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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

India is the largest democracy in the world. As a developing economy it has a vision of ensuring a decent standard of living for 1.3 billion Indians, especially for the future of its 238 million children in the age group of 5-14 years (as per 2011 census).

GoodWeave’s Child Friendly Community (CFC) programme aims to prevent children from becoming victims of child labour by promoting educational opportunities. The programme operates out of communities where families are associated with carpet weaving and home-based work related to apparel and home textiles.

This study pertains to CFCs which have been operational since 2016 in 15 project sites in Rajasthan. It operates across 14 villages in 3 districts in Rajasthan, and has contributed significantly towards providing more than 1000 children, an enabling environment to learn and continue schooling.

As a part of baseline study, 2,580 children (from the above-mentioned project areas) were assessed on their Learning Level Ability (LLA). LLA is measured on a scale of A, B, C in 2 subjects, viz. Hindi (National Language) and Mathematics [Math]. Of the 2,580 children assessed, 1,442\(^1\) children scored C, implying that their learning levels in both Math and Hindi were below par for their age. These 1,442 children were identified as ‘at-risk’ children and were the beneficiaries of the CFC programme.

134 direct beneficiaries were enrolled into schools with the help of GoodWeave since June 2017. Most were below 12 years of age with a good mix of girls and boys. These children were enrolled into schools by engaging with the parents and teachers from their community.

267 children out of the 2,580 originally assessed in 2016 were already in school but found to be irregular in their attendance. These children, with nearly equal gender mix, were nudged back into regular attendance (regularized children). This was achieved through weekly monitoring of school attendance and regular meetings with the parents and the school teachers and working with the children to improve their learning outcomes through the Motivation Learning Centre (MLC), serving as bridge schools.

Motivation Learning Centres set up by CFC not only provided a joyful environment for children to play, laugh, make friends, develop social behaviour, and have a sense of happy childhood, but it also made learning fun, thus ensuring children were motivated to come to the MLC everyday.

Avaluable output of the CFC programme has been 29 learning modules in Hindi across 28 topics, 22 Teaching Learning Materials (TLMs) developed for Hindi, 6 TLMs developed for Math, 1 English module on “Good Touch & Bad Touch” and 4 &3 worksheets for Hindi & Math respectively. CFC approach to collaboration is demonstrated by the GoodWeave team working with 2 organizations for their teaching

\(^1\)This number has been adjusted downward from 1,464 reported in the CFC Programme Information after triangulating with a subsequent report which identified 22 children records as duplicates.
materials, viz. 1 Math kit (10 TLMs) from JODO GYAN Organisation and 1 LIC Kit (consisting of 119 story books in Hindi & English) from Pratham Books. Books were also purchased from Eklavya Foundation, Barkha Series Books (NCERT) and books from Arvind Gupta.

The effectiveness of the CFC Programme can be established by the fact that more than half the children (refer to Figure 1 on page 11 and Tables 2, 3 and 4 on page 11 and 12) who were rated a ‘C’ in Hindi or Math in 2017 moved to a higher rating in the subsequent year.

CFCs provided employment opportunity to 50 educated youths as Youth Facilitators. The motivation levels of the Youth Facilitators trained and supported by a committed GoodWeave team have been the key enablers of the programme in the communities.

Poverty, parental illiteracy, lack of schooling facilities, unemployment due to illness, alcoholism and over population are some of the main reasons for putting children at risk of becoming child labour. While India has poor statistics on child labour, it is important to acknowledge the significant investments made in terms of policies, schemes and infrastructure to address the issue of child labour. Heavily funded Government programmes like Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (Education for all), Beti Bachao (Save the girl child), Beti padhao (Educate the girl child), Right to Education and Government Mid-day Meal schemes have ensured 100% enrolment of children in schools in the State of Rajasthan.

But along with some positive developments, there have also been ambiguous decisions like The Child Labour (Prohibition & Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 which allows a child to help his/her family or family enterprise which is involved in a non-hazardous process as specified in the Schedule- provided this is after his/her school hours or during his school vacation and provided that such work does not adversely affect the child’s school education. This amendment creates ambiguity and makes it difficult to monitor issues of child labour in the family enterprise as most of the family enterprise are in the unorganised sector.

In this social context of a developing country like India, the CFC objective to provide an enabling and fun learning environment and provide support to the children to stay in school is exemplary. Having such facilities in a village is appreciated by the community and child’s parents, improves literacy in the village thus contributing to long term development.

It is important to note that according to the Right to Education Act, the responsibility of ensuring enrolment, attendance and completion of education lies on the government and not the child’s parents. This makes all Government departments such as Panchayat & Department of Education stakeholders in the success of the CFC programme. In order to ensure sustainability of the CFC programme, it is suggested that various government stakeholders are invited to participate in future GoodWeave programmes.

The village sites visited for the purpose of this evaluation do not have much engagement with other social development organisation working in the field of education and youth employment. This makes GoodWeave a pioneer with experience to establish an ecosystem to encourage children to stay in school and promote learning. For example, the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) launched in 2001 by the Central Government
with an aim to facilitate access to elementary education, witnessed an increase in school enrolment, over the years, but not in learning outcomes. The CFC Programme, with its rich experience of improving learning level assessment should develop local NGOs to participate in the CFC programmes so that they can transfer their learning and experience for the greater good of all. This would also help the CFC advantage reach a larger set of beneficiaries.

The motivation of the Youth Facilitators, the support of the community, school teachers and the very obvious love for the MLC by children can be further sustained if GoodWeave develops a sustainable source of funding for this project. Identifying some of the Brands and retailers sourcing carpets from this region, who are legally mandated to invest 2% of their profits in CSR Projects can be persuaded to support the CFC programme on a long-term basis.
1. **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE**

1.1 Background of CFC Projects

1.1.1 GoodWeave International’s Child Friendly Communities (CFCs) offer educational opportunities to children in carpet weaving communities. The CFC model involves establishing Motivation and Learning Centres (MLC) to serve as “bridges” to improve sustainable public-school access among marginalized groups. It also involves working with government-run schools to ensure higher enrolment, attendance, and educational achievement for children. Since GoodWeave seeks to improve and expand its CFC programming, they requested BlueSky CSR Company to conduct an evaluation.

1.1.2 GoodWeave believes that CFC programme is essential for mitigating the risk of child labour, given the assumptions that:

1.1.3 When children are in school and learning, they are not working as labourers. Over time, as parents see that their children are gradually getting educated, which is reflected in their positive behavioural changes, they will then continue to send their siblings to school.

1.1.4 Marginalized families can be convinced of the importance of education, and along with local schools, they can mobilize and create a culture of education, leading to improved enrolment and retention, and reduced incidences of child labour. Irregular attendance at school is a key contributor to poor learning outcomes of children.

1.1.5 The CFC Programme in Rajasthan has been operational from 2016 to 2018, in 14 villages across 3 districts. The 3 Districts consist of 15 CFCs:

- District 1: Jaipur (11 CFCs)
- District 2: Dausa (2 CFCs)
- District 3: Alwar (2 CFCs)

1.2 Purpose of Evaluation

GoodWeave commissioned BlueSky CSR Company [BlueSky] to make an evaluation of the Child Friendly Community (CFC) Programme in Rajasthan, with the following objectives:

1.2.1 Examine the effectiveness of educational support for children through Child Friendly Communities (CFCs), with particular focus on school attendance and learning outcomes.

1.2.2 Assess the approach and strategy that has contributed to or impeded the ability of CFC to provide educational access to at-risk children.

1.2.3 Learn how parents and teachers perceive CFC, and how CFC affects the culture of the broader community towards education.

1.2.4 Determine whether GoodWeave is adequately positioned to provide strong, sustainable, and cost-effective CFC programme in the long term and whether partnership may help GoodWeave in this regard.

1.2.5 Shed light on how GoodWeave can integrate monitoring of educational and supply chain programming.

1.2.6 Identify lessons learned, unintended outcomes, missed and potential opportunities.

1.2.7 Distil actionable and strategic recommendations from the findings.
2. METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

2.1 Scope of Work

The BlueSky evaluation report focuses exclusively on GoodWeave’s CFC programme in Rajasthan.

2.2 Assessment Methodology

There are three sources of data that were used in the analysis:

2.2.1 Key Informant Interviews: The study involved collection of Primary data from key informants through one-on-one interviews and group discussions. This method of data collection was chosen to develop a good understanding of how the various components of the CFC were functioning and the perceptions of the community towards them. Additionally, 5 CFC Staff members, comprising of 3 male and 2 female staff and 3 GoodWeave Staff, comprising of 1 male and 2 female members were also interviewed. The counts of interviews are in Table 1 as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Bisanpura</th>
<th>Dhaula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFC Staff</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoodWeave Staff</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Facilitators</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers of Government / Regular Schools</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers of Private Schools</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of Government Schools / MLC [Age Group 6-14 years]</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panchayat</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 On-going Data Collection & Reports from CFC team: The following reports pertaining to Rajasthan CFCs were referred to:

2.2.2.1 Master List of Villages: List of children and their Learning Level Assessment (LLA) outcomes as of December 2017 and December 2018 in Math and Hindi by each CFC.

2.2.2.2 Learning Level Assessment Status: Counts of children rated A, B or C overall (based on an average of ratings obtained in Hindi and Math) rolled up by each CFC for the years 2016, 2017 and 2018.

2.2.2.3 Regularized list: Snapshot data of regularized (those with prior issue with school attendance, now attending school regularly) children from July 2017 to November 2018.

2.2.2.4 Enrollments through GoodWeave’s support: List of children enrolled in schools from July 2017 to December 2018.

2.2.2.5 Activity List: Counts of various activities conducted by each CFC.

2.2.2.6 TLM catalogue: Details on the TLM material used in the MLCs for Math and Hindi.

2.2.2.7 Tradecraft Evaluation Report titled “External Evaluation of Ending Child Labour and Forced Labour in Apparel Supply Chains in India”, implemented by GoodWeave and funded by C&A Foundation. Relevant extracts from the report were referenced to validate the findings from this study with respect to the Rajasthan CFCs.

3. RESULTS

Domains of Enquiry – Results by 5 Categories

The 16 topics listed in the Evaluation Domains of Enquiry listed in Table 1 of the ToR [Refer to Annexure page 26] have been addressed in 5 categories:

- Implementation of CFC Programme
- Quality of Instruction
- Reach and accessibility of CFC Programme
- Community perception and engagement
- Relationship of CFC programme to Child Labour Outcomes

3.1 Implementation of CFC Programme

The CFC programme with its Motivation and Learning Centres and Youth Facilitators provide an enabling atmosphere and guidance to learn basic language and mathematical skill that help the child to cope up with the school curriculum, something the parents and teachers find difficult to provide at times. The CFC programme has been successful in mainstreaming children with poor learning ability and thus contributing to the child’s improved attendance and performance in school. We arrive at the above conclusion based on the following data analysis:
3.1.1 The baseline study conducted in 2016 assessed 2,580 children between ages of 6 to 14 years, across 14 villages in Rajasthan, where the community has traditionally been engaged in carpet weaving.

3.1.2 The CFC Programme used a Learning Level Assessment instrument to test learning levels in Math and Hindi of children, assessed according to age-appropriate learning levels and graded them into A, B & C level of learning, “A” being highest and “C” being the lowest. For example the Math assessment included basic numeral identification to addition, subtraction as the age of the child increased. Similarly, Hindi assessments comprised of readability of letters to comprehensibility of stories.

3.1.3 1,442 out of the 2,580 children were identified to be beneficiaries of the CFC programme due to scoring a ‘C’ in both Hindi and Math on the learning assessment. These children were termed as at-risk children (i.e. at the risk of becoming child labour). These children were encouraged to participate in Motivation and Learning Centres (MLCs) that played the role of ‘bridge school’ to improve learning outcomes of the children.

3.1.4 The Motivation and Learning Centres (MLC), which are open for 3 to 5 pm every school day, operate out of the government school premises or community recommended locations like a community centre. These centres operate after the regular school hours. The mix of children includes regularised ones, that is, those whose attendance was stabilized with help from Youth Facilitators; Enrolled ones, that is, fresh enrolments into school with the help of GoodWeave and lastly, children already in school. Each of these 15 MLCs have data reporting attendance by 88 children on an average as of Dec 2018.

3.1.5 Since the inception of the MLCs in 2016, the performance scores on the Learning Level Assessments have been on a steady rise. The undernoted Figure 1 shows the assessment scores over 3 years as shared with the evaluator. The grades shown in the chart are averaged grades of Hindi and Maths. The green line in Figure 1 shows the percentage of children with learning level ‘A’; this has been on a steady increase over the last 3 years; the red line depicts the percentage of children who scored a learning level of ‘C’; this has been on a decline.

**Figure 1: Overall Learning Level Assessment Scores - Rajasthan CFCs**
3.1.6 The number of children identified as beneficiaries in 2016, 2017 and 2018 whose assessments were done are listed in Table 2 here under:

**Table 2: Number of Direct Beneficiaries Assessed by Year of Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Assessment</th>
<th>Number of Direct Beneficiaries Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,328&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.7 For children whose Learning Level Assessment (LLA) grades were available for 2017 & 2018 for Hindi and Math respectively, a healthy improvement in levels has been observed as shown in the Tables 3&4 below.

In the Hindi subject:
- Nearly 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the children who had scored a ‘C’ in 2017 moved to a higher grade (A/B) in 2018.
- Also, more than half the children who had scored a ‘B’ in 2017 were rated ‘A’ in the subsequent year. These assessments were based on age-appropriate learning levels.

In Math subject:
- Half of the children who had scored a ‘C’ earlier, moved to a higher grade in 2018 (A/B)
- 62% of the children who had scored a ‘B’ in 2017, scored an ‘A’ in 2018

**Table 3: Learning Level Assessment Outcomes for 2017 and 2018 – Hindi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindi LLA – 2018</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindi LLA – 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>2</sup>Summary report of Learning Level Assessments from 2016, shared with the evaluator showed a count of 1,328 children only and has been reproduced here as is.
Table 4: Learning Level Assessment Outcomes for 2017 and 2018 – Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math LLA – 2017</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td><strong>536</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td><strong>431</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.8 In so far as the data of the 1,227 children assessed across 14 villages of Rajasthan was concerned, the latest round done in 2018 also indicated a healthy participation of girls at 45% across all age groups, as shown in the Figure 2 below. The healthy gender mix is an encouraging sign.

**Figure 2: Gender Distribution by Age of the 1,227 Children Assessed in 2018**

3.1.9 An earlier evaluation enquiry observed that “Not all the at-risk” children were out of school when they went through the Learning Level Assessment. The same holds true in Rajasthan. Among the children assessed, the total number of children who were out of school at that time could not be determined based on the data of only enrolments provided. It was observed that 134 direct beneficiaries were enrolled into schools with the help of GoodWeave since June 2017. 80% of the enrolled children were 12 years of age or less; refer Figure 3 below. The proportion of girls among all enrolled children was comparable to the boys at 45%; refer Figure 4 below.
3.1.10 A total of 267 children out of the 2,580 assessed were regularised into schools from the 14 villages in Rajasthan since 2016. 87% children were of 12 years or younger; refer to Figures 5 and 6 below. It is significant to note that the proportion of girls and boys is comparable at 51%. Most of the regularised children are still in contact with the MLCs and have shown improvement in their Learning Level Assessments. This establishes the effectiveness of the regularization process. GoodWeave has been conducting a weekly real time attendance tracking of all at-risk children and has been following up with the school, child and the family to ensure that the child attends school regularly.
3.1.11 The Bisanpura and Dhaula qualitative evaluation visit demonstrated that the co-ordination among GoodWeave, the Youth Facilitators and the teachers from the collaborating schools was high. GoodWeave team and Youth Facilitators conduct 2 sessions a week with the students and the teachers to improve the collaboration. Over 40 such sessions have been conducted across the 14 villages since inception.

3.1.12 There is meticulous and detailed documentation at the MLC on children’s attendance and learning level. Case-file of every child documenting his/her progress is maintained at the MLC. The MLC attendance registers and case-files were shown to the evaluators but were not available in soft copy form for further reference.

3.1.13 The original theory of change document developed at the beginning of the CFC programme has undergone organic changes during the maturity of the processes. Moreover, there have been changes among the staff and some knowledge losses during transition of human resources. Despite this, motivated Youth Facilitators and Field Mangers have been a huge positive factor influencing the
success at the 2 sites visited. The Youth Facilitators are supported by a committed GoodWeave Team focused to achieve the programme results. Knowledge transition in terms of design, activities, report and results can be better managed by having consistent reporting formats from the start of the programme.

3.2 Quality of Instruction

This section details the effectiveness of the teaching processes being employed by the CFCs. The Teaching Learning Materials (TLMs) are the most salient feature of the programme, having helped improve learning levels in Hindi and Math as reported in the previous section.

3.2.1 A positive highlight of the CFC Programme observed is the quality of the training material, also known as Teaching Learning Material (TLM). TLMs are available for teaching Math and Hindi in an interactive manner. Jodogyan and Pratham books have been key collaborators in development of Mathematical aid and fun learning, known as the Playway Methodology. 1 Math kit (10 TLMs) from JODO GYAN and 1 LIC Kit (consisting of 119 story books in Hindi & English) from Pratham Books have been acquired as part of this collaboration. Books have also been purchased from Eklavya Foundation, Barkha Series Books (NCERT) and Padma Shri Arvind Gupta. In addition to purchase of TLMs, these are also being innovatively developed by Youth Facilitators in the form of hand-drawn charts and local games; refer to Figures 7 and 8 below. This has encouraged innovation and improvisation and has witnessed good engagement from the Youth Facilitators coupled with participation from children. These form a part of the MLC materials to support children’s education in a holistic manner. The improvement in learning outcomes as stated earlier validates the efficacy of the learning material and methods deployed.

Figure 7: A TLM for Hindi
3.2.2 The catalogue of the TLM developed by the CFC team is very detailed and exhaustive. The Youth Facilitators have found the content to be very engaging and useful for the children. Children in Dhaula and Bisanpura were observed to be very participative and engaged with the TLM materials during the evaluation visits. In addition to the Math and Hindi materials, Youth Facilitators also suggested having content for English to help children improve spoken English. The inability to speak English has been pointed out as a severe limiting factor for higher education and future employment among youth.

3.2.3 While the TLM content is of excellent quality, it was observed that it serves the purpose of clarifying the concepts up to elementary level Math and Hindi. Based on inputs from GoodWeave staff, it was observed that the content is comparable to school curriculum at the elementary levels. This observation, when linked to the low representation of adolescents at MLCs, indicates that MLC has limited means to address their needs at present. A discussion with the GoodWeave team revealed that adolescents perceived that they were over aged to begin primary learning. Hence, despite repeated efforts from the team, the turnout among the adolescents has been low. This presents a further area of deliberation.

3.3 Reach & Accessibility of CFC Programme

The following section evaluates the extent of success of the CFCs in providing educational opportunity to at-risk children and potential barriers that need to be addressed.

3.3.1 Every CFC Programme village collaborated with an average of 4 local schools to identify children during conducting the Learning Level Assessments and identifying at-risk children, enrolments and regularization of attendance, as needed. This has expanded the sphere of influence of the programme.

3.3.2 Current system of working with schools (identified as part of the project), conducting awareness session, demonstration classes of TLM, supporting the school with their list of irregular children, promoting reading habits by providing library books to the school and working with them through
the MLC has been effective. The CFCs conduct regular and structured feedback sharing discussions with schools as well as address student tracking related concerns on a case by case basis. The response time of the Youth Facilitators to child tracking requests has been commended by the teachers.

**Excerpts from government school teacher interviews:**

“We are supposed to work with weaker students. But since MLC is around, we co-ordinate with the youth facilitators and have seen improvement in the student’s all-round performance”

“Under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan, we are supposed to work with the weaker students and report their progress. But we are always short - staffed and cannot manage this. MLC is a big help to us”

### 3.3.3 Considering the fact that over 1,000 children are being served by the 15 MLCs in Rajasthan, the dropouts from the programme have been a small proportion. MLCs reported a dropout of 202 children out of 1,442 from the year 2016 to 2017, while a mere 15 children dropped out from 2017 to 2018. The dropouts were mainly due to children reaching 14 years of age (upper age limit of children supported in the programme) followed by migration from the village. Thus, overall retention of children in the programme is high.

### 3.3.4 The unintended positive consequence of the MLC is that it is being used by all children, both “at-risk” and the rest. Children in public and government schools have a safe enabling area to complete their homework or improve their learning outcomes with the help of the Youth Facilitator.

### 3.3.5 48% of the children attending MLC in Rajasthan were from Private schools, while rest were from Government schools. The children interviewed appeared happy and positive about attending the MLC after school hours every day. They thought of their school as a place to study and the MLC as a place to play and learn new things in an enjoyable way! During the summer break too, the CFCs engage children in Summer Camp activities.

### 3.3.6 During the evaluation visit to the MLC the evaluator interacted with the children with games and other fun activities. The participation of the girls was as good as the boys in these games. The interview with parents also brought out the fact that irrespective of gender, the parents were committed to educate their children as they believed that education was a means out of poverty. The data from MLCs shows a good gender balance too of 55% boys 45% girls. The teachers interviewed said that girls in fact did much better than boys, scholastically.

**Excerpts from Parent interviews:**

“Nowadays education is so important....whether girl or boy”

“Girls do much better than boys in school...they are more disciplined and dedicated”
3.3.7 While the overall objective of identifying at-risk children and improving their learning outcome has been achieved, there are other factors like Government backed development programmes which have contributed to achieving objectives common with the CFCs. There has been an overall improvement in Gross Enrolment Rates (GER), across the country, including the state of Rajasthan\(^3\). At a macro level too, the decadal figures of Census have shown a decline in the child labour rates among children in 5 – 14 years of age\(^4\). Some key Government schemes are listed below:

3.3.7.1 Mid-day Meal scheme, launched in 1995, sought to address the issues of hunger and malnutrition among children by serving hot cooked meals in schools.

3.3.7.2 Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) (2001) meant to provide useful and relevant elementary education for all children in the age group of 6 to 14 years; it recognized the need to improve the education system with active participation of the community and envisioned to bridge the prevalent gender and social inequalities.

3.3.7.3 The Right to Education (RTE) (2009) meant to ‘provide every child (between the age group of 6 – 14 years) the right to quality and equitable elementary education in a formal school’.

3.3.8 It was obvious that the Youth Facilitators (Youth Facilitators) were popular and recognised by the community members. In fact, there were occasions where if the Youth Facilitator was late on any of the days, the children would reach the Youth Facilitator wherever he or she was and take her / him with them to open the MLC doors! While the 2 sites had good Youth Facilitators, the discussion with the GW staff revealed that demotivated staff adversely influenced the programme in other sites.

3.4 Community Perception & Engagement

The following section discusses the perception of the community towards the CFC Programme; how it has evolved, how the parents and the community engage with the programme and the related outcomes.

3.4.1 The commitment of parents to provide education for their children has been found to be high, though many of them are illiterate or semi-literate themselves. The attitude towards children education has been changing for good over the past few years. The Community recognises MLC as an important part of their village, helping the children study and enjoy themselves simultaneously. Visible improvement in children’s behaviour, hygiene habits and study habits has been observed during interviews with parents and teachers. This has led to a positive perception about the CFC. Recall of the ‘Didi’ (as the female Youth Facilitator is addressed) and the ‘Centre’ is high among community members.

---

\(^3\)PRS Legislative Research – Standing Committee Report Summary  
\(^4\)Census – 2001, 2011
Excerpts from Parent interviews:

“Since start of the MLC, children are very enthusiastic to go there in the afternoon. They don’t waste their time playing in the dirt or picking up fights with other children”

“Child comes home and shares what they played at MLC”

“We might be less educated but want children to study and do well”

Excerpt from a Teacher’s interview:

“Have seen an improvement in children's outward behavior and personal hygiene. They have become more respectful to elders. Now learning outcomes are becoming important, so having activities in MLC to supplement school studies is very good”

Excerpt from a Youth Facilitator’s interview:

“Have heard some parents want their girls to do work like the Didi (female Youth Facilitator) when they grow up”

3.4.2 The CFCs have conducted several sessions over the past 2 years with an aim to engage the parents and the larger community. The following Table 5 gives the counts of various types of activities done since inception. Girl child education, Child Marriage, Child labour, Demonstration on how children are taught in MLC with the support and use of TLMs, Good Touch & Bad Touch, Role of Parents in education, sharing of children's progress and learning difficulties with parents group have been the topics covered during the sessions with the community.

Table 5: Type and Count of Activities Conducted in Community from 2016 to 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Count of Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Meetings</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mobilization Events</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.3 Youth Facilitators are seen as a source of positive influence on the children. Teachers of government and private schools regard the MLC as a supplement to their effort and are therefore supportive.

3.4.4 The Panchayat members interviewed in one of the communities were aware about the activity of the MLC and were willing to help raise awareness towards sending children to school.
Excerpt from an Interview with a Panchayat member:

“MLC is doing good work of providing tuition to the students. This will make their foundation strong. No other NGO/Organisation is working on this in the community. We can help raise awareness about sending children to school and MLC.”

3.4.5 The Youth Facilitator was recognised by the community as being associated with the “centre” as the MLCs are called. In the 2 CFC’s evaluated, the Youth Facilitators were recognised by all the parents and school teachers of the village. And the children loved the Youth Facilitator more like an older friend rather than a teacher. The fact that the Youth Facilitators were young and passionate to help their community also helped this relationship. The Youth Facilitators were seen as a positive influence on children. As many of the parents themselves are not educated, when their children (whether they go to government or private school) learn something good in the MLC – be it rhymes about addition and subtraction or rhymes about hygiene- the parent feel very proud of the MLC.

3.4.6 The CFC programme has shown that there is opportunity to provide employment to the educated youth of the village in improving the learning levels of the children by re-programming the CFC programme as a community supported sustainable programme. This has provided employment opportunity to youths, who are able to establish trust with the community they themselves come from. Interviews with self-motivated Youth Facilitators suggest that they see their job as a service to the community they belong to. Having had to play the role of community influencers and educators has helped enhance their own self confidence. The Youth Facilitator role is especially sought by young under-graduates. They are willing to devote a few hours each day to working with the CFC, while pursuing their own studies. These observations hint at the Youth Facilitator role being suited for the aspiring youth, to improve his/her confidence levels which could help access bigger opportunities in the future. Re-positioning the Youth Facilitator's role in this way could also help reduce the focus on their limited pay, which has been raised as a concern by the Youth Facilitators.

Excerpt from an interview with a Youth Facilitator:

“So many of my friends at college would like to give a few hours each day to teach in the community... but there is no opportunity other than the CFC here”

3.4.7 An unintended negative consequence of the MLC has been that the government school teachers now get a little less involved with children, knowing that they can pass off the problem of drop outs, poor learning outcomes and children with irregular attendance issue to the Youth Facilitator to address.

Excerpt from an interview with Youth Facilitators:

“they (teachers) don’t take trouble to check reason for irregular attendance or help weaker students... they just report the problem to me”

“the school teachers earn much more than us but since the MLC has started their work burden has lessened”
3.4.8 Because the Youth Facilitators have done a great job at improving learning outcomes in the MLC, the MLCs are considered almost as a free tuition centre for completing homework.

3.4.9 The parental attitude observed was that the respected the CFC but did not want to come forward to take the charge since they felt that they were not equipped to talk about education as they themselves were not educated. Others, who appeared to be more informed, offered to help spread awareness about educating children but did not readily offer to assist the MLC activities.

Excerpt from Parent interviews:

“what can we do (when asked how they could support the CFC programme)...we don’t know much about their studies”

“we can ask the others (in the community) to educate their children...it is very important”

3.5 Relationship of CFC Programme to Child Labour Outcomes

This section explores if the CFC initiative has been able to prevent at-risk children from becoming victim of child labour.

3.5.1 In both the Rajasthan project sites visited in Dhaula and Bisanpura, during the interviews and focused group discussions with the parents it was clear that the Youth Facilitators are very respected for the support they provide in keeping the children in school. While there was a 100% enrollment of children in school, the MLC was seen as a contributor in improving the child’s learning level as well as teach him manners, hygiene and other social skills.

3.5.2 The effectiveness of the CFC programme has been to enable a learning environment and thus provide an opportunity to an at-risk child who otherwise would have dropped off and become a victim of child labour.

3.5.3 It is evident that the CFC programme has been built on community trust and support and that it is seen as a contributor to the learning levels of the children; there were references about neighbors stepping in to encourage and ensure that children go to MLC whenever they see any child playing or loitering after school hours.
4. UNINTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE CFC PROGRAMME

This section summarises the observed outcomes from the Results section, which may have been unintended during the design of the CFC programme. This section needs to be reviewed to assess any adjustments needed to the future CFC programme in light of the unintended consequences.

4.1 While the CFC programme was designed and executed with the purpose of serving as “bridges” to improve sustainable public-school access among marginalized groups, the actual reach of the programme has been observed to not be limited to the marginalised group alone. A positive unintended outcome (refer 3.4 in Results Section) of the programme has been observed to be that the MLGs have become THE learning centre for children in the community. Children from the community, whether they were at-risk of dropping out of school or otherwise have been seen attending the MLGs. The reason for this is attributed to the child friendly nature of the MLGs pointed out by the children themselves. Due to the participation of larger number of children from the community, the CFC programme has been understood to have received wider recognition among community members, schools and administrative authorities (Panchayat), as opposed to being limited in reach to a handful of ‘at-risk’ or ‘regularised’ children.

4.2 A negative unintended outcome (refer 6.7 of Results section) resulting out of discussion with Youth facilitators (YFs) is that the school authorities in communities with CFC programmes were being perceived as ‘outsourcing’ their job of addressing issues of low attendance and working with academically weak children to the YFs. The interviews with teachers too revealed that they referred the low attendance cases to YFs immediately. The YF interviews revealed that this can tend to lower their morale due to the huge remuneration gap between the teachers and themselves.
5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Scale and Sustainability

While the communities visited by BlueSky presented negligible risk of child labour, it is suggested that relevant and significant indicators across all the CFC programmes should be compared to arrive at indicators depicting high, medium, low or negligible risk of child labour.

For example, The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 which allows a child to help his family or family enterprise in occupations which are not hazardous and not done other than during school vacations or after school hours. The following types of activities can be done to monitor if everything is above board:

5.1.1 Laying down indicators like (a) type of family enterprise (b) hazardous or non-hazardous (c) access to other employment opportunities (d) family unit details such as number of children, poverty level, access and application to government schemes, literacy level (e) penetration of digital technology, migration etc. will help identify a village’s likely level of at-risk children, that is, High, Medium, Low or Negligible. The CFC plan can be designed to observe these parameters so that communities which have negligible or low numbers of at-risk children can be identified.

5.1.2 CFC’s Identification of parameters with low levels of at-risk children will ensure regular business from reputable Brands and retailers to communities which have an effective and well run MLC. This will contribute to addressing poverty, economy of the village as well as ensure traditional skills are preserved.

5.1.3 Impact on learning outcomes; Math and Hindi modules work very well. Collaborating with other similar organisations across different regions will help in pollinating best practices in TLM more efficiently and help scale the programme.

5.1.4 More frequent TLM Training camps for Government teachers as a part of the CFC activity will help garner more support from them regarding identifying at-risk children. Higher motivation and improved teaching by the government teachers might result in better interaction during lessons and consequently better school attendance of children.

5.1.5 Sustainability has to be built in from the start of the programme by identifying and engaging stakeholders (Panchayat, parents, Government Departments, schools etc.) who can share some responsibility of the programme. The deliverables of the CFC programme should align with some of the larger deliverables of the local government, like literacy levels, Right to Education. For example, the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) programme launched in 2005 initially focused on getting children into schools. But in 2017, the SSA narrative sought to address the improvement in learning outcomes and not just getting children into schools. The CFC programme has rich, experience and tried and tested Teaching Learning Materials to improve learning outcomes. There is an opportunity to leverage these strengths and showcase best practices to collaborate with SSA which can enhance the scale of the CFC programme considerably.

---

5 Assessment based on media reports
5.1.6 As part of the CFC programme design, it is important to identify and engage stakeholders like Brands, Suppliers, Contractors etc. The shared ownership and supply chain responsibility of these Brands, suppliers and contractors can be designed to contribute to long term support of the CFC programme.

5.1.7 The current study observed that there are no other development organisations in the area. Hence GoodWeave can consider identifying and developing smaller and more local NGOs and training them for the CFC. This will help in distilling the current programme experience to the local talent and encourage GoodWeave to be a leader for other innovative initiatives.

5.2 Best Practices

5.2.1 Collaboration with Jodogyan, Pratham and other organisations working in the field of learning outcomes is a good practice.

5.2.2 Collaboration with local school teachers of private and government schools; this has been implemented very well.

5.2.3 Regular training of Youth Facilitators and field teams with the GoodWeave team.

5.2.4 Using local language, folk music tunes and traditional games to teach concepts.

5.2.5 Maintenance and documentation of progress of each and every child at the MLC.

5.3 Lessons Learnt for Future Programmes

5.3.1 To include for effective implementation

5.3.1.1 Assess the educational needs of the adolescent children group (13 to less than 14 years) and develop appropriate TLM modules.

5.3.1.2 To ensure robustness of programme data and to tie all loose ends, track the at-risk children even after they are regularised in school till they have completed 14 years of age.

5.3.1.3 The Youth Facilitators are one of the main stakeholders of the CFC programme. Identifying additional deliverables and activities for them and employing them with full day wages will provide employment to educated youth. Currently they are employed for 3 hours (MLC operational hours) which is not a sustainable employment option for them.

5.3.1.4 Including TLM modules for English will be very appreciated by the children as well as the parents.

5.3.2 To Integrate CFC into Supply Chain Surveillance

5.3.2.1 Supply chain surveillance can come in only when the Brands are transparent about their supply chain. Brands need to determine their sphere of influence in the supply chain and train the supply chain links like contractors, community cooperatives, and panchayats to identify and share the responsibility of ensuring good education to the children. The core context of the evaluation of CFC Programme done by BlueSky CSR in Rajasthan did not have components of supply chain surveillance.
5.3.3 To Achieve Feasibility of Scaling

5.3.3.1 There are demographic indicators, the presence or absence of which indicates the risk of child labour. The 2 villages of Dhaula and Bisanpura have indicators which point out to a negligible risk of child labour. Such indicators need to be further defined and communicated to Brands so that they are confident about sourcing from home-based industry such as the ones available in Dhaula and Bisanpura.

5.3.3.2 The programme needs to build in shared ownership with local bodies at the village level e.g. Panchayat and government schools at the design stage itself so that Stakeholders responsibility can be transitioned easily after the initial stage.

5.3.3.3 The indicators of the CFC programme should be aligned to the larger deliverables of the social development programmes initiated by Government; indicators like literacy levels, gender parity in education, age-based learning outcomes, employment of rural educated youth etc. This will ensure higher integration and ownership of the CFC programme in the community as well as a higher degree of adoption by the government functions and departments.
# ANNEXURE

Domain of Enquiry From ToR Mapped to 5 Categories of the Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Categories of Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of identification of at-risk children</td>
<td>How effective has the process been by which the CFC initiative has identified at-risk children?</td>
<td>1. Implementation of CFC Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of targeting and enrolment</td>
<td>Could the pilot have done more to increase children’s access to education? What opportunities were missed, and what has been learnt?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student enrolment and retention</td>
<td>How effective has the CFC initiative been at connecting non-school going children to educational opportunity? How effective have CFC been at improving school attendance among school-going children? How effective has the CFC initiative been at retaining and improving learning levels of students in Motivation and Learning Centers (MLC)? How much attrition in school attendance is observed, and what are the causes for attrition? Is attrition higher among girls or boys, older or younger children?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instruction</td>
<td>How effective are approaches used in CFC programming in improving children’s learning levels?</td>
<td>2. Quality of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach of CFC</td>
<td>How successful has CFC been in providing educational opportunities to at-risk children in the target communities? Since the CFC began operation, what changes to beliefs and practices around education and child labor have been made and why? What was the effect of these changes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of CFC</td>
<td>What are the barriers to children’s participation in CFC programmes? Are there specific barriers for boys, girls, adolescents or older youth?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community perceptions of CFC programme and the value of education</td>
<td>What is the community’s perception of the usefulness of the programme? Has this changed since the CFC started operations? Have GoodWeave interventions influenced parental perceptions on the value of education? If so, how?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>How effective has the CFC initiative been in engaging youth, parents, teachers and principals, in building a Child Friendly Community?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes in the community</td>
<td>Has the CFC had an impact on youth facilitators, parents of children in CFC, other children in the community, or the community more broadly?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship of CFC programme to child labor outcome</td>
<td>How is the CFC intervention impacting child labour situation in immediate and long term?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Safeguarding</td>
<td>What trainings, systems and resources are in place to ensure the safety and protection of children in CFC?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges to effective implementation</td>
<td>What external and internal factors as well as challenges and risks have influenced the program meme delivery, successes and failures? In what ways?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors impacting potential for sustainability</td>
<td>What is needed for CFC to sustain programme impact on enrollment and learning outcomes? How can CFC expand their impact in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data collection processes to strengthen programmes</td>
<td>How can CFC be integrated into supply chain surveillance? How can we combine our social programming with our auditing processes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of scaling</td>
<td>Is the CFC project currently in a position to sustain itself / scale? If so, how can effectiveness and efficiency be maintained as it scales? If not, what are the factors that could enable the project to sustain and / or scale in the future?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there opportunities for CFC to become more cost effective, particularly as they expand?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and management of CFC</td>
<td>Should GoodWeave consider engaging partners to implement CFC programmes? What would be the benefits and drawbacks of this approach?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>