals (details will be provided in the contract)