

Final Evaluation Report of the Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts Phase 2 Project

Peter Ninnés
A. N. S. Habibur Rahman
Tanay Dewan

March 2015

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	ii
Acronyms	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Executive Summary.....	vi
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Project Background	1
1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation	2
1.3 Composition of the Evaluation Team	2
1.4 Key Issues Addressed	2
1.4.1 Alignment and Synergy	2
1.4.2 Major Achievements	3
1.4.3 Linkage and Coordination.....	3
1.4.4 Constraint and Challenges	3
1.4.5 Effectiveness and Efficiency.....	3
1.5 Outputs of the Evaluation.....	3
1.6 Methodology and Structure of the Evaluation	3
1.7 Limitations of the Evaluation	4
2. The Development Challenges and Project Response	5
2.1 The Development Challenges	5
2.2 Responses by the Government of Bangladesh	6
2.2.1 Constitutional and Policy Responses.....	6
2.2.2 Sector-Wide Approaches.....	6
2.3 Activities of Other Development Partners and NGOs.....	9
2.4 UNDP Responses.....	9
3. Findings.....	11
3.1 Project Relevance	11
3.1.1 Relevance of the Activities and Outputs to the Objectives of the Project	11
3.1.2 Relevance of the Activities and Outputs to the Intended Impacts	12
3.1.3 Relevance to the GoB	13
3.1.4 Relevance to the HDCs	13
3.1.5 Relevance to Schools and their Communities	14
3.2 Integration Potentials.....	14
3.3 Clarity of Roles.....	15
3.3.1 Roles under the Peace Accord and the Hills District Acts	15
3.3.2 DPE and HDC Officials' Understanding of their Roles	16
3.4 Efficiency	16
3.4.1 Cost Efficiency.....	16
3.4.2 Time Efficiency	17
3.4.3 Comparison with Alternate Approaches.....	17
3.5 Effectiveness.....	18
3.5.1 Effectiveness of Policy Focused Advocacy and Support.....	18
3.5.2 Effectiveness of the Systems Strengthening Activities	19
3.5.3 Effectiveness of the Activities to Improve Access	20
3.5.4 Effectiveness of the Activities to Improve Educational Quality	22
3.5.5 Effectiveness of the MLE Activities	23
3.5.6 Effectiveness of the Project Design	25
3.5.7 Effectiveness of Project Management and Coordination.....	26
3.5.8 Effectiveness of Administrative, Operational and Technical Aspects	27
3.6 Impact of Project Activities	27

3.6.1 Achievements of the Project Against the Project Indicators	27
3.6.2 Impact of the Activities on Student Learning	30
3.6.3 Unintended Impacts	30
3.7 Sustainability.....	30
3.7.1 Sustainability in the Current Policy and Programme Environment	30
3.7.1 Views on Sustainability of Stakeholders in the CHT	31
4. Conclusions	32
5. Lessons Learned, Recommendations and Future Projects.....	34
5.1 Lessons Learned.....	34
5.2 Recommendations for Way Forward and Future Projects	34
6. Annexes.....	37
Annex 1. Terms of Reference	37
Annex 2. Itinerary	40
Annex 3. Interviews and Focus Groups	41
Annex 4. List of Documents Reviewed.....	44
Annex 5. Data Collection and Analysis Instruments	46
Annex 5a. Interview Protocols	46
Annex 5b. Focus Group Discussion Questions.....	51
Annex 5c. School Observation Checklist.....	54
Annex 5d. Curriculum Materials Analysis Rubric	55
Annex 6. Project Achievements against the Indicators.....	56

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1 Performance of Three Hill Districts on MICS Education Indicators, 2009.	5
Table 2 Upazilas Involved in SBECHT-2	10
Table 3 Project Expenditure Per Student Per Year	16

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ALP	Adult Literacy Program
AOP	Annual Operating Plan
BHDC	Bandarban Hill District Council
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CHT	Chittagong Hill Tracts
CHTDF	UNDP's Chittagong Hill Tracts Development Facility
CHTRC	Chittagong Hill Tracts Regional Council
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
DFAT	Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DFATD	Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development
DFID	UK Department for International Development
DG	Director General
DM	District Manager
DPE	Directorate of Primary Education
DPEO	District Primary Education Officer
DPEP	District Primary Education Plan
ED	Executive Director
EFA	Education for All
EFS	Education Field Supervisor
EO	Education Officer
EU	European Union
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
G&IE	Gender and Inclusive Education
GoB	Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
GPE	Global Partnership for Education
GPS	Government Primary School
HDC	Hills District Council
IDA	World Bank's International Development Association
IMLI	International Mother Language Institute
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
KHDC	Khagrachari Hill District Council
L1	First Language, Mother Tongue
L2	Second Language
LNGO	Local Non Government Organisation
LOA	Letter of Agreement
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MDG2	The second Millennium Development Goal
MG	Mothers' Group
MICS	Multi-indicator Cluster Survey
MLE	Multilingual Education
MO	Monitoring Officer
MoCHTA	Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs
MoEF	Ministry of Environment and Forests
MoPME	Ministry of Primary and Mass Education
MoWCA	Ministry of Women's and Children's Affairs
MT	Mother Tongue
MTB-MLE	Mother Tongue Based Multilingual Education
NCTB	National Curriculum & Textbook Board
NEP	National Education Policy
NGO	Non-government Organisation
NGPS	Non Government Primary School
PCJSS	Parbatya Chattagram Jana Sanghati Samiti, a political party in the CHT
PEC	Primary Education Completion examinations, commonly called PSC exams
PEDP-II	2 nd Primary Education Development Program
PEDP-III	3 rd Primary Education Development Program
PP-1	Pre-primary year 1
PP-2	Pre-primary year 2
PPE	Pre-primary Education
PTA	Parents Teachers Association

RHDC	Rangamati Hill District Council
RNGPS	Registered Non-government Primary School
SAS	A local NGO in Rangamati District
SBECHT-1	Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts- Phase 1 Project
SBECHT-2	Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts- Phase 2 Project
SF	School Feeding Programme
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SIL	Summer Institute of Linguistics
SLIP	School Level Improvement Plan
SMC	School Management Committee
SMF	Social Management Framework
SWAp	Sector Wide Approach
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee of SBECHT-2
TNGO	Transnational Non Government Organisation
TO	Training Officer
TOYMU	A local NGO in Bandarban District
UEO	Upazila Education Officer
UN	The United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UPEP	Upazila Primary Education Plan
URC	Upazila Resource Centre
WFP	World Food Programme

Acknowledgements

The Final Evaluation of SBECHE-2 Project has been carried out with the support and cooperation of a wide range of stakeholders. Our sincere gratitude goes to the CHTDF officials in the Dhaka office, Mr. Henrick Larson, Mr. Robert Stoelman, Mr. AHM Mohiuddin, Ms Aiko Cakir and Mr Jefarson Chakma for their support and assistance during this evaluation.

Mr. Shwe Aung Prue and Mr. Sukheshwar Chakma from the CHTDF office in Rangamati supported the fieldwork in CHT and we thank them for their substantial assistance and patience with our numerous questions.

For their feedback on the project, we would particularly like to thank Mr Abdul Mozid Shah Akond, Joint Secretary, MoCHTA; Mr Serdar Md. Keramat Ali, Deputy Secretary, MoPME; and Mr Murshid Akhter, Research Officer, NCTB.

Among the donors, we are grateful for the insights of Mr James Jennings from the Australian High Commission in his capacity as Chair of the PEDP-III consortium; Mr Fabrizio Senesi, Mr Jurgen Heimann, and Ms Nadia Rashid from the Delegation of the EU to Bangladesh; and Mr Joseph Sebhatu from the Canadian High Commission and Mr Ali Md. Shahiduzzaman from DFATD.

From the TNGO and UN agencies we wish to extend our gratitude to Dr Kiichi Oyasu, Mr M. Shahidul Islam and Mrs Shereen Akhter from UNESCO; Mr M. Zahirul Islam from WFP; and Mrs Meherun Nahar Shapna and Mr Deba Pria Chakma from Save the Children.

Mr. Nikhil Kumar Chakma, honorable Chairman of RHDC, Mr. Dr. Nilu Kumar Tanchangya, Mr. Thumra Ching Chowdhury, Councilors of CHTRC, and Mr. Aung Swe Pru, Councilor of RHDC have given their valuable views on ensuring access and retention of the CHT children in the primary education.

The Evaluation Team express their gratitude to Mr. Mominur Rashid Amin, CEO of BHDC, Ms. Suparna Chakma, EO of CHTRC, Mr. Riton Kumar Barua, DPEO, Khagrachari, Mr. Shahidul Azam, DPEO (In-charge), Bandarban, Mr. Mans Mukul Chakma, UEO, Rajastali and Mr. Jasim Uddin, URC Instructor (In-charge), Mohalchari. They all showed their concern for continuation of education of the CHT children.

The SBECHE project staff of the three HDCs have extended their kind support for conducting the field level evaluation of the assignment. Among them, Mr. Shyamal Mitra Chakma, EO, RHDC, Mr. Pongkajmoy Tripura, EO, BHDC, Mr. Hridoy Kumar Tripura, MO, KHDC, Mr. U Mong Sing Marma, MO, BHDC, Mr. Mintu Marma, Mr. Baching Chak, Mr. Umong Hla Marma, EFS, BHDC, Mr. Monindra Tripura, Mr. Lal Liansang Loncheo, TO, BHDC, Mr. Ripon Ghosh, Mr. Promod Chakma, EFS, RHDC, Ms. Porichita Khisa, Mr. Suketon Chakma, TO, KHDC have played active roles in arranging school and community level FGDs.

We wish to express our thanks to the heads and concerned officers of Toymu, SAS and Zabarang LNGOs for sharing their experiences of working with the project.

Finally, very special thanks go to the 385 FGD participants from SMCs, MGs, PTAs, teachers and students whose views were vital to this evaluation.

Peter Nannes, Team Leader
ANS Habibur Rahman, Education Expert
Tanay Dewan, CHT Expert

Executive Summary

(Brief description of the project, context and purpose of the evaluation and main conclusions/findings, recommendations for way forward and lessons learned);

Description of the Project

1. The Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts Phase 2 (SBECHT-2) project ran from 2010 to 2014 and aimed to contribute to improve socioeconomic development in the CHT in line with the principles in the CHT Accord by establishing and promoting access to quality primary education in the CHT. It built on the achievements and lessons learned from the first phase of the project (2008-9).

2. The main activities in SBECHT-2 were:

- Policy advocacy, especially for achieving nationalization of the project schools to ensure their sustainability after the project. This involved supporting the process of nationalization and advocating for flexible nationalization criteria suitable to the CHT context by promoting CHT issues in a range of forums and socializing responsible officials regarding CHT issues.
- Strengthening education systems, including providing financial and capacity building support to the Hill District Councils in Rangamati, Khagrachuri and Bandarban; funding education support positions in the HDCs; funding capacity building of school management and school community groups; supporting the development of linkages between HDCs and relevant line ministries; and piloting an Adult Literacy Programme for school community members.
- Increasing access to education by building renovating or extending 300 schools, supporting HDCs to recruit teachers, providing grants for school improvements, and funding a pilot school feeding program.
- Improving the quality of education, by training local teachers and providing funds for teaching and learning materials.
- Developing a range of Multilingual Education materials for use in pre-primary and Class I to III.

Context of the Project

3. The project was undertaken when the Government of Bangladesh was implementing its second and third Primary Education Development Programmes and other development partners were doing relevant work in areas such as pre-primary education, multi-lingual education, and second-chance education. The project aimed to fill perceived gaps in educational provision in the CHT, namely, that GoB PEDPs did not cater for the political, geographic, cultural or linguistic context of the CHT. At the same time the other development partners were engaged in work other than providing large-scale primary education to remote parts of the CHT. The project filled this gap by providing cultural and linguistically relevant primary education to unserved and under-served communities in remote parts of the CHT.

Purpose and Methodology of the Evaluation

4. The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the major achievements and impact of SBECHT-2, review the effectiveness and efficiency of the project in the five activity areas, and to provide forward looking recommendations for future education activities in the CHT. Other issues addressed included alignment and synergy with government programmes, linkage and coordination among stakeholders, and constraints and challenges.

5. The methodology of the evaluation included an extensive desk review of project documents and related material, interviews with key stakeholders at national and district levels, including officials in MoCHTA, MoPME, DPE, NTCB, the three HDCs, CHTRC, CHTDF, WFP, EU, SC, UNESCO, DFAT, DFATD, and implementing LNGOs. Focus groups discussions were held with stakeholders in 12 schools across the three districts, including head teachers and teachers, students, SMCs, MGs, and PTAs. School observations were conducted in the same schools, and the MLE curriculum materials were analysed for their cultural and linguistic content and their quality.

Main Findings and Conclusions

6. The Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts Phase II project responded to the extensive basic education needs of a large number of unserved or under-served communities in remote parts of the CHT. It made substantial progress in filling a gap created by the inability of the GoB to provide education to these parts of the population of Bangladesh. The project achieved its

overall objective of contributing to “improved socio-economic development of the CHT in line with the principles of the CHT Accord”. The improvements in education levels of the children in the project schools should have a long-term benefit to themselves, their families and their communities. The training provided to teachers and the capacity building at various levels will also have long-term, positive impacts in the CHT. The SBEC-HT-2 project also substantively fulfilled its purpose to “establish and promote access to a quality primary education system in the CHT.” The sustainability of most of these achievements is almost certainly going to be assured through the policy advocacy efforts that facilitated the process of nationalization of the project schools. However, it is uncertain exactly how nationalization will impact on quality particularly child-friendly approaches, the use of the less common CHT languages in school, and the role of the HDC in the management of the schools when they become GPSs.

The activities were highly relevant to the objectives, purpose and intended impacts of the project, and to the HDCs, the schools and their communities. They were also relevant to the GoB’s goals for basic education as enshrined in legal documents and international commitments. However, expanding the role of the HDC or integrating the project activities into the education SWAp has proved problematic because of the lack of recognition in major GoB primary education development programs of the contents of the Hill District Acts including the role of the HDCs. The project was implemented efficiently, with reasonable per student costs. The project took longer to implement than expected, mainly due to the slow pace of the GoB’s school nationalization process.

The policy advocacy and system strengthening activities were all quite effective, apart from the slow pace of nationalization. The activities to improve access and quality were also effective. Some respondents had reservations about the quality of locally recruited teachers and the effectiveness of the relatively few days of teacher training. Child-friendly student behaviour management was one area needing improvement. Improvements to access and quality were also limited to 13 upazilas, whereas the original project design covered all 25 upazilas. This meant the project had little or no impact on remote communities in the remaining 12 upazilas. The project was well managed and coordinated, with no major administrative, technical or operational problems.

The project had a major impact on basic education. Teacher attendance improved and monitoring and data collection were enhanced. Many SMCs, MGs, and PTAs became more active in and supportive of schools. The HDCs became more adept at managing and coordinating education activities, particularly liaising with their counterparts in DPE. The DPE officials also became accustomed with methods for supervising and monitoring remote schools, empowering SMCs and implementing MLE. NER and GER both increased, and the number of schools with clean toilets and access to drinking water also rose significantly. MTB-MLE was introduced into 132 schools, and while the MLE aspect was a big improvement on the previous situation, compared to international standards of MLE, the program introduced in this project was rather modest.

The project extended access to education in 13 of the 25 upazilas, with the unintended impact of creating a situation where some remote areas of the CHT had been supported, but others had not. This could have been avoided by the donors agreeing to fund the project for a third phase, especially since the donors continue to agree that even the revised PEDP-III does not adequately address the basic education needs of remote parts of the CHT.

Lessons Learned

- The project demonstrated a workable model for providing education in the remote parts of the CHT. Aspects of this model have been incorporated into government policy, namely the changes to the school nationalization criteria for remote CHT schools.
- Building on existing development activities and structures provides a sound basis for new development projects.
- Since the implementation of the CHT Accord is a work in progress, project formulation needs to more closely involve liaison with line ministries at the national level, not just the district level.
- The speed at which the GoB partners can fulfil their commitments to the project or undertake actions relevant to the project should not be overestimated
- Capacity building of SMCs, MGs and PTAs through LNGOs is effective and efficient, but sustainability of those groups needs to be built into the training.

Recommendations

A full list of recommendations for the way forward and future projects is found in section 5.2. The content of the recommendations can be summarised as follows:

- The UN agencies and other development partners need to continue to advocate for the implementation of the CHT accord and promote an understanding of the unique context of CHT, including in PEDP-III and its successor programme, the democratic election of HDCs, line ministry and HDC officials' understanding of education issues and their respective roles (Recommendations 1-4 and 12).
- Sustainability and equity need to be enhanced by: maintaining a contingency fund to allow for slow GoB processes, focusing project activities on equity, ensuring curriculum material electronic files are conserved, ensuring project positions are funded by the HDCs after the project ends, and promoting the project's remote area primary education provision model to other relevant development partners (Recommendations 5-6, 24, 28, and 31).
- Effectiveness and efficiency need to be enhanced by: ensuring higher level officials participate in TACs, line ministries have a CHT focal point, improving the capacity for monitoring and supervision at the district and upazila level, ensuring continuity of schools community groups after the first generation of leaders retire or move on, and providing adult literacy programs (Recommendations 7-11, 15, 17, 23, and 29).
- Access to and provision of quality education in remote parts of the CHT can continue to be improved by: mapping education provision in the CHT, identifying the remaining unserved or under-served areas, and filling those gaps; by strengthening the student-centred and child-friendly nature of education programmes; advocating for a school model suitable to remote areas, implementing education in the four CHT languages not covered in the project (Recommendations 13-14, 16, 18-22, 25, 26, and 30).
- Project management can be enhanced by appointing an M&E officer from the project formulation stage (Recommendation 27).

1. Introduction

1.1 Project Background

The Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) is in the south-eastern corner of Bangladesh. The CHT has international borders with Mizoram and Tripura states of India in the east and north respectively, and the states of Rakhaine and Chin of Myanmar in the south. It also has internal borders with Chittagong district in the west and Cox's Bazaar in the south. The region covers an area of 13,184 km², which is equivalent to about ten per cent of the land area of Bangladesh. The CHT is situated in Chittagong Division, and comprises three administrative districts – Rangamati, Bandarban and Khagrachari. CHT is the traditional homeland of eleven indigenous groups. The three largest groups are the Chakma, the Marma and the Tripura. The others groups are the Pangkhua, Bawm, Khumi, Lushai, Tanchangya, Mro, Khyang and Chak. Each group tends to maintain distinct social, economic, and political institutions within their territories rather than assimilate fully into a national society. Each indigenous community has a distinctive culture, heritage and language. Most of these languages are vigorous and are not considered endangered over their entire range, which in some cases carries over into Myanmar or India. The exceptions are Bawm and Chak, which are classified as threatened or endangered.¹ Informants to this evaluation did suggest, however that some of the Indigenous languages are endangered in terms of their use in the CHT, due to the press to learn and use Bangla.

The population in the CHT is approximately 1.5 million, or about one per cent of the population of Bangladesh.² Approximately 50 per cent of the population is either long-term or recent Bengali ethnicity settlers, while the remaining 50 per cent are indigenous peoples. As a region, the CHT has distinctive administrative, ethnographic and socio-economic features in comparison to other parts of Bangladesh. Uniquely in Bangladesh, the CHT region has its own national level Ministry, the Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs (MoCHTA). MoCHTA works at the regional and district levels through a Regional Council (CHTRC) and three Hill District Councils (HDCs). Besides the formal administrative structure, the CHT is traditionally divided into three circles: Chakma, Mong and Bhomong. Each circle is headed by a Circle Chief locally known as a Raja.

Settlement of the CHT by Bengali people from the plain lands of Bangladesh in the 1970s and 1980s led to armed conflict with the Indigenous groups. The Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) Accord (commonly known as the CHT Peace Accord) was signed in 1997 between the GoB and the political party representing the Indigenous groups, the Parbatya Chattagram Jana Sanghati Samiti (PCJSS). However, more than two decades of conflict left many of CHT's inhabitants in conditions of extreme poverty. In addition, a lack of economic opportunity resulted in high unemployment levels. Given the physical remoteness, cultural and linguistic differences, and limited livelihood options, the CHT population has found itself detached from the mainstream and lacking in access to resources, services and infrastructure for their needs. The Peace Accord is a major political achievement for Bangladesh. As the cornerstone of a successful peace building process, it opened up new development opportunities to the people of the CHT. The Peace Accord transfers responsibility for 33 subjects (areas of governance) from the national government to the three Hill District Councils, including the delivery of pre-primary and primary education. The three Hill District Councils are the only district councils with such devolved powers. In other parts of Bangladesh, district level officials are national government postings.

Since 2008, UNDP through the Chittagong Hills Tract Development Facility (CHTDF) has been supporting basic education among un-served and under-served Indigenous groups in the CHT. The "Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts-Phase 2" (SBECHT-2) project commenced in 2010 and has complemented the Government of Bangladesh's 2nd and 3rd Primary Education Development Programs (PEDP-II and PEDP-III), and in particular the Action Plan for Mainstreaming Indigenous Children in Education and the Gender and Inclusive Education Plan. The

¹ See www.ethnologue.com for the status of each language. For issues of endangered languages, see Moseley, Christopher (ed.). 2010. *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, 3rd edn. Paris, UNESCO Publishing. Online version: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/endangeredlanguages/atlas>

² Figures quoted in this paragraph are from the Terms of Reference – see Annex 1.

majority of the funds to support the project (€6.6m out of €8.35m) have come from the European Union.³ Other funders were DFATD and UNDP.

The overall objective of SBECHE-2 is "Improved socio-economic development of the CHT in line with the principles of CHT Accord". Within the scope of this overall objective, the project purpose is to "establish and promote access to a quality primary education system in the CHT." Project activities have focused on policy advocacy, strengthening education systems at national, district and upazila levels, increasing access to basic education, improving the quality of education, and developing and implementing multilingual education. The project has addressed barriers to participation in education of Indigenous groups by establishing schools in remote areas, recruiting community based teachers who speak local languages, and organizing training courses to promote child-friendly learning. It has introduced mother-tongue based Multilingual Education (MLE) for children belonging to seven CHT Indigenous groups and developed culturally sensitive, relevant materials. It has also worked to strengthen community participation in education.

The project is being implemented in close collaboration with the Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs (MoCHTA), Ministry of Primary and Mass Education (MoPME), Directorate of Primary Education (DPE), and the National Curriculum and Textbook Board (NCTB), in partnership with the three GoB to plan the 3rd Primary Education Development Program (PEDP-III). This program is currently in its fourth year, and emphasises the quality of education, including education for Indigenous groups.

1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

The full ToR for this evaluation is found in Annex 1. The evaluation assesses the major achievements and overall impact of SBECHE-2, and reviews the effectiveness and efficiency of the project interventions in establishing and promoting access to a quality primary education system in the CHT. It particularly focuses on the assessment of capacity development of HDCs and issues of sustainability of HDC managed schools as well as recommendations for ways forward and UN Joint Programming for CHT.

The specific objectives of the final evaluation are:

- To assess major achievements and overall impact of the project, providing evidence-based results of its contributions in establishing and promoting access to a quality primary education system in the CHT, especially focusing on targeted results related to policy advocacy, strengthening education systems, increasing access to basic education, improving the quality of education, and developing and implementing multilingual education;
- To provide a forward-looking plan on future programming and modalities of implementation in the CHT emphasizing sustainability, engaging with national actors and institutions, ensuring linkages across institutions, and partnering with other UN agencies for a One-UN approach in the CHT.

1.3 Composition of the Evaluation Team

The evaluation team was put together by CHTDF and comprised an international Team Leader and two national consultants, namely a CHT Expert and an Education Expert. The CHT Expert was from the Chakma community and based in CHT while the Education Expert was from the Bangalee community and based in Dhaka, and travelled to the CHT for the field work.

1.4 Key Issues Addressed

The evaluation addresses a number of key issues.

1.4.1 Alignment and Synergy

- The project's alignment/synergy with government policies and programs, including the nationalization policy, the National Education Policy 2010, and the PEDP-III project.
- The roles of HDCs and different duty bearers
- How better alignment and integration can be achieved to ensure sustainability of the project outcomes

³ Other donors included CIDA from 2008-2012 (Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project, total funds USD1,627,810) and UNDP.

1.4.2 Major Achievements

- The major achievements of the project in line with the expected results
- The sustainability prospects of these achievements and how such sustainability can be achieved

1.4.3 Linkage and Coordination

- The role of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and HDCs in feeding the project learning into PEDP-III
- Engagement and better coordination with the line departments for effective inclusion of ethnic minority children in mainstream education

1.4.4 Constraint and Challenges

- Constraints and challenges that the project has faced, and overcome, and the lessons learned
- Implications of these lessons learned for implementation of future projects

1.4.5 Effectiveness and Efficiency

The effectiveness and efficiency of project coordination and management, including specific reference to:

- Organizational and institutional arrangements for collaboration among the various partner institutions involved in project execution
- The effectiveness of the monitoring mechanisms currently employed by the project management in monitoring progress on a regular basis
- Administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that have influenced the effective implementation of the project (including recommendations for necessary operational changes and alignments)
- Institutional capacity building of HDCs for better delivery of education services and national level advocacy in favor of strengthening primary education system in the CHT in line with the CHT peace accord

1.5 Outputs of the Evaluation

The outputs of the evaluation are this final report, as well as presentations to stakeholders in Dhaka. This report provides recommendations for maximizing sustainability of the achievements of the project as well as approaches and actions to take in future projects aiming to improve educational access and quality in under-served areas of CHT.

The outputs will be used by organisations that currently provide support for education in CHT, including HDCs, line ministries, UN agencies, and TNGOs. They will be particularly important for planning future Primary Education Development Projects (post PEDP-III) and for lead UN Agencies providing support to education in the CHT, primarily UNICEF and UNESCO. This report also provides important recommendations relevant to TNGOs supporting MLE, including Save the Children and others.

1.6 Methodology and Structure of the Evaluation

This evaluation used primary and secondary sources of data. The primary sources included focus groups and interviews with key stakeholders in Dhaka and CHT. The itinerary for the field work is found in Annex 2. A full list of people interviewed and focus groups conducted is found in Annex 3, while a list of the documents reviews is found in Annex 4. The interview and FGD protocols are found in Annex 5a and 5b respectively. School observations were also conducted in schools where focus groups were held. The school observation checklist appears in Annex 5c. The MLE curriculum materials developed as part of this project were analysed, and the analysis rubric is found in Annex 5d.

Secondary sources included CHTDF annual reports; SBECHE-2 documents including the project proposal, annual reports, and monitoring reports; relevant government policy documents; minutes of TAC and inter-ministerial meetings; various national surveys such as MICS, socio-economic and household surveys; and documents pertaining to the national primary education development projects PEDP-II and PEDP-III.

Key informants for interviews were chosen from all the relevant government ministries, donors, CHTDF project personnel, LINGO partners, and HDC officials (including those funded through the project). Project-funded HDC officials were chosen in such a way as to ensure that one or two people

form each position (TO, MO, EFS, EO) were covered across the three districts, based on advice provided from the CHTDF personnel in Rangamati.

A purposive sample of schools were selected, designed to cover a wide variety of school types. The ratio between HDC schools, GPS, and private primary schools approximately reflected their ratio in the project. The schools in the sample also:

- Represented a range of ethnic communities
- Covered all three districts
- Included some schools that are considered to have implemented the project well and others that were not so successful
- Included some schools that have been successfully registered with the GoB
- Included some schools that have school feeding, ALP, and/or MLE
- Included some schools that participated in both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of SBECHT, and others that only participated in Phase 2.

Data from focus group discussions was recorded during the discussion on large sheets of paper so that all participants could see what was recorded and comment on it. This text, representing responses to each question or discussion topic, was then translated into English and entered into excel files. The excel workbook had one worksheet for each category of focus group, and one row on the worksheet for each focus group. Responses to each question were entered in the same column on each worksheet, so that all the responses could be read one after the other by reading down the column. A start list of codes based on the ToR was created. The major categories in the list of codes were “relevance”, “integration potentials”, “clarity of roles”, “efficiency”, effectiveness”, “impact”, “sustainability” and “future projects”. The responses were coded by the CHT Expert and the Education Expert, before the coding was checked by the Team Leader. Discrepancies were discussed until agreement was reached on the code or codes to be attached to each sentence or idea. A similar process was used for the interview data. The CHT data was recorded on paper and entered into excel files and coded. The Dhaka interview data was entered directly into the excel files during the interviews.

The “find” function in excel was then used to identify all the occurrences of particular codes either on each worksheet or in the entire workbook. Where necessary, useful and relevant notes were made concerning the number of responses of that kind or the characteristics of the respondents who provided such responses.

The first week of the evaluation was spent commencing the desk review and planning the methodology. The planning for the methodology was done via Skype calls between the Team Leader at his home base, the national consultants and CHTDF staff in Rangamati, and the CHTDF staff in Dhaka. In the second week, after the Team Leader arrived in Dhaka, the data collection instruments were finalized and data collection commenced. The CHT based consultants undertook four days data collection in Rangamati, while the Team Leader commenced interviews and continued desk review in Dhaka. The Team Leader maintained contact with the CHT based consultants. At the end of the Rangamati data collection, the Team Leader discussed the data with the CHT Expert and Education Expert by telephone. This involved the consultants reading out sample of their questions and the FGD or interview responses. The Team Leader responded to this in terms the quality of the data including the depth and breadth of the responses. The team then discussed the efficacy of the data collection instruments and any minor changes required.

During the third week, the CHT based consultants collected data in Bandarban, while the Team Leader continued to monitor the data collection, undertake interviews and meetings, and do the desk review. In the fourth week, the CHT Expert commenced the analysis of MLE curriculum materials. The CHT Expert and the Education Expert also commenced data entry, translation and coding for the FGD and interview data from Rangamati and Bandarban Districts. During the fifth week, the data coding was checked by the Team Leader, the draft report composed, and a presentation prepared and presented to stakeholders in Dhaka.

1.7 Limitations of the Evaluation

The evaluation was conducted during a period of civil unrest throughout Bangladesh. This prevented the Team Leader from obtaining security clearance to travel to CHT. Thus, all of the Dhaka interviews and meetings were conducted by the Team Leader, with support from the Dhaka-based CHTDF Senior Technical Advisor - Education. As Bangladeshi nationals, the other team members were able

to travel to CHT, so CHT data collection in Rangamati, Bandarban and Khagrachari Districts was undertaken by the CHT Expert and the Education Expert, supported by the Rangamati-based Programme Officer - Education.

2. The Development Challenges and Project Response

2.1 The Development Challenges

As noted above, the CHT provides a unique geographical, cultural and linguistic context quite different to the plain lands that form the majority of Bangladesh. Along with the history of recent social and armed conflict, this has resulted in a relatively poor performance in most basic education indicators in the three hill districts. Two main sources of data exist concerning the state of education in the CHT at the time of the commencement of this project. According to the 2009 MICS, pre-primary and primary education indicators were quite poor in the Bandarban compared to the other two districts and the national figures.⁴

Table 1. Performance of Three Hill Districts on MICS Education Indicators, 2009.

Indicator	Rate (%)			
	National	Bandarban	Khagrachari	Rangamati
Pre-school attendance rate	23	30	39	41
Primary net intake rate	67	52	69	64
Net primary school attendance rate	81	61	79	75
Proportion of pupils reaching Class V	80	62	79	80
Primary school drop out rate (NIA)	1.2	2.3	1.0	0.9
Repetition rate	4.8	9.3	4.9	4.8
Literacy rate women 15-24 yrs	72	40	54	53

Although according to the MICS (2009) Rangamati and Khagrachari have similar levels to the national indicators, there are substantial variations within the two districts due to remoteness. The 2008-9 socioeconomic survey reports that only 34 per cent of paras (villages) in CHT had a GPS, with a range from 29 per cent in Bandarban to 40 per cent in Khagrachari.⁵ Moreover, a quarter of households sampled in CHT had no GPS in the para nor in the surrounding community and that about one-fifth of children spent an average of 80 minutes traveling to and from school. Slightly over four per cent of Indigenous students did not understand the medium of instruction. Only 61 per cent of Indigenous households and 69 per cent of Bangalee households said they could afford to send their children to school all year round.⁶

Only 1.5 per cent of Indigenous households reported having books in their mother tongue in the home, compared to 95.5 per cent of Bangalee households. Of the Indigenous households, only four groups, the Bawm, Chakma, Marma and Tripura speakers, reported having books in their indigenous language in the home. Only 2.3 per cent of Indigenous households reported the use of MT in their children's school, compared to 95.5 per cent of Bangalee households.

The 2008-9 socioeconomic survey examined education levels of household members in the sample, and found that 51 per cent of respondents had no formal education, including 88.4 per cent of Khumi, 86.6 per cent of Mro, 74.1 per cent of Khyang, 62.5 per cent of Tangchangya, 59.3 per cent of Tripura, and 54.8 per cent of Chakma, down to 22.7 per cent of Lushai speakers.⁷

Fifty-nine percent of Indigenous households and 71 per cent of Bangalee households reported that their children dropped out of school before the end of Class V.⁸ This is the inverse of the figures for proportion of children reaching Class V reported in the 2009 MICS. Over 71 per cent of

⁴ Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2010. *Bangladesh Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2009. Technical Report Vol. 1*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Planning Division, Ministry of Planning, and UNICEF, Dhaka.

⁵ Barkat, Abul, et al. 2009. *Socio-Economic Baseline Survey of the Chittagong Hill Tracts*. Human Development Research Centre and CHTDF, Dhaka p. 29

⁶ Barkat, Abul, 2009, *ibid*, p. 117-118

⁷ Barkat, Abul, 2009, *ibid*, p. 189, Table 4.5

⁸ Barkat, Abul, 2009, *ibid*, p. 119. It is not clear from the text nor from the survey form (p. 267) whether this means at least one child or all children in the household did not complete primary education.

respondents cited financial problems as the reason for school drop outs before the completion of primary school.⁹

Overall, the education situation in CHT at the commencement of SBEC-HT-2 was weak, and substantially worse in Bandarban than in Khagrachari and Rangamati. It must be remembered, however, that the situation varied within districts from one upazila to another, and within upazilas.

2.2 Responses by the Government of Bangladesh

2.2.1 Constitutional and Policy Responses

The *Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh* allocates to the State the responsibility for "establishing a uniform, mass oriented and universal system of education and extending free and compulsory education to all children to such stage as may be determined by law."¹⁰ This article justifies the provision of education to all children in the CHT. On the other hand, a "uniform" system, if interpreted narrowly through the application of uniform regulations and requirements (e.g. for school nationalization, minimum community population size to qualify for provision of a GPS, and so on) may not allow for variations in the social, cultural, and geographic contexts within the country, such as in the CHT.

The *National Education Policy* proclaims education for all children as fundamental (p. 5). The aims and objectives of the NEP address the developmental challenges in education. Some relevant aims include:¹¹

- "To remove socioeconomic discrimination" (aim, 7, p. 8);
- "To create unhindered and equal opportunities of education for all as per learners' talents and aptitudes, irrespective of geographical, social and economical situations" (aim 8, p. 8);
- "To ensure a creative, favourable and joyful environment for the students" (aim 15, p. 9);
- "To take special measures for the development of education of the backward classes of the country including the street-children" (aim 22, p. 9);
- "To promote and develop the languages and cultures of the indigenous and small ethnic groups" (aim 23, p. 9);
- "To initiate special measures to promote education in the areas identified as backward in education" (aim 26, p. 10).
- "To facilitate learning in the mother languages of the indigenous peoples and small ethnic groups at the primary level of education" (p. 12);

2.2.2 Sector-Wide Approaches

From 1999-2003, the education development challenges were addressed by the GoB through a range of unilateral projects between donors and GoB, which have come to be known as PEDP-I.¹² This was a project approach rather than a sector-wide approach (SWAp). Since that time, a SWAp has been used, both in the form of the Second Primary Education Development Program (PEDP-II), and the current Third Primary Education Development Program (PEDP-III).

PEDP-II (2004-11) aimed to reduce poverty and contribute to socio-economic development through improving quality, equitable access and efficiency in primary education. The program had three components. First, the project undertook organizational development and capacity building at all levels of the education system, except the HDC's which, contrary to the HDC Acts of 1989, were generally ignored. Second the project focused on improving the quality of teaching and learning by enhancing teacher training, developing curriculum materials (in Bangla), increasing the supply of teachers, and supporting communities to their schools. The third component focused on infrastructure

⁹ Barkat, Abul, 2009, *ibid*, p. 119

¹⁰ Bangladesh. The Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh. Article 17(a).

¹¹ Bangladesh. Ministry of Education. 2010. *National Education Policy 2010* [English]. Ministry of Education, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, p. ii.

¹² Bangladesh. Directorate of Primary Education. 2014. *Program Overview and Implementation Guide. Third Primary Education Development Program (PEDP 3)* (Revised Program Document, December 2014). Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, p. ii.

improvements. These included building seven hostels in CHT.¹³ The fourth component supported students with special needs and disadvantaged students.¹⁴

While PEDP-II addressed the EFA, MDG and poverty reduction goals of the GoB, its implementation rate was much slower than planned, in for example, the development of MLE materials.¹⁵ Despite having an “Action Plan for Mainstreaming Tribal Children” [=Tribal Action Plan],¹⁶ the focus was on improving existing government schools in CHT, while NGPS were not included.¹⁷

The Tribal Action Plan made ten recommendations and developed a plan to implement them. The recommendations were:

- Recruit community based teachers
- Organize training and orientation courses for teachers
- Introduce pre-primary schooling with language education
- Review curriculum and textbooks for their coverage of Indigenous issues
- Improve infrastructure of the schools
- Provide stipends to students’ families
- Strengthen supervision and monitoring
- Strengthen the SMC
- Establish new primary schools
- Allow for flexibility of school timetables and calendars.

The action plan expanded this set of recommendations to also include substantial capacity building for MoPME and DPE offices concerning awareness, understanding, monitoring and supporting Indigenous education.

It should be noted that while PEDP-II purported to increase access, it only focused on improving existing GPS. There was no major attempt to address the issue of remote communities in which children had to travel long distances to reach a GPS. In this sense, the PEDP-II and the Tribal Action Plan were only partially cognisant of the unique context of the CHT.¹⁸

Although a PEDP-II assessment report cites various sources showing that net enrolment rates in CHT have increased from about 57 per cent in 2001 to about 82 per cent in 2010, it is unable to identify how much of this increase can be attributed to PEDP-II. Nevertheless, the report states that the PEDP-II “almost certainly led to an increase” in CHT Indigenous students’ enrolment.¹⁹ The report however makes no comment on other aspects, such as the review of curriculum and textbooks’ coverage of Indigenous issues. It is clear then that at the end of PEDP-II some of the gaps identified earlier remained, and SBECHE-2 remained important for filling them.

The Third Primary Education Development Program (PEDP-III) is a six-year program that has followed on from PEDP-II. It is funded by GoB, ADB, DFAT, DFATD, DFID, EU, IDA (World Bank), JICA, SIDA, UNICEF and GPE. The program aims to “to establish an efficient, inclusive and equitable primary education system delivering effective and relevant child-friendly learning to all Bangladesh’s children from PPE through Class V primary.”²⁰ PEDP-III has four major components: Teaching and Learning, Participation and Disparities, Decentralization and Effectiveness, and Planning and Management. The PEDP-III revised programme document makes no mention of the HDCs, which have the legal authority to manage education in the CHT. The PEDP-III Indigenous People’s Framework is mainly concerned that the programmed complies with the safeguards in the ADB’s

¹³ Participants in this evaluation said that despite this handover, no funds had been provided to run the hostels.

¹⁴ World Bank. 2014. *Bangladesh - Second Primary Education Development Project [Project Performance Assessment Report]*. Washington DC; World Bank Group, pp. 11-14

¹⁵ United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2009/2011. *Project Proposal: Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts Phase II*. CHTDF, Dhaka, p. 21

¹⁶ Bangladesh. Directorate of Primary Education. 2006. *Primary Education Situation Analysis, Strategies and Action Plan for Mainstreaming Tribal Children*.

¹⁷ United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2009/2011. *Op. cit.* p. 21

¹⁸ Owens, L., Poyck, G., and Uddin, F. 2009. *Primary Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts - Phase II*. [Formulation] Mission Report, Vol. 1. European Union, p. 36

¹⁹ World Bank. 2014. *Op. cit.* p. 28

²⁰ Bangladesh. Directorate of Primary Education. 2014. *Program Overview and Implementation Guide. Third Primary Education Development Program (PEDP 3)* (Revised Program Document, December 2014). Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, Government of the People’s Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, p. ii.

Social Management Framework. This involves ensuring programme activities do no harm to Indigenous people, lands or institutions, or if they do, that adequate consultation takes place. The weakness of this SMF is that it makes no requirement that Indigenous people and their institutions are involved in the formulation of interventions from the beginning, at the planning stage. They only require Indigenous people be consulted during the course of implementation. As a result the Indigenous People's Framework only suggests that implementation of the sub-component for the Indigenous peoples "may consider involving their representative government institutions which, in the case of Chittagong Hill Tracts, can be the Hill District Councils (HDCs), the CHT Regional Council (CHTRC) and the Ministry of CHT Affairs (MoCHTA)".²¹ Given that HDCs are the legally constituted managers of education in the CHT, the PEDP-III Indigenous People's Framework should have followed the CHT Peace Accord and made inclusion of institutions such as CHTRC and the HDCs a mandatory requirement of all aspects of the PEDP-III project cycle, from planning to budgeting to implementation, reviewing, monitoring and evaluation.

Annex 2 of the revised PEDP Programme document provides a "Gender and Inclusive Education" (G&IE) action plan. Responsibility for implementation of various components of the plan are allocated to various divisions within MoPME, but ironically not mention is made of the role of the HDCs. The plan includes incorporating "G&IE equity elements" in the curriculum (sub-component 1.3), providing teacher training and orientation (sub-component 1.6), and providing single-class schools in remote areas (sub-component 2.1.3). However, the plan only includes capacity development on gender and IE issues for DPE and MoPME officials, but not for HDC officials who are the legally constituted providers of education in the CHT.

Component 3.1.2 of the G&IE plan concerns "Decentralized School Management and Governance" and includes activities to ensure female needs and perspectives are included in field-level capacity building, ensure AOPs promote women's participation, ensure that SMCs are gender responsive and that SLIPs, UPEPs and DPEPs address gender needs, and that SMCs are able to address gender issues. The plan says that SMCs should "Identify procedures and strategies to ensure full participation and representation of all levels of community in SMC including women, and tribal and marginalised groups and implement strategies/procedures". Component 3.1.1 has an activity to "Orient all field staff on gender and inclusive education objectives and activities." Component 4.4 promotes disaggregation of school census data by equity groups, including ethnicity. While the G&IE plan does propose a qualitative review "to assess to what extent the IE and gender needs are addressed in the decentralized school management and governance structure", there is no provision or requirement to ensure AOPs promote Indigenous peoples' participation, nor to ensure that SMCs are responsive to Indigenous issues, nor that SLIPs, UPEPs and DPEPs address Indigenous needs when relevant, nor that SMCs have the capacity to address Indigenous issues.²²

The changes to the education system under PEDP-III include some that will be advantageous to the specific context of the CHT. These include "MoPME approves policy for multi-lingual education for instruction in mother tongue in the early years with transition to the national language ensuring full competency in both languages by the end of Class V" (although informants to this evaluation said that the policy now provides for a complete transition to Bangla by the end of Class III).²³ According to the revised program document, the "approved pre-primary education curriculum has multi lingual provisions, and textbooks in 5 languages are being prepared."²⁴ These five languages include the three most common Indigenous languages in CHT, namely Chakma, Marma, and Tripura, as well as Garo and Sadri from elsewhere in Bangladesh. The focus on needs based interventions in PEDP-III will also potentially contribute to education improvements, assuming the criteria are chosen in a way which will capture the unique context of the CHT.²⁵

²¹ Bangladesh. Directorate of Primary Education. 2010. *Indigenous Peoples Framework. Primary Education Sector Development Program 3*. Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, paragraph 39.

²² Bangladesh. Directorate of Primary Education. 2014. *Program Overview and Implementation Guide. Third Primary Education Development Program (PEDP 3)* (Revised Program Document, December 2014). Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, p. 222-228.

²³ Ibid, p. 26

²⁴ Ibid, p. 26

²⁵ Ibid, p. 28

2.3 Activities of Other Development Partners and NGOs

UNICEF Bangladesh in partnership with the MoWCA and MoPME has been providing centre-based care for children aged four to six years in several places in Bangladesh, including CHT. The project trains one teacher per Early Learning Centre. The centres provide nutritional biscuits in conjunction with WFP, and link with local primary schools to enhance transition from PPE to primary school. The services are provided as part of a suite of service offered in *para* centres, the building of which commenced in 1996 as part of UNICEF's Integrated Community Development Project. In 2015, UNICEF started trialling the use of some of the PPE MLE materials developed as part of the SBECHT-2 project. UNICEF is also a major contributor to PEDP-III. It channels funds from its national committees to the project, and provides technical assistance for teacher training, supporting SMCs, and social mobilization.

Four NGOs (Save the Children UK, SIL International, Grontmij and Ashika) provided technical capacity to develop 1.5 years worth of pre-primary MLE materials including teachers' guides for the SBECHT-1 project in seven CHT Indigenous languages. They also developed supplementary materials (charts) containing songs, fables and poems in Indigenous languages to supplement the national curriculum in Class I. Save the Children has continued to develop MLE materials for Class I and II, and is also developing materials for Class III and IV, in four CHT languages: Chakma, Marma, Tripura, and Mro.

BRAC is another major education provider in the CHT, especially for pre-primary and second chance primary education. BRAC also runs 30 primary schools for Chakma children in Rangamati and Khagrachari using a transition MLE model. A range of resources have been developed including primers or textbooks in mathematics, social studies and Chakma language.²⁶

2.4 UNDP Responses

UNDP CHTDF's responses to the education development challenges outlined above commenced with the pilot SBECHT-1 project from 2008-9. That project trialled (in 150 schools in six upazilas) many of the activities undertaken as part of SBECHT-2, including:

- Strengthening systems by contracting LNGOs that trained SMCs and MGs
- Improving access through building and renovating 132 schools, and recruiting and training teachers
- Enhancing MLE by forming language committees and developing curriculum materials²⁷

SBECHT-2 commenced in 2010 and extended the project activities to a total of 300 project schools in 12 of the 25 upazilas in the three hill districts (25 schools in each district). In addition, the project provided capacity development for SMCs in another 180 GPSs (60 in each district). In January, 2014, the full project implementation activities were extended to 15 schools in a 13th upazila (Naikhongchari Upazila in Bandarban). Over the course of the project, some of the original project schools have obtained registration and have been absorbed into the government system. At the time of the evaluation, 228 schools remained managed by the HDCs, 65 are government schools, and the remainder are non-government private schools.

The upazilas involved in SBECHT-2 are shown in Table 2. At the commencement of SBECHT-2 in 2010, the project was implemented in 12 of the 20 upazilas in which CHTDF was undertaking development work.²⁸ In 2014, a 13th upazila was added, by which time CHTDF overall was working in all 25 upazilas.²⁹

²⁶ Islam, Safiqul. 2015. BRAC Experience on Promotion of Mother Language. Paper presented at the International Seminar on Preservation and Promotion of Mother Languages and Multilingualism, IMLI, Dhaka, 22 Feb.

²⁷ Owens et al., op. cit., p. 32

²⁸ United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2010. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2009*. CHTDF, Dhaka, p. 10

²⁹ United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2013. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2012*. CHTDF, Dhaka, p. 6

Table 2. Upazilas Involved in SBECHT-2

District	Upazilas
Rangamati	Bilaichari, Jurachari, Rajasthali, Baghaichari
Khagrachari	Matiranga, Mohalchari, Panchari, Laxmichuri
Bandaraban	Ruma, Rowangchari, Alikadam, Thanchi, Naikhyangchuri

For SBECHT-2, the education development activities were grouped into five components. As suggested by the mission report, greater emphasis was placed on advocacy to stimulate changes in the approach taken by the national government to education in the CHT.³⁰ The components and the various activities are listed below:

1. Policy Advocacy
 - Advocating for flexibility in the criteria for registration and nationalization
 - Advocating for fast-tracking of the nationalization process
 - Assisting the nationalization process by supporting documentation preparation at the local and national level including obtaining leases in forest reserves
 - Actively participating in and promoting CHT education issues at relevant forums including the TAC Education and Inter-ministerial meetings
 - Socializing responsible officials into the unique challenges of education in the CHT
2. Strengthening Education Systems
 - Providing financial and capacity building support to HDCs, including training on planning and managing schools and developing a district education strategic plan
 - Funding HDC positions including Training Officers, Monitoring Officers and Education Field Supervisors
 - Funding capacity building support to SMCs, MGs, PTAs to enhance school management, monitoring, financing, and improving school facilities
 - Supporting the development of linkages between HDCs and line ministries including MoPME at the national, district and upazila levels
 - Funding a pilot Adult Literacy Programme to increase the capacity of SMCs and MGs and build the capacity of HDCs
3. Increasing Access to Education
 - Building, renovating or extending 300 schools, including 60 new schools (in addition to the 60 constructed under SBECHT-1)
 - Providing capacity building and financial support to HDCs to recruit local teachers
 - Providing grants for school improvements
 - Funding a pilot school feeding program in 12 schools
4. Improving Quality
 - Training local teachers in needed areas including subject knowledge and relevant pedagogy (e.g. multi-grade, MLE)
 - Providing funds for teaching and learning resources to facilitate active, student-centred learning
5. Multi-Lingual Education
 - Developing and implementing MTB-MLE pre-primary classes and teaching and learning materials in seven Indigenous languages for the first 1.5 of two years of pre-primary in 132 project schools³¹
 - Developing supplementary reading materials for Class I in eleven local languages, based on local legends, poems and songs³²

³⁰ Owens, et al., op. cit., p. 35

³¹ The seven languages were Bawm, Chakma, Khyang, Marma, Mro, Trangchangya, and Tripura (two distinct dialects). These are the languages used in the areas covered by project schools.

³² In addition to the languages listed in the previous footnote, the materials covered Chak, Khumi, Lushai, and Pangkhua languages.

- Developing supplementary reading materials in Bangla language for Class II and III of translations of Indigenous stories from the eleven Indigenous communities
- Advocating for a comprehensive national MTB-MLE policy
- Participation in the MLE forum which advocates for MLE and facilitates communication between MLE providers

In addition to SBECHT-1 and SBECHT-2, UNDP-CHTDF has also recently supported MDG Acceleration exercises in the three districts. This has involved working with a wide range of stakeholders to identify one MDG in each district that needs attention. The types of bottlenecks are identified in various aspects of the MDG, and an action plan developed. Khagrachari and Rangamati identified MDG 1 as the area to accelerate, while Bandarban selected MDG 2.³³ In the latter district, five key areas with bottlenecks were identified: access to education in terms of parents valuing education and overcoming geographical barriers; support for formal early education; MLE; school/education management; teacher training; non-formal primary education; and overall education service delivery in CHT. Bottlenecks were identified in policy and planning; budgets and financing, service delivery, service demand and in cross cutting areas (such as community involvement, remoteness, coordination, and decision making processes).

3. Findings

3.1 Project Relevance

3.1.1 Relevance of the Activities and Outputs to the Objectives of the Project

3.1.1.a *The policy focused advocacy work*

The policy and advocacy work was relevant to the objectives of the project because government policies at the time were preventing the establishment, registration or nationalization of schools in some parts of the CHT. Three examples: 1. The requirements regarding the population of a community and its school-aged children for establishment of a GPS were too high for the remote parts of the CHT. 2. The pre-requisites for teacher training and teacher employment prevented adequate numbers of local teachers being employed in CHT schools. 3. Advocacy for MLE was also relevant since many children did not understand Bangla or the school system did not value or encourage use of their MT.

3.1.1.b *The recruitment, support and capacity building of HDC leaders and education staff*

The Peace Accord and the Hill District Council Acts provide HDCs with a mandate to managed and deliver pre-primary, primary and secondary education in the CHT. However, the experience and capacity to manage and deliver formal pre-primary and primary education was limited. Furthermore, there was a lack of designated positions in the HDC to work in the area of basic education. As a result, this project's support and capacity building of existing HDC staff, as well as the recruitment and funding of basic education staff positions was highly relevant to HDCs ability to implement the provisions of the Peace Accord and the Hill District Acts.

3.1.1.c *Capacity building of district and upazila officials*

With the development of capacity in the HDCs, it was also important to build the capacity of DPE officials based at the district and upazila levels who were already supporting over 1300 GPS and NGPS in the CHT.³⁴ In particular, it was important to provide forums for coordinating the work of these two education providers. Furthermore, it was important to socialize these officials into the

³³ MDG 1 is to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, while MDG 2 is to achieve universal primary education.

³⁴ Calculations based on data in: Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Bandarban*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka; Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Khagrachari*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka; Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Rangamati*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka. The DPE supports NGPS through, for example, the supply and distribution of textbooks.

contexts of remote parts of the CHT, and support joint monitoring visits to project schools. These joint monitoring visits were also relevant to building up the capacity of education officials at district and upazila levels.

3.1.1.d Capacity building of SMCs, MGs and PTAs

The capacity building for SMCs, MGs and PTAs was highly relevant to the project, particularly for the newly established schools where no such bodies had existed. This activity was also relevant for the other schools supported in the project, since in many instances such groups had become moribund. The supply of school development plan grants to these groups was also relevant because it provided resources for the groups to empower them to make a difference in their schools, which all existed in cash-poor areas. The advocacy work of the LNGOs was relevant and essential for mobilizing communities and informing them of the value of education. It was important to mobilize communities to support and monitor schools and teachers, form or revive SMCs, MGs, and PTAs, and encourage student attendance.

3.1.1.e The construction and renovation of schools

The construction of new schools activity was highly relevant as these schools were constructed in areas where no school had existed before. The selection criteria (which were applied at the upazila level) also ensured that needy areas were prioritized and duplication and overlap avoided. Including enough classrooms to accommodate pre-primary students was also relevant to implementing MLE based pre-primary and enhancing access and retention.

Renovation of existing schools was also a very relevant activity since it enhanced the facilities and made them more child-friendly. Addition of water supplies and toilets in particular was important for the well-being of students and staff. Adding extra classrooms to existing schools was also a relevant activity as it provided more space to enhance access.

3.1.1.f The school feeding and adult literacy programmes

The school feeding program was undertaken as a trial in 12 schools, one in each upazila. This trial was important for establishing a workable mechanism for delivering nutritious food in the context of CHT, with its transport and capacity challenges. The adult literacy program was relevant since there are high levels of illiteracy in CHT and literacy and numeracy help community members to make more substantial contributions to schools and communities.

3.1.1.g Recruiting and training teachers

The recruitment and training of local teachers was not only relevant but also essential for the success of this project. It addressed two issues. First, local teachers have higher attendance rates because they are part of the community. Second, local teachers speak the local language and can therefore communicate better with students and community members. The salary support was also essential. Although the amount paid to teachers was only about half the rate paid to teachers in GPSs, most communities provided teachers with accommodation and/or food to supplement their stipend. Without the salary support, teacher could not have been employed.

3.1.1.f The development of MLE

The development of MLE at pre-primary level and training teachers to implement the curriculum were both relevant, particularly in schools that existed in mono-lingual communities. This activity was somewhat less relevant for students in mixed language communities or schools who did not speak the Indigenous language of instruction. However, these mixed language schools were relatively few in this project.

3.1.2 Relevance of the Activities and Outputs to the Intended Impacts

The major impacts of the project are reflected in the wording of the main components of the project.

3.1.2.a Advocacy for adjustments to administrative and financial practices and policies in the GoB and HDCs

The formation and support of the TAC, the involvement of CHTDF officers in inter-ministerial meetings, the exposure visits of line ministry officials from Dhaka to CHT were all relevant activities for providing a forum and knowledge base to advance changes in policies and practices and hence impact educational access in CHT. While all relevant stakeholders were represented on the TAC, the practice by some line ministries of sending relatively junior officers to the meetings was not helpful

because the discussions were not relevant to officers of that level. They were more appropriate for high-level officials. This issue is discussed further under effectiveness.

3.1.2.b Strengthening the education system in the CHT

Increasing the capacity of the HDC officials and supporting coordination work with district, and upazila level education officials was highly relevant for strengthening the education system in the CHT. This activity partly addressed the problem created by a lack of clear regulations both at HDC and GoB levels about how responsibilities are divided between the GoB and the HDCs in provision of primary education. Providing salary support to HDC level education officers such as MOs, TOs and EFSs was relevant, since the HDCs did not have funds for this work. However, as noted below this was not done in a sustainable way, since no mechanism was established for the HDC to takeover funding these positions when the project finished.

3.1.2.c Improving access to education in the CHT

Providing schools and recruiting teachers were essential to improving access to education in CHT in places where no school existed before. Repairing schools also contributed to improving access by providing a healthier environment that was more conducive to attending school.

3.1.2.d Improving the quality of education in CHT

Most old and new teachers were only familiar with traditional, lecture-based teaching. Thus, providing teaching and learning materials and training teachers in child-friendly methods were very relevant to improving the quality of education in CHT.

3.1.2.e Providing MTB-MLE in CHT

The development of MTB-MLE materials and materials based on local culture, and training teachers to use them, were all highly relevant activities for the CHT, where the use of Bangla from pre-primary level may be an impediment to learning and staying in school. These activities were especially relevant for inducting young children into the formal learning process. They were also relevant to providing a foundation in literacy, which could then be built on in learning the other school languages of English and Bangla.

3.1.3 Relevance to the GoB

Overall the project's focus on reaching remote areas, providing child-friendly schools and promoting MT was highly relevant to fulfilling the aims of the Bangladeshi Constitution and National Education Policy. The project also contributed to meeting Bangladesh's EFA and MDG2 commitments to provide basic education for all students regardless of context. Furthermore, the project contributed to fulfilling the legal requirements of the Hill Tracts Acts regarding transfer of management of primary education from the GoB to the HDCs. The current SBECHT-2 project and its predecessor SBECHT-1 replicated some of the activities in the PEDP-II and PEDP-III. However, during the formulation of SBECHT-1, there was a recognition that PEDP-II as a national program working in GPS could not address many of the basic education needs in the CHT, especially in areas where there was no GPS. The two SBECHT projects were designed to fill some of these gaps. It is clear also from the PEDP-II implementation report that at the end of PEDP-II some of the gaps identified earlier had not been addressed, and SBECHT-2 remained relevant for filling them, at least in CHT. In particular, SBECHT-2 undertook some of the activities in PEDP-II's Tribal Action Plan that were not implemented in remote areas through PEDP-II. These included recruiting and training local teachers, introducing MTB-MLE pre-primary schooling, improving school infrastructure, strengthening supervision and monitoring, establishing new primary schools, and building the capacity of MoPME and DPE regarding Indigenous education.

3.1.4 Relevance to the HDCs

This project was highly relevant to the HDCs which are underfunded and to which the full transfer of subjects as described in the Hill District Acts has not been achieved. The project provided the HDC with an opportunity to become more involved and experienced in educational management, especially for schools in remote parts of the CHT. It also provided an opportunity and mechanism for HDCs to collaborate and communicate more closely with GoB's district level officials.

3.1.5 Relevance to Schools and their Communities

The activities in this project were highly relevant to schools and their communities. As noted above, the communities that benefited from this project either had no school previously, or had a school that was in need of improvement. These needs were unable to be addressed by the GoB through its PEDP-II and PEDP-III projects.

3.2 Integration Potentials

Once all the project schools have been nationalized they will be able to accrue the benefits of PEDP-III and its heir. However, it should also be noted that as with PEDP-II, some aspects of PEDP-III have been slow to be implemented, such as the development and printing of MLE curriculum materials. Thus integration into the government system and PEDP-III is not a guarantee that the project schools will benefit as much as the PEDP-III proposal suggests. However, there is the potential for all the project schools to benefit from some specific PEDP-III activities, including school feeding (which only covered 12 schools in the SBECST-2 pilot), targeted stipends for the less well off families, school health programs, support for developing and maintaining a child-friendly school environment, and needs based infrastructure development, which will take into account the hilly geography of the CHT. However, PEDP-III will only develop MLE materials in three CHT languages, which will leave a gap for the remaining Indigenous languages in CHT.

PEDP-III includes activities to enhance decentralization and effectiveness (component 3). The project schools, once nationalized, should benefit from the training provided to head teachers, teachers, and upazila and district officials (in the DPE and UEOs) in a range of areas including developing and implementing School-Level Improvement Plans (SLIPs), Upazila Primary Education Plans (UPEPs) and District Primary Education Plans (DPEPs). However, it is unclear which entity will be responsible for managing HDC schools once they are nationalized. If their management reverts fully to MoPME, the gains made in terms of empowering the HDCs will be lost and contrary to the process of decentralization.

Unfortunately, because of the lack of recognition of the HDC as the legally constituted implementers of primary education in the CHT, it appears that the training for district and upazila officials may not be extended to HDC staff. This is a major omission and should be corrected during the final years of PEDP-III implementation. CHTDF advocated for “effective involvement of HDCs in education management” during the development of the PEDP-III program framework in 2010, but this appears to have been ignored.³⁵ Later, the mid-term review of PEDP-III also failed to take into account the legal role of HDCs in managing basic education in the CHT.

HDCs should be integrally involved in the conceptualizing, planning, implementation, monitoring, reviewing and reporting for the post-PEDP-III program. Development Partners should continue to advocate for such inclusion and to continue to support Ministry officials to become more aware of the contents of the relevant laws and the context of CHT. Furthermore, a new PEDP program document should list relevant officials of the HDCs as the accountable parties for management, implementation and reporting of aspects of the program in the three Hill Districts, and provide capacity development to ensure this accountability can be achieved. This will mean that the new PEDP program documents will list relevant HDC officials as accountable parties for the three Hill districts, and the relevant GoB line ministry officials as accountable parties for the other 61 districts. This would allow the new PEDP to be in accord with the prevailing legal requirements regarding responsibility for education in the CHT. Activities related to completing the transfer of pre-primary, primary and secondary education functions and positions should be included in the new PEDP, with a separate budget line. The full hand over of responsibility for education to the HDCs as per the Peace Accord and the HDC Acts should be incorporated into a disbursement-linked indicator in the new PEDP to encourage the full implementation of these laws.

One major constraint on the strategy proposed in the previous paragraph is that the HDCs are appointed by the government and are not the democratically elected representatives of the residents of CHT as envisioned in the HDC acts. Therefore, at the same time as efforts are made to include HDCs in the whole new PEDP process, actions should be taken to also speed up the election of HDCs as per the Acts, in order to ensure accountability of the HDCs to the residents of CHT.

³⁵ United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2011. *Progress Report on Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts - Phase II* (January – December 2010). CHTDF, Dhaka, p. 40.

Recommendation 1. That UN agencies and other donors to continue to advocate for the greater inclusion of HDCs in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of PEDP-III activities for the remainder of that project, as well as the planning, accountabilities and other aspects for the next PEDP.

Recommendation 2. That The UN Agencies and other donors to continue to advocate for the democratic election of HDCs as per the Hill District Councils Act.

3.3 Clarity of Roles

3.3.1 Roles under the Peace Accord and the Hills District Acts

The major issue regarding roles that the project encountered related to the relationships between the HDCs and the national government line departments. Under the terms of the Peace Accord, the responsibility for education rests with the HDCs.

All the line departments responsibilities for basic education are meant to be transferred to the HDCs, but there is no clear understanding of what this means in terms of the role of central ministries, the role of HDC and the role of line departments in the districts. At the moment all decisions are made in Dhaka, though the HDCs do have some control of finance, as well as recruitment and payment of teachers. The HDCs have not drafted any rules or regulations about how to manage their services. So there is an incomplete legal and regulatory framework. Previously the 1900 CHT law took precedence over other relevant law. However, the Peace Accord has become the new model law, yet the Deputy Commissioner and the traditional leaders tend to still are guided by the 1900 regulations. The national laws such as the Union and Upazila Acts, have failed to take into account both the Peace Accord and the 1900 regulations. MoCHTA, MoPME, and MoF need to amend their regulations to conform to the Peace Accord and the Hill District Acts of 1989. CHTDF under its governance programme is working on harmonization of laws and acts. It is facilitating a major workshop on these legal and regulatory issues that will include making a road map on what needs to be done to harmonize the laws and regulations at various levels of government.

In education, a road map and mechanism need to be developed about how to transfer responsibility for pre-primary, primary and secondary schools to the HDCs. As of 2011, there were a total of 932 GPS, 419 RNGPS, and 195 NGPS across the three Hill districts.³⁶ If the HDCs are to be responsible for all these schools, a large transfer of funds and personnel will need to occur.

GoB education officials interviewed in Dhaka saw it as their role to improve the quality of education throughout the country through actions such as nationalizing schools and providing curricula and textbooks. MoCHTA has the role of coordinating the line ministries with the CHT, but admits there is a “small gap” in the understanding that other line ministries have of the CHT. The MoCHTA official said, “MoPME is not ready to take over the 228 schools but the PM has already given consent”. This remark suggests that even MoCHTA officials feel that the nationalization process involves MoPME taking over management of the schools from the HDCs. Furthermore, many government officials working in the education ministries have little or no background in education, but are professional administrators. This means that they do not necessarily have a finally nuanced understanding of education issues, especially in terms of diversity and equity. Overall, GoB officials were supportive of education improvement in CHT, but it was in a paternalistic way rather than in terms of empowering the HDCs. As one respondent said “I feel very happy we are doing something for the backward people who are not in the streamline” (sic).

Recommendation 3. That UN agencies and other development partners support the relevant government officials to not only understand the context of the CHT but also to have well developed

³⁶ Calculations based on data in: Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Bandarban*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka; Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Khagrachari*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka; Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Rangamati*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka.

understanding of concepts of equity and how these concepts apply to the provision of services for a diverse population.

Recommendation 4. That UNDP and other development partners, as part of the process of harmonizing laws and regulations, support the GoB to develop a clear understanding of the roles of MoPME and other line ministries in supporting HDCs to manage education in the CHT, and develop a road map and mechanism for the staged and full transfer of responsibility of education to the HDCs.

3.3.2 DPE and HDC Officials' Understanding of their Roles

Since the increased capacity of HDC officials to manage and support basic education provided by this project was a relatively new extension of the HDCs power, it took some time for roles to be clarified. There are two perspectives on the roles of the HDC. First, the Peace Accord and the Hill District Council Acts envision democratically elected HDCs as responsible for delivery of pre-primary, primary, and secondary education in the CHT. This would ultimately lead to the HDCs being responsible for the management and support of all of the schools in the CHT, including the ones currently managed by MoPME. This would amount to well over 1,600 schools. The draft district-specific education strategies developed as part of this project envision that this would happen by the DPE office in each district coming under the purview of the HDCs.³⁷ However, even with the support of the SBECHT-2 project, HDCs neither had or have the funds nor the personnel to do this. Nor are the HDCs constituted or democratically elected as per the Hill District Acts. This limits their accountability to their constituents.

The second way to view roles is in terms of what has happened in practice. Over the course of this project, the various roles stabilized to some extent, and mutual understanding developed. HDC took the role of managing and supporting the project schools, while MoPME through its DPE district and upazila officials maintained their responsibility for GPSs. DPE took on the role of supporting the HDC managed schools through coordinating textbook distribution and providing PEC examinations for the HDC schools. DPE and HDC officials undertook joint monitoring and supervision visits, and HDC used the DPE data collection forms.

An HDC representative was eventually included on the committee to review nationalization applications, although this was not done at first, and advocacy efforts were required. One unresolved issue appears to be who will manage project schools once they are nationalized. After nationalization, schools become GPS, so under the current system they would be managed by MoPME's DPE. However, this may disempower the HDCs and be counter to the intent of the Peace Accord and the Hill District Acts. As noted above, CHTDF is currently facilitating a multi-sector dialogue on harmonizing laws and regulations in the CHT, and these issues should be addressed in that process. The wider issue of how and when further implementation of the transfer of subjects (including education) will be achieved will also be addressed in that process. (See also Recommendation 4, above)

3.4 Efficiency

3.4.1 Cost Efficiency

Table 3 shows the project expenditure per calendar year, the number of students enrolled in project schools, and the expenditure per student in each year and overall.

Table 3. Project Expenditure Per Student Per Year

Year	Students	Budget €	€/student
2010	17,205	1,733,456	101
2011	19,909	1,144,077	57
2012	19,088	1,698,175	89
2013	20,007	1,685,638	84
2014	20,195	1,686,455	84
Totals	96,404	7,947,801	82

³⁷ Bandarban HDC. 2014. Education Strategy (Draft, November 2014); Khagrachari HDC. 2014. Education Strategy (Draft, November 2014); Rangamati HDC. 2014. Education Strategy (Draft, November 2014).

The project cost about €82 per student overall, with a range in each year from €57 to €101. It is difficult to make comparisons of per capita costs across systems and contexts. Nevertheless, this figure is comparable to the per capita costs of providing and supporting contextually appropriate education systems with similar kinds of inputs in other remote settings.³⁸

3.4.2 Time Efficiency

The project was originally slated to run from January 2010 to September 2013. However, in 2013, the end date of the project was extended from December 2014. In 2014, a final extension was granted to the end of March 2015, to allow for evaluation and reporting. Funding of project activities ceased in December, 2014. The main reason for the extension was that sustainability of the project achievements had not been achieved as the nationalization process was not complete. Further, the teacher training programs were not complete, and the ALP and school feeding programs were not yet complete. Since funds were still available, the extension was granted.

There were numerous aspects of the project that took longer than expected to achieve or in which delays were reported.

1. When the GoB policy changed from registration to nationalization, some of the work had to be redone to meet the new requirements. Furthermore, the process of nationalization is cumbersome and involves field visits by GoB officials to verify school information provided by the districts. In the CHT, these field visits take much longer than on the plain lands.
2. The slow response of GoB officials. In one instance it took 15 months for a government ministry to respond to a request from another ministry related to the nationalization process.
3. Development of HDC Education Strategies. This process was started in 2012, and was still being finalized in February, 2015.
4. In some instances, disbursement of teachers' salaries was delayed due to difficulty getting information from schools and delays in the procedural requirements.

The activities over which CHTDF had more control were implemented in a more timely fashion, such as those carried out by the HDC officers paid through CHTDF fund. Indeed, the fact that almost equivalent amounts of funds were spent in the final three years of the project indicate that by the third year all the schools were operating and all activities were being undertaken.

Recommendation 5. That in future projects, to allow for slow GoB processes, CHTDF should provide sufficient project funds (or maintain a contingency fund) to maintain project activities until they are handed over to GoB or HDCs.

3.4.3 Comparison with Alternate Approaches

UNDP is rarely involved in basic education development projects, but there were advantages to UNDP undertaking this work. For example, UNDP had already undertaken a very substantial amount of community mobilization work in CHT. This had included the formation of para development committees at the village level in hundreds of paras. Since the project was implemented in upazilas where CHTDF already had a significant presence, CHTDF already had existing community relationships and people in the community had already been empowered to think about and plan their own development activities. This meant that there was already a pool of people in the community who could make important contributions to SMCs, MGs and PTAs.

One consequence of this approach was that communities that had not yet benefitted from CHTDF's work would not benefit directly from this project, either. The alternative was to also include upazilas or communities in which CHTDF had no prior experience. This would have been more inclusive but probably less efficient and less effective.

³⁸ For example, Jesuit Refugee Service spent about €90 per head providing basic education (grade 1-10) to children in two refugee camps on the northern Thai-Myanmar border from 2009-2012. ZOA spent about €30 per head providing very basic education to children in seven refugee camps on the central Thai-Myanmar border from 2010-2014. See Ninnes, P. 2012. Evaluation of the Karenni Education Program for the European Commission, Scottish Catholic International Aid Fund and Jesuit Refugee Service. JRS, Bangkok; Ninnes, P. 2014. Final Evaluation of the Educational Resourcing and Institutional Development (ERID) Project in Seven Camps Along the Thai-Burma Border. ZOA Thailand, Mae Sot.

Sites for new schools, which included pre-primary classes, were chosen in communities whose main language was one of the seven languages for which MLE materials had already been developed. This was more efficient than choosing communities for which new MLE materials would need to have been developed. However, it also had the consequence that smaller language groups continued not to be able to access pre-primary MLE in their own language, unless they could get support from another NGO such as Save the Children or UNICEF.

Schools that were to be funded for renovations were those that already had relatively more classrooms and which were in relatively good condition. This was because the project did not intend to do major repairs, but instead to do minor renovations and improvements such as water and sanitation facilities. This meant that other aspects of the project such as improving teaching and learning could be implemented more quickly. If a community school was in relatively good condition and of reasonable size, this was also taken as an indicator that the school community was relatively well organised and that any further inputs would be sustainable. This was more efficient than selecting schools that needed major renovations or in which there were signs that the community was not supporting the school. However, it also had the consequence that schools in great need of renovation or in great need of community mobilization may have been excluded from the project.

Recommendation 6. That future CHTDF project designs should focus first on equity, identifying the most needy communities using a participatory needs analysis, and then shape administrative, management and funding modalities accordingly.

3.5 Effectiveness

3.5.1 Effectiveness of Policy Focused Advocacy and Support

The TAC achieved a number of important policy changes described above. As such, the project introduced into the government system a new model of schooling for remote areas, which allows for smaller numbers both in the school catchment area and in the school itself. On the other hand, the TAC and Inter-ministerial meetings' effectiveness was limited by a lack of consistency of attendance of members at meetings. For example, MoPME sent one official to each of the last four meetings of the TAC, but it was a different person each time. Similarly, representatives from the MoE attended three of the last four meetings, with one official attending two meetings and two others attending one each. DPE, the national implementer of PDEP-3, sent one different representative to two of the last four meetings.

Another issue impacting on the effectiveness of the TAC was that it was chaired by a MoCHTA official with the rank of joint secretary. In such a case, other line ministries do not send officials of equivalent rank to the meeting, but of one rank lower.³⁹ Thus other line ministries sent officials of the rank of deputy secretary, who do not have much decision making or policy making power in the government system. Furthermore, the National Steering Committee is chaired by the relevant minister. Having TAC chaired by a MoCHTA official of at least Additional Secretary rank will lead to higher ranked and thus more influential officials attending from other line ministries.

Greater ownership of the project by MoPME, DPE and MoE may have been achieved through closer involvement of these line ministries with formulating the project from the beginning of SBECHT-1.⁴⁰ Also, if a CHT focal point had been assigned at national level in MoPME/DPE and MoE to be responsible for progressing CHT matters in general (regardless of the agency or NGO involved), greater consistency of attendance may have been achieved, along with closer coordination and greater effectiveness and efficiency. For example, CHT focal points at Joint Secretary level could

³⁹ The rank order is Minister, Secretary, Additional Secretary, Joint Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Senior Assistant Secretary.

⁴⁰ The 2008 CHTDF annual report lists a range of stakeholders that were consulted in the SBECHT-1 formulation, but they were all in the CHT. No mention is made of consultations with line ministry officials in Dhaka. See United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2008. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2007*. CHTDF, Dhaka, p. 30. An international technical specialist was recruited to among other things strengthen linkages between HDCs, MoCHTA and MoPME, but by then the scope and focus of the project had already been established. See United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2010. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2009*. CHTDF, Dhaka, p. 21.

have driven registration and nationalization and championed SBEC-HT-2 and the CHT and ensured the project remained visible within the MoPME and MoE. Furthermore, such a focal point could also provide advocacy and capacity development for line ministry officials' understanding of and support to decentralization.

Recommendation 7. To ensure participation by high-level officials from other ministries who can make policy decisions (i.e. joint secretary or above), TAC's should be chaired by officials of at least the level of Additional Secretary.

Recommendation 8. UN agencies including UNDP should advocate for MoPME, MoE, MoEF, MoF and other relevant line ministries to appoint a CHT focal point person at joint secretary level to be responsible for CHT matters, to liaise with relevant officers in MoCHTA and to ensure CHT matters are progressed in that line ministry.

3.5.2 Effectiveness of the Systems Strengthening Activities

3.5.2.a Effectiveness of the capacity building of the HDC administrators and officials

The capacity building and support to the HDC administrators and education officials was very effective. One HDC Chair said he felt "empowered" by the project, and that the project enhanced coordination between HDCs and CHTDF. The education officials reported that they had developed their confidence and capacity in areas such as training of trainers, MLE, monitoring and evaluation, advocacy, supervision, management and needs assessment. Their liaison with DPEO appears to have been effective, with textbooks distributed and examinations conducted. Furthermore the quality of the data coming from the schools increased greatly over the course of the project. This indicated the growing capacity of the education officers to support the schools in their data collection and reporting. The effectiveness of their work was inhibited from time to time by factors beyond the control of the project, such as wet season travel. Lack of transport options and insufficient TA and DA for monitoring visits to more remote communities (e.g. to cover overnight costs or the cost of porters when walking to schools, which are paid by some other organisations or NGOs) were the main constraints on monitoring that **HDC education officials** believed had not been adequately addressed.

Recommendation 9. Support DPE officials at district and upazila levels to increase their experience in monitoring and supervising remote CHT schools, as well as their knowledge of the methods and costs (e.g transport, TA, DA) of conducting high-quality supervision and monitoring.

Recommendation 10. Explore alternative modalities for monitoring such as the use of upazila and union parishad officials, mobile phone technology, civil society organisations, further capacity building of SMCs, and so on.

3.5.2.b Effectiveness of the capacity building of the MGs and PTAs

The training for MG and PTA members was originally very effective. Members who received the training reported that as a result they were able to contribute to the schools by urging children to attend, keeping the school clean, keeping children safe, monitoring student attendance, supporting student learning, and learning how to run the MG or PTA. However, the effectiveness of the training may have declined over time as trained members ceased to be active in the group and new, untrained members joined. For example, at one of the schools visited, only two of the eight MG members present had attended training, and that training had been conducted in 2011. At another school, the participants reported that all of the people who received training were no longer active in the MG, as the composition of the MG had changed. There was no indicator in the log frame for the activity of providing initial or refresher training for MGs or PTAs. However, from the focus group discussions it can be said that any refresher training that was held did not pick up all the new members.

Recommendation 11. Future training of MGs/PTAs should include training for teachers and SMC/MG members in how to train the next generation of MG/PTA members to ensure continuity of the capacity of members to run the group.

3.5.2.c Effectiveness of the capacity building of the district and upazila education officials

Overall, the support to the District Primary Education Office was quite effective and contributed to the coordination of activities and facilitated communication. A range of participants in this evaluation reported that DPEO staff and HDC staff were monitoring schools together. They also reported that coordination between the HDC and the DPEO was working well in two areas, namely the distribution of textbooks and the organisation of the PEC (Class V) final examinations. Upazila level officers reported attending teachers' meetings, acting as resource persons in workshops and motivating the community to support the teachers. One of the LNGO officers also reported that there was a good level of dissemination of information from the government to the schools. However, one DPE official believed that the work of his officers, and the linkages between the government and the project, could still be improved.

Recommendation 12. Ensure that project budgets contain funds to provide a practical and effective orientation for newly appointed DPE and MoPME national, district and upazilla level officials who take up their positions in CHT.

3.5.3 Effectiveness of the Activities to Improve Access

3.5.3.a Effectiveness of the school construction and renovation work

There is no doubt that the school construction and renovation work increased access to primary education in a large number of communities. The increases in enrolment and attendance are discussed further in a later section of this report. However, a wide range of the participants in this evaluation noted the effectiveness of the project in extending access to education in remote areas.

The fieldwork for this evaluation included observation of the conditions in and quality of the support schools. All the schools visited had buildings that were in good condition. Most of the schools were clean but had no system of garbage collection. Eleven of the twelve schools observed had a water supply. All of the schools had toilets, most of which were functional. All schools had water for washing hands, but only four schools had soap provided at the hand-washing place. Other schools kept their soap in the office, which is not a very effective practice. All school had drinking water available but in all cases students shared cups, which is unhygienic. All observed classrooms had a teacher's desk, placed in the traditional position at the front of the class. School furniture was in good condition and all but one school had enough seating for students. Four SMCs said that a hostel for students was one of their major infrastructure needs.

Recommendation 13. Projects that involve provision of drinking water should also ensure for hygiene purposes that students have their own cup for drinking water, which can usually be brought from home, and soap provided at the place where hand washing occurs.

Recommendation 14. Continue construction and renovation of schools (including hostels) in un-served or under-served areas based on a comprehensive mapping exercise.

3.5.3.b Effectiveness of the capacity building and support to the SMCs

The SMC participants in this evaluation reported that the SMC training developed their capacity in a number of ways. SMC focus groups in 10 schools reported that the training helped them ensure more regular attendance of students, while a similar number said it enabled the SMC members to contribute to improving the school, usually through labour and the supply of building materials. Ten focus groups also said that they had registered the school land as part of the nationalization process. The other most common responses in terms of what SMCs were now able to do were: supporting teachers (e.g. providing accommodation or food; 3 responses), creating a savings fund for the school (2 responses), building and running student hostels including employing cooks, and monitoring teachers' attendance (2 responses). Two other SMCs said that having a hostel with a cook would be helpful for their school, although at the time of the project they did not have a hostel.

Although the annual reports state that all schools have developed and are displaying their SDP, four of the twelve schools visited for this evaluation did not have the SDP displayed at the time of the evaluation visit. The annual reports state that refresher training was held in 2012 and 2013 for over 5000 SMC members on each occasion. However, some SMC members said they had no training, suggesting some members had slipped through the net.

Other participants in this evaluation also noted that the SMC capacity building was effective in empowering school communities and raising awareness of the importance of education. One respondent opined that the SMCs in the project schools were stronger than those in the GPSs in CHT. However, in some poorer communities or those in which the school had relatively few students, it was difficult for members to support the school financially or in other ways.

Recommendation 15. Future training of SMCs should include training for teachers and SMC members in how to train the next generation of SMC members to ensure continuity of the capacity of members to run the group.

3.5.3.c Effectiveness of the school feeding and adult literacy programmes

The school feeding program was activated in 12 schools, one in each upazila. Members of school communities reported that the program ran smoothly, that it helped the children learn and made them happy and healthy. The adult learning program has been evaluated elsewhere.⁴¹ It covered over 800 illiterate adults across the three districts. Participants in the current evaluation who had undertaken the training or who knew people who had undertaken the training stated that it resulted in participants developing basic literacy skills such that people could better use their mobile phone, understand the television news, and help their children with their school work.

Recommendation 16. WFP should continue to seek funds to extend the SFP to more remote schools in CHT.

Recommendation 17. Extend the GoB ALP programme to illiterate parents including MG, SMC and PTA members in needy school communities, adapted to the local context of CHT.

3.5.3.d Effectiveness of the teacher recruitment program

Overall, the teacher recruitment and training process has been effective. In most places there were enough teachers, although BHDC and RHDC reported a general shortage of qualified teacher candidates in remote areas. BHDC also reported a shortage of teachers in Ruma and Thanchi Upazilas. Lack of teacher housing was an issue in three locations. Two school communities reported teacher shortages, including a GPS that did not receive the full suite of project interventions. One LNGO expressed the view that teachers with higher qualifications should be recruited. Another LNGO reported that, in some cases, unpaid teachers who were excess to school needs were recruited, simply to meet the criterion for nationalization pertaining to numbers of teachers in the school. While this may have been done with the best intentions, it is a potentially fraudulent practice that should be investigated, since if it is occurring, it will have funding implications when schools are fully nationalized i.e. HDCs may receive funds for teachers who do not actually do any work. A better strategy would be to advocate for a change in the criterion to allow for the small number of teachers required in small schools in remote parts of the CHT, and/or to advocate for the development of satellite schools. Such satellite schools could be located, in the case of paras with no GPS, in the para centres already developed by UNICEF and which offer pre-primary education.

Most of the SMC and MG/PTA members were positive about the teachers in their school. They were praised for being punctual, getting good results, visiting students' homes, putting in extra hours to help students, and generally teaching well. Another benefit of local teacher recruitment was that it provided jobs for young people in the communities. However they noted the need for teacher housing in some communities.

One HDC reported that some teachers had not received the initial training. Since initial training was conducted in 2010, 2012 and 2014, it is likely that newly recruited teachers may have missed out at first.

The teachers themselves were satisfied with many aspects of their training. Some areas where they felt they needed more training in order to be able to apply them properly were developing and using teaching aids, lesson planning and multi-grade teaching.

⁴¹ Rahman, A. N. S. Habibur. 2014. *Adult Literacy and Life Skills Program (ALP) April 2013 – December 2013. Evaluation Report.* CHTDF, Dhaka.

Recommendation 18. Support the further provision of teacher accommodation to enhance the recruitment and retention of teachers.

Recommendation 19. Advocate for a change in the criterion for nationalization to allow for the small number of teachers (less than four) required in schools in remote parts of the CHT, while maintaining student: teacher ratios of less than 30; and/or advocate for the development of a policy that allows for satellite schools (e.g. in existing para centres with no GPS) with less than four teachers, supervised by a larger central school.

3.5.4 Effectiveness of the Activities to Improve Educational Quality

3.5.4.a Effectiveness of the teacher training in child-friendly methods

Eleven of the 12 schools visited had children's work displayed inside and/or outside the classroom. The exception was the GPS. It had received fewer inputs than the other schools, but the inputs did include the initial and refresher teacher training in child friendly methods. Some parents reported that children drew pictures as part of their exams, and these were displayed, although in some cases the displays were changed very infrequently (e.g. once per year).

Three of the eleven project schools and the low-intervention GPS had classroom seating arranged only in rows. Six project schools had a combination of rows and a U-shaped arrangement. Two schools had seating arranged in double benches, which created opportunities for students to sit face to face in groups. In addition, students at eight schools reported that they sometimes sat in groups to do reading or other tasks.

Students at five of the schools reported that students who made mistakes were physically punished by the teacher, who hit them with a cane, their hands, or a book. Students at three schools reported that teachers scolded them or called them names (such as "donkey"). Students at three project schools also reported that teachers made students do some humiliating action as punishment, including standing on one leg, holding their ears, or putting their head under the table. These kinds of punishments were reported from a total of six schools, while the other six student focus groups said that teachers used non-violent and non-humiliating behavior management strategies. Students at all twelve schools reported that teachers acknowledged good work or deeds with praise and in some cases by telling their good deeds to other students.

Two of the district education officials interviewed for this evaluation expressed the view that the amount of teacher training provided was inadequate both in terms of pedagogy and improving teachers' subject knowledge. However, they also noted the sincerity and commitment of the teachers.

Recommendation 20. Strengthen the implementation of child-friendly teaching methods, including non-violent and dignified behaviour manager, interactive teaching and learning methods, student-centred classroom arrangements, more extensive and varied displays of students' work, adequate supplies of teaching and learning materials, use of the local environment as a learning and teaching resource, multi-grade teaching, lesson planning and co-curricular activities, by using trainers with knowledge of the local social, cultural and linguistics context, by continuing to explain child-friendly methods to community members, and by using methods that minimize the time teachers are away from their schools.

Recommendation 21. Support the PTIs in CHT to teach student-centred, active, and child-friendly methods in all teacher education programs.

Recommendation 22. Continue to provide opportunities for local teachers with knowledge of Indigenous languages and cultures to upgrade their subject knowledge and teaching qualifications through distance learning or other suitable modes.

3.5.4.b Effectiveness of the monitoring and supervision activities

The HDC officials believed that the monitoring for the project had been effective since 2012, when the data collection forms were revised. This coincided with the employment of a specialist M&E officer in CHTDF. The monitoring guidelines developed as part of the project were useful and effective, and the monitoring staff could follow them. One of the HDC officers reported that the academic supervision process had been unclear, and had only been clarified in October, 2014.

As noted elsewhere, the number of monitoring visits by HDC Monitoring officers, Training Officers and Education Field Supervisors was not recorded in the project results indicators, so no quantitative data was available on the frequency of monitoring visits. However, monitoring visits by DPEO staff was recorded, and while numerous visits were made, the frequency was well below that aimed for in the indicator (see later section).

The rainy season, unavailability of public transport, remoteness, insufficient TA and DA paid to the project-supported education support workers (TOs, MOs, EFSSs) in the HDC, differences in TA and DA paid by various organisations, lack of vehicles, as well as the large number of activities in each quarter were cited as factors that impacted on officers' ability or willingness to undertake monitoring visits. Some schools were so remote that it took two days to visit them, but no DA was provided. A number of alternate strategies were used for collecting monitoring data, such as telephone communication and training headmen, Karbari and Union Parishad members to collect basic school data.

Recommendation 23. Conduct a dialogue with HDCs, all UN agencies and other agencies working with communities in CHT to move towards harmonization of TA and DA allowances.

3.5.5 Effectiveness of the MLE Activities

As noted in the UNDP Responses section above, the project developed MLE pre-primary materials for 1.5 of the 2 years of pre-primary education delivered in 132 project schools, for 11 Indigenous language, and implemented seven of these sets of materials. From Class I, all the other project schools, including the 132 with MLE pre-primary classes, used Bangla as the medium of instruction to fit in with the mainstream education system and government requirements.

Supplementary materials were of two kinds. First, posters were made for Class I containing fables, poems and rhymes from CHT cultures, using local script and local language on one side, and Bangla script and local language on the reverse, so that teachers could read it. There were produced in seven local languages, which teachers in the 132 MLE project schools used at various points in the school day. Second, teaching aids for use in teaching Bangla and English were made and used in all project schools.

The production of MTB-MLE materials for Class II and III was begun but not completed nor implemented. Instead, supplementary materials comprising Indigenous stories translated into Bangla were produced, distributed and used in all the project schools.

Some of the early problems encountered with the MLE program and the action taken to address them were:

1. Four Indigenous language scripts were not familiar to the teachers or students (Chakma, Marma, Tanchangya and Mro). After widespread consultation with local language committees, community members and other stakeholders, it was decided to transliterate these materials into Bangla or Roman script so that teachers could read them.
2. The GoB curriculum required that Bangla and English were introduced at Class I, but the MLE model initially assumed the introduction of these languages at later stages. To address this problem, the MLE programme was reviewed and adjusted at the end of 2010/beginning of 2011.
3. Initially, HDCs had no direct role in coordinating the activities of language committees or the MLE Officers (initially based in local NGOs). To address this problem, the positions of MLE Officers were merged with that of Training Officers, and based in the HDCs. In addition, the activities of the language committees were brought under the purview of HDCs through LOAs.

The MLE materials produced were of good quality with ample illustrations in colour and black and white. The pre-primary level big books had attractive colour covers. The text and pictures included many relevant features of CHT, such as buildings, families, local foods and food preparation methods, recreational activities, hygiene, water collection and use, local musical instruments, fishing, farming including *jum* cultivation, rearing animals, local plants and animals, seasons, and others. The series of pictures produced for pre-primary covered similar themes, including my school, domestic animals, garden, trees, birds, colour, flowers, fruits, *jum*, vegetables, seasons, forest, wild animals, sky, water animals, insects, bamboo and keeping healthy.

Overall, these MTB-MLE and MLE materials were a very important development in the curriculum available to students in project schools. They affirmed local culture and language, provided a relevant context for literacy development, taught relevant knowledge and provided teachers with materials for implementing student-centred active learning.

The teachers found the MLE materials useful. At two schools the teachers said the materials were helpful for teaching Bangla and English. At one school the teachers affirmed the importance of MLE in learning the principles of reading and writing. At another school the teachers said that the students enjoyed learning in their MT, while at another school the teachers said the children guardians/parents liked their children learning MT.

At one school the teachers said that they had not been trained to use the materials, and therefore did not use them properly. At another school, the teachers said that they had the MLE materials in the past, but the materials were no longer in the school. SMC members at that school confirmed this observation.

The community members were pleased to have the MLE and cultural materials used in the school. They said it reduced the fear young children had of starting school, made them more confident, acted as a bridge to learning Bangla, and helped to transmit Indigenous culture. Other participants in this evaluation believed that the MLE materials improved enrolment and attendance of children, helped inexperienced teachers do their job well, made learning more joyful, improved academic performance, increased students' confidence, prepared students for primary schools (in the case of pre-primary materials), and improved the attitude of community members to Indigenous languages. The materials were considered to be highly appropriate for the context and of a suitable quality.

One interviewee expressed dissatisfaction that the MLE development and implementation process had been changed in the middle of the project, and that nationalization had taken priority. Another said that more teachers with the ability to teach in MLE mode were needed. On the other hand, one participant noted that the use of MLE in CHT had helped to convince the government about the value of MTB-MLE.

Overall, this was a relatively modest approach to MLE. It was only implemented in 132 of the 315 project schools, and focused on easing entry into formal education and transition to Bangla, the language of the majority ethnic group in Bangladesh and the medium of instruction in primary school. This transition model contrasts with the maintenance model of MTB-MLE, which aims to develop full literacy in L1 and then L2.⁴² In maintenance models, L1 is used as the medium of instruction and/or taught as a subject up to at least high school level.⁴³ But even as a transition model, the MLE approach in this project is minimal. Most transition approaches have from two to six years of school using L1 as the medium of instruction in order to develop enough L1 fluency to make the transition to L2 medium of instruction successful.⁴⁴ In this project, only 1.5 years of pre-primary were conducted in L1. The risk with this approach is that the Indigenous languages will come to be seen not as worthy of high-level study in their own right, but simply as an early childhood stepping stone towards learning English and Bangla.

On the other hand, the MTB-MLE approach taken in this project was a substantial improvement on the previous situation where local languages were neither used nor valued for their own sake nor as a means of introducing and establishing literacy concepts. Furthermore, the existence of these materials and teachers who are familiar with them provides a platform for further curriculum development as the GoB implements its MLE policy. This policy only covers Chakma, Marma and Tripura, so support will need to be provided to the HDCs to implement the GoB MLE policy for other CHT languages.

Recommendation 24. The electronic files for all of the MLE big books, picture series, charts and other supplementary materials for all 11 languages should be collected and saved on files or servers, as well as copies supplied to each HDC for preservation for future use, in coordination with the NCTB.

⁴² MTB-MLE Network. 2011. Improving learning outcomes through mother tongue-based education. RTI International.

⁴³ The maintenance model is used, for example, by the Karen Education Department in Kayin State in Burma, in which Karen language is used as the medium of instruction in all of primary school using Karen script, Karen is studied as a subject up to Grade 12, and English and Burmese are introduced in Grades 1 and 3 respectively. The Karen Education Department provides education in those parts of Kayin State controlled by the Karen National Union in opposition to the Government of Myanmar. Source: Ninnes, P. 2014. A Review of the Basic Education Curricula Used in Refugee Camps on the Thai-Myanmar Border. Save the Children International, Mae Sot.

⁴⁴ MTB-MLE Network, 2011, op. cit.

Recommendation 25. A future project could involve implementing the materials for the other four Indigenous languages that have not yet been implemented, as well as continuing to implement the other materials such as picture cards, big books, charts.

Recommendation 26. Monitor the GoB's MTB-MLE policy, to ensure that eventually the NCTB develops materials to support the policy for the eight languages not currently being, namely, Bawm, Chak, Tanchangya, Lushai, Khumi, Khyang, Mro, and Pangkhua.

3.5.6 Effectiveness of the Project Design

Overall the project design was effective for implementing the project activities, but in the long-term, less effective for ensuring some of the gains were sustainable (see section on sustainability, below). The project may have been even more effective in terms of reaching more of the most disadvantaged communities if its community and selection process had been different:

1. The SBECHE-1 Mission Formulation Report envisioned that the project would eventually have three phases covering all 25 upazilas. Phase I would cover two upazilas in each district. Phase II would extend the project to 4 upazilas in each district. Finally, in Phase III, the project would be extended to all 25 upazilas. The selection of upazilas in Phase I and II was thus based on the assumption that eventually all upazilas would be included. As a result, the selection criteria were based on both level of need and practical considerations, such as the perceived need to treat each district equally.

In hindsight, and knowing that the project would only extend to 12 (and finally, 13) upazilas, the selection process might have more closely focused on the most needy upazilas. **The project certainly worked in and had a substantial and positive impact on, the most remote parts of Khagrachari and Rangamati.** However, if the criteria for selecting 12 upazilas had been applied to all 25 upazilas simultaneously, rather than separately in each district, it is likely that more upazilas in Bandarban would have been involved, and less upazilas in the other two districts.⁴⁵ One DPEO official noted that indeed there were remote locations in upazilas not included in the project that could have been included.

However, there were other external factors impacting upazila selection during the project period, apart from the early assumption that eventually all upazila would be involved. For example, Naikhyongchari Upazila in Bandarban District, which has very low literacy levels, could only be included from 2014 when its security situation improved to allow the project interventions to be implemented there.

2. The decision to build and renovate equal numbers of schools (10 new schools built and 15 schools renovated) in each of the original 6 upazilas in SBECHE-1 and subsequent 6 upazilas in SBECHE-2 was based on administrative concerns and/or notions of equality, rather than on the principle of equity, that is, supporting the most needy schools and communities.⁴⁶ Project staff considered that 25 schools would be a reasonable number to expect upazila staff to administer, manage and monitor. While a needs analysis was done at the upazila level, this occurred was after the upazilas had been selected, and with the number of intervention schools already decided. However, a needs based approach from the start would have allocated new schools, undertaken renovation and allocated staff across the 12 upazilas based on the needs of the schools, rather than

⁴⁵ This is because the 2009 MICS shows Bandarban lagging behind the other two districts on most educational indicators (see Table 1 above). If the 25 upazilas are ranked on the basis of literacy levels in 2001 as reported in the district statistical reports then of the 12 upazilas with the least literate populations, six were in Bandarban, four in Rangamati and two in Khagrachari districts. Similarly, based on 2011 literacy figures from the same source, six upazilas were in Bandarban, three in Rangamati and three in Khagrachari districts. Thus on these kind of criteria, the participating upazilas might have been somewhat different in Phase II. Calculations based on data in: Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Bandarban*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka; Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Khagrachari*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka; Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Rangamati*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka.

⁴⁶ The same approach was taken in the selection of the original 150 schools and six Upazilas in SBECHE-1. See United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2008. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2007*. CHTDF, Dhaka, p. 29.

the need to allocate identical numbers of staff and other resources to each upazila. It may be that some schools were included in some upazilas that had lesser needs than schools that were excluded from the project in other upazilas. A more effective approach would have been to identify 60 communities throughout the original 6 upazilas most in need of a school, and the 90 communities throughout the 6 upazilas who could most benefit from school renovation. This probably would have resulted in different numbers of schools supported in each upazila, and this could be justified by the fact that the allocation was based on the level of need of each school and community, as indicated by the selection criteria or needs analysis. While the argument was put forth during the course of this consultancy that all schools and upazilas in the CHT are needy, with limited resources it is important to maximize impact by selecting participants in a systematic manner based on an initial needs analysis, rather than assuming that levels of need are uniform or that different levels of need are not important since all schools are needy.

3. According to the selection criteria matrix, communities selected for new schools were limited to communities from the seven language groups for whom at the time pre-primary MLE materials have already been developed in the first phase of the project. This was because each new school would include a classroom for pre-primary. An approach based principally on equity would have built schools in those communities that, among other things, had the lowest levels of education. The community with the lowest level of education according to the 2008-9 socioeconomic survey were the Khumi, with 88 per cent never having attended school. However, the Khumi are small in number, and it was beyond the resources of the project in the first phase to develop MLE materials for the smaller language groups. So the Khumi communities like the other small language groups were excluded from the new school building aspect of the project. However, recognizing these constraints of the process, the project did support two schools in Ruma upazila in Bandarban, in which the students were 100 per cent Khumi. Furthermore, the new school selection criteria had more flexible criteria for smaller ethnic groups, in which the community required a minimum of only 20 pre-school aged children, rather than the usual 25, to be eligible to apply for support from the project. Furthermore, the 15 schools added in 2015 in Naikhyongchuri Upazila in Bandarban all served the Chak community, which was one of the excluded language groups in the original selection process.

4. Effectiveness of the MLE program was affected by the desire on the part of project officials to develop schools that integrated with the national system. This issue has been canvassed in a previous section. It should be noted, however, that due in some part to CHTDF's and other NGOs' advocacy for a more comprehensive approach to MLE, the GoB now has an MLE policy which allows for the use of MT up to Class III 3. So future students will have a greater proportion of their primary education in MT. CHTDF has also developed materials in MT that have not been used due to the change in the approach used by the project after the review of the MLE approach. These may yet be useful for teaching MT in Class I to III under the new GoB policy.

(See Recommendations 25 and 26 above)

3.5.7 Effectiveness of Project Management and Coordination

The project was effectively managed and coordinated, especially in the final three years. In the first two years, the monitoring mechanisms were not well developed, and data against some of the indicators was not collected. At that time, there was no dedicated M&E officer for education. From 2011-2012, a much more robust monitoring system was developed which was easier for the field officers to use. It provided detailed feedback on all of the indicators and allowed progress to be tracked and adjustments to be made. This was reflected in an increase in the quality of reporting of the indicators in the annual reports. However, in September, 2013, when the project was extended without any extension of funds, the specialist M&E position in Rangamati was abolished, and the M&E functions added to the work of the remaining officers.

Most of the indicators in the log frame worked well and good quality data was collected against them. A few of the original indicators were ambiguous or unrealistic:

1. "Teacher attendance at project schools increases by 10% per year." Attendance can only increase by 10% per year over the life of a 4-year project if the baseline rate is 60% or so. No baseline figure is available, but it is unlikely that it was 60% since the figure in 2012 was 91.2%.
2. "Decrease in student absenteeism in project schools in which MLE is used (drops at least 5% per year)"; "Decrease in repetition rates in project schools (drop by 5% per year)"; "Drop-out rates reduce by 5% per year". There is a difference between the *rate* dropping by 5% per year

(20% then 15% then 10%) and the *number* of absentees, repeaters or drop-outs falling by 5% per year.

There were two significant omissions from the log frame, namely an indicator for monitoring visits by HDC monitoring officers, training officers and education field supervisions officers, and an indicator for the capacity building provided to MGs/PTAs.

Recommendation 27. Appoint an M&E officer from the formulation stage of project design in order to ensure robust development of monitoring and evaluation plans, log frames, indicators, and so on.

3.5.8 Effectiveness of Administrative, Operational and Technical Aspects

Overall, the administration, operation and technical aspects of the project were undertaken effectively. Participants in this evaluation identified a small number of problems:

- One HDC official suggested that initially the capacity of the HDC to implement the project was inadequate.
- One district reported that there was a shortage of exam centres for administering the PEC exam.
- Communication was affected by poor roads and lack of mobile phone coverage in remote areas
- Monitoring was particularly difficult in the rainy season.
- The funding allocation for monitoring in remote locations was inadequate especially when overnight stops were required.
- One LNGO that reported that the release of funds for their activities was not done in a timely manner. This problem was also reported by one of the HDCs.
- One LNGO said that teacher salary payment was irregular.
- One LNGO reported that there were delays in commencing the contract.
- The abolishment of the M&E expert post in 2013 produced a gap that could not be filled
- Refresher teacher training was moved from upazilas to District centre (Khagrachari) where training and accommodation facilities were said to be better. However, this meant teachers were away from their schools longer.

Some of these challenges were addressed during the course of the project. For example, in Rangamati District, the timing of school holidays was changed to ensure schools could be accessed while they were in session. In addition, Headmen, Karbari, and Union Parishad members were trained in basic monitoring techniques so that they could monitor the schools when offices from the District or upazila could not reach the school.

3.6 Impact of Project Activities

3.6.1 Achievements of the Project Against the Project Indicators

The detailed analysis of the achievements of the five components of the project are provided in Annex 6.

Component 1. Policy Focused Advocacy and Support

1. GOB formulating circulars/guidelines/policies in relation to education needs in the CHT. This was *achieved*, with a number of changes to policies and regulations (detailed elsewhere in this report) to allow for the registration/nationalization of small, remote schools in CHT. The fact that nationalization has not yet been finalized means that fully *achieved status* was not granted. Full achievement of this indicator could have been facilitated by having a stronger link with and ownership of the project by MoPME, MoE and NCTB from the very beginning, with senior government officers introduced to the specific contexts of CHT and tasked with supporting the project and participating in working groups.
2. HDCs have targeted an increase in the resource allocation for the primary education sector in the CHT. This result was *partly achieved*. Full achievement status would have been granted if the district specific education strategies had been finalized, costed and funded.
3. Recommendations put forward by Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)-Education are implemented. This result was *mostly achieved*. Almost all of the recommendations of the TAC were implemented, except the one to form a form a joint committee chaired by the Deputy Secretary, Development in MoCHTA, with representatives from MoCHTA, MoPME, DoE and

CHTDF to prepare a status paper on CHT schools seeking nationalization. This committee never met.

Component 2. Strengthening Systems

1. Teacher attendance at project schools increases by 10% per year. There is *no baseline data* to assess this indicator. HDCs lacked the capacity to manage and report data on this indicator prior to 2012. Teacher attendance increased each year for which data was provided and was very high by the end of the project. Teacher attendance increased from 91.2% in 2012 to 96.0% in 2014.
2. Accurate demographic and ethnic data updated annually is available for planning & monitoring by HDCs and/or UEOs. This result was *achieved*. There was no means to verify the accuracy of the data, but the project was able to provide data on the number of students enrolled and the proportion from the various language backgrounds for 2011-2014.
3. DPEO and A/UEO do 5 school visits per quarter per upazila in 2010, increasing to 8 per quarter by 2013. This result was *not achieved*. Regular schools visits did occur, but over the five years of the project (2010-2014 inclusive) these only averaged 2.75 visits per quarter per upazila.
4. 100% of SMCs which received minimum 3 days training are functioning by applying their training knowledge. This result was *partially achieved*. Most SMC members in the 300 intensively supported schools received two or more days training. **2099 members of SMCs from the selected 180 GPSs received training. HDCs reported in 2014 that 83.5% of SMCs were functioning.**
5. A budget and School Development Plan (SDP) is publicly displayed, accurate and up to date, and understood by SMC, parents and Para members in 100% of project schools by end of 2010. This result was probably *fully achieved* early in the project. However, four of the 12 schools visited for this evaluation did not have their SDP on display.
6. District-specific education plans/ strategies developed by HDCs (at least one plan/strategy per HDC). This result was *almost fully achieved*. At the time of this evaluation, the district-based education strategies were in their final draft, with the process having taken three years.
7. Stakeholders' coordination meetings on primary education held by HDCs (4/year/HDC), reflecting improved sharing of information/collaboration. This result was *mostly achieved*. On average, HDCs organized three coordination meetings per year.

Component 3. Access to Education.

1. Net enrolment rates in project school catchment areas increases to at least national average (2008: 90.8%). This result was *not achieved*. NER increased from 90.7% in 2010 to 92% in 2013. The national NER in the meantime increased from 94.8% in 2010 to 97.3% in 2013. Enrolment numbers increased from 8,241 in 150 project schools at the end of SBEC-HT-1 in 2009, to 20,195 in 315 project schools in 2014. Most of the increase occurred in the first and second years of the project when new schools were built and others extended.
2. Gross enrolment rates in project school catchment areas increases to at least national average (2008: 97.8%). This result was *achieved*. The GER increased from 95% in 2010 to 118% in 2014, compared to national figures of 107.7% and 108.6% respectively. Although the result was achieved, it could be due to a positive factor, that is, increased enrolment of over-age students who had previously missed out on education, or to a negative factor such as increased grade repetition.
3. No. of new schools constructed (Target: 60). This result was *achieved*. Sixty new schools were constructed in 2010.
4. No. of school buildings renovated or extended (Target 272). The result *exceeded* the target, with 343 facilities renovated or extended from 2010-2014.
5. No. of project schools with clean toilets increases (100% of project schools have clean toilets by 2013). This result was *partially achieved*, with 75.4% of schools have clean toilets in 2014. Note: Most schools visited for this evaluation did not have soap available for hygienic hand washing after toilet use. Lack of nearby water was cited as a reason that schools could not keep their toilets clean.
6. No. of project schools with safe drinking water facilities increases (to reach a target of 100% coverage by 2013). This result was *achieved*, although in all schools visited during the evaluation, students shared cups. This makes the drinking water unsafe if any students using the cups has an infectious disease transmittable by mouth or hand and cups are not washed with water and detergent before re-use.

Component 4. Quality Education

1. Increase in the proportion of schools that utilize child-centered, activity-based teaching methods against agreed criteria (e.g., seating, group work, manipulative) (75% of intensively supported schools by 2013). This result was *almost fully achieved* by 2014, with 67.5% of schools using child-centred, activity based learning in at least some schools and 69% using the innovative teaching and learning materials supplied as part of this project.
2. Increase in the proportion of schools that arrange seating in a child centered way (to reach a target of 75% of intensively supported schools by 2013). This result was *almost fully achieved*, with 72.7% of schools having at least some classes with child-centred seating arrangements. However, it should be noted that some schools visited for the evaluation had a proportion of classes with seats and desks in traditional rows, and the remainder with a U-shaped arrangement. This means it is likely that substantially less than 75% of classrooms had child-centred seating arrangements.
3. Project classrooms each year keep a student: teacher ratio within range of 20-30:1. This ratio was *achieved in half* of the four years for which data was recorded (2010 and 2014).
4. Annual school contact hours move towards the UNESCO recommendation of 850+ in classes 3-5, and 680 hours in pre-primary, classes I and II. This result was *achieved* for Classes III-V (850+ hours) and *almost achieved* for Pre-Primary and Classes I and II (600+ hours)
5. 10% more classes each year use teaching aids and/or supplementary reading materials. There was *insufficient data* collected to assess this result. HDC data indicates that in 2012, 69.7% of classes used these materials, rising to 86.7% in 2013 and 79.8% in 2014. However, project officers reported that monitors did not collect this data systematically.
6. All project school teachers receive initial training for a minimum of 18 days. This result was *mostly achieved*. The initial teacher training programme ran for 18 days, and 481 teachers took it. However, some teachers in the focus groups said that they only received 12 days of MLE training.
7. 100% project classes each year have a trained teacher in charge. According to the project annual reports, this result was *achieved*. However, a small number of teachers in the evaluation focus groups reported that they had not received training.
8. All teachers receive annual in-service (follow-up) training for a minimum of 10 days. This result was *achieved*. Data provided by the PMR unit of CHTDF and clarified by project staff indicated that 2-day refresher training was held five or six times a year, for a total of at least 10 days.
9. Project school head teachers have received minimum 4 days initial management and pedagogy training and follow up training within 12 months (Target: 300 project school head teachers). This result was *mostly achieved*. Head teacher training was held in 2010 2011, and 2012. Head teachers from schools that joined the project after 2012, such as those in Naikhyongchari Upazila in Bandarban District, received abbreviated training during their attendance at basic teacher training courses.

Component 5. Mother-Tongue Based Multi-Lingual Education

1. No. of schools in which teachers and pupils are actively using MLE (Target: at least 120 schools). This result was *exceeded* (132 schools). However, MT is only used in Pre-Primary I and II, and Class I.
2. Decrease in student absenteeism in project schools in which MLE is used (drops at least 5% per year). This result *could not be assessed*. Absentee rates were only calculated for the 300 project schools in 12 upazilas, not just for the 132 MLE schools.
3. Decrease in repetition rates in project schools (drop by 5% per year). This result *could not be assessed*, as data were only available for 2013 (repetition rate 11%) and 2014 (repetition rate 10%). The 2013 and 2014 rates are not comparable because they used different data sources (See Annex 6 for details).
4. Decrease in drop-out rates in project schools (drop by 5% per year). This result *could not be assessed*, as data were only available for 2013 (drop-out rate 3.4%) and 2014 (repetition rate 2%). The 2013 and 2014 rates are not comparable because they used different data sources (See Annex 6 for details).
5. MLE materials developed from pre-primary to class 3 in languages of the CHT (MLE Material for PP-1 & PP-2 and Supplementary Materials for class 1 to class 2). This result was *achieved*, although materials for the second half of Pre-Primary II were never implemented and the supplementary materials for Class II and III had local Indigenous stories written in Bangla, not in MT. Furthermore, only seven Indigenous languages were employed in the schools, not all 11.

Some of the extant scripts were not used but were replaced by Bangla or Roman script, since in some cases teachers could not read the script for their language.

3.6.2 Impact of the Activities on Student Learning

One way to evaluate the effectiveness of the project activities is to examine pass rates in the PEC examinations. By 2014, the average pass rates by upazila were 91% - 100% overall. The overall PEC pass rate in 2014 for boys and girls in project schools was 97% for both groups. The project supported improvements to the quality of teaching and learning in schools, but for the PEC it also supported extra-curricular tutoring. It is not possible with the data available to distinguish between the impact on pass rates of improvements in the quality of classroom teaching from the impact of the provision of tutoring. Nor is it possible to assess the quality of the PEC examinations or the types of questions asked. If, for example, the questions mainly test rote memorization, then a pass rate of 100% is less impressive than if the questions assess higher order thinking and problem solving.

3.6.3 Unintended Impacts

Although the project originally intended to cover all 25 upazilas, by the end of SBECHT-2 it had only covered 13. Although a third phase to cover the remaining upazilas has been considered, funding has not been forthcoming. The reason given by donors is that funds should be channelled into PEDP-III activities rather than into separate projects. This contradicts the donors' own reasons for supporting SBECHT-2, namely, that PEDP-II and PEDP-III do not address the unique context of CHT. However, as noted earlier, PEDP-III mainly focuses on existing government schools including those who have been able to achieve nationalization. One unintended impact of the cessation of donor funding before the project was extended to all upazilas is that the project has created two groups of communities and schools in CHT. One group has received support from SBECHT-2, and one group has not. With no third phase of the project, it is uncertain whether needy community schools that did not participate in the project can get support to attain nationalization and hence participate in PEDP-III.

3.7 Sustainability

3.7.1 Sustainability in the Current Policy and Programme Environment

Of the schools that had the major interventions, all but 228 are currently nationalized and integrated into the government primary school education system. There is a very high likelihood that the remaining 228 schools will be nationalized and integrated into the government system within the next year or so. This is substantially due to the advocacy efforts of the project to make the criteria for nationalization more flexible and to gain a waiver from the Honourable Prime Minister regarding the land lease criteria for schools situated in forest reserves. The major issue that remains pertains to the timing of the commencement of government funding. Informants to this evaluation noted that it may be up to 12 months between when a school is nationalized to when the resources to support it start flowing from the government.

The HDCs believe they can cover teacher salaries and infrastructure needs with their current budgets, so the schools themselves will probably be sustainable in some form. However, the HDCs believe that they cannot support measures from the project intended to enhance the quality of education in the schools, such as teacher training, monitoring and supervisory activities undertaken by officers supported by this project. In the last 15 months of the project, there were 43 positions receiving salary support through the SBECHT-2. These included training officers, monitoring officers, and education field supervisors based at the district or upazila level.

The HDCs and the SBECHT-2 project officials are currently seeking finance from various sources to bridge the gap between nationalization and the receipt of government funding to cover these activities. Furthermore, it may be possible for HDC monitoring officials involved in other sectors to do some basic monitoring of, for example, teacher and student attendance, in the course of their visits for other monitoring requirements. Once nationalization is achieved, the responsibility for monitoring, training and field supervision will pass to the DPEO and staff in the district offices. These offices are already stretched for resources, so it is unlikely they will have the resources to undertake appropriate supervision, monitoring and training. Furthermore, they have not received the quantity of training in child-friendly schools or active learning that the HDC staff supported by the project received. It is doubtful if the DPE officers can provide the same quality of support, although PEDP-III does promote child-friendly learning.

The source of this substantial limitation of sustainability goes back to the design of the project. There was no agreed mechanism on how the project-supported training, monitoring and supervising staff would be integrated into either the HDCs or the DPEO at the end of the project. There could have been a letter of agreement with the DPE via the district DPEO that funds for these positions would gradually be provided to the HDC from the MoPME over the course of the project. The funds could have been allocated as part of PEDP-III. Thus by the end of the project, the HDC would have funds to continue to employ all of these 42 officers. As it is, there are currently no funds for these positions, so the quantity and quality of support they previously provided to the schools will be compromised or lost altogether.

The awareness raising undertaken in all the school communities is another aspect of the project that will be sustainable. Once families have realized rights to their children's education, and been exposed to a student-centred and active model of teaching and learning, they are less likely to be satisfied with lesser quality education. The communities have been empowered with knowledge and experience and can use these to press for their continuation.

Recommendation 28. A mechanism should be included in CHTDF projects for the ongoing funding by HDCs or line ministries of positions created with project funds. Otherwise, the capacity built and experience gained is dissipated at the end of the project.

3.7.1 Views on Sustainability of Stakeholders in the CHT

Stakeholders in the CHT had two major concerns regarding sustainability. The first was how to bridge the short-term funding while HDSs await the outcomes of the nationalization process. The second concerned how to extend the gains made in the project to under-served areas that had not participated from the project.

3.7.1.a Bridging the Short-Term Gap

It was anticipated that it would take 9 to 12 months from the end of the SBECHT-2 project for government funds flowed to the HDC to support the newly nationalized schools. In the meantime, stakeholders identified a range of options:

1. Use existing HDC funds to pay teacher salaries. There are enough funds available, but using funds for salaries would come at the expense of other activities, such as monitoring.
2. Employing less teachers and requiring them to teach double shifts or multi-grade classes
3. Reduce teacher salaries and top them up with cash or food contributions from the school community (although several respondents said that people were too poor to be able to do this)
4. Approach the Honourable Prime Minister's Office for a special grant to tide the schools over until nationalization funds become available.
5. Lobby the donor community or local government for funds
6. Incorporate school monitoring into other CHTDF field based activities
7. Use funds from the MDG acceleration process

Recommendation 29. CHTDF to work with HDCs to put in place interim monitoring procedures using monitors for other projects to undertake basic monitoring, or using MDG acceleration funds to employ specialist education monitoring officers.

Option no. 1 is already being implemented by the HDCs. Nos. 2 and 3 are not very just, given that project teachers already earn only about half of a GPS teacher's salary. In addition, No. 2 would put nationalization at risk under the current policy that requires four teachers at a school. Option no. 4 may be possible, given that the Office has already provided support to the nationalization process. Option 5 also has moral strength, given that the donors supported the program up until the end of 2014, believing that it met crucial needs in the CHT. Option 6 is also feasible although the depth of monitoring may be limited to collecting data on easy to measure indicators such as teacher and student attendance, and student enrolment. Monitoring the quality of teaching and learning is more difficult for non-specialists. No. 7 is also feasible and should be investigated further.

Most stakeholders who commented on the lack of bridging funds realised that it was caused by the very slow process of nationalization. Nevertheless, a number of stakeholders expressed disappointment that funding ceased before the process was complete. When designing projects, donors and implementers need to allow for the fact that if long-term sustainability of the achievements relies on handover of financial support to the GoB, then the very slow pace of the bureaucratic

machinery should be taken into account, and contingency funds set aside to maintain activities until the handover process is completed. Such continuity of activities is particularly important when substantial resources have been put into getting children in to school and keeping them enrolled and attending by providing teacher training and appropriate learning materials. Any lengthy disruption to school activities threatens many of those gains. Students who stop attending school because it closed temporarily may never return. Teachers become demoralized, learning materials are lost or damaged, and school buildings suffer from lack of maintenance. In the case of SBECHT-2, many efforts were made to ensure that nationalization was achieved before the funds ran out. The project was extended for 15 months. Extraordinary and highly commendable efforts were made to government officials to speed up and complete the process. Nevertheless, in the end, it was not enough, so it is important to amend the strategy to avoid a repetition of this short fall.

(See recommendation 5 above)

3.7.1.b Extending the Gains to Other Under-Served Areas

A number of stakeholders in this evaluation realized that the project had covered only some of the needy areas in the three districts in the CHT. Although needs analysis was undertaken at the upazila level, the original plan to cover all 25 upazilas was not achieved. Although some of these upazilas have relatively urban populations, most upazilas have some remote areas. A comprehensive mapping exercise of pre-primary and primary education education needs throughout the CHT needs to be undertaken.

Recommendation 30. Undertake a comprehensive mapping exercise of pre-primary and primary education needs throughout the CHT drawing on existing knowledge at the upazila level as well as primary data.

Recommendation 31. Since CHTDF has developed an effective model for delivering basic education in remote parts of the CHT, CHTDF could promote its model to relevant development partners who could for example, implement an interim two-year project based on the CHTDF model until the end of PEDP-III to reach schools and communities not reached in the current project, using the structures and processes already established, incorporating modifications recommended in this report, and based on community needs.

4. Conclusions

1. The Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts Phase II project responded to the extensive basic education needs of a large number of unserved or under-served communities in remote parts of the CHT. It made substantial progress in filling a gap created by the inability of the GoB to provide education to these parts of the population of Bangladesh. Nevertheless, some remote communities in CHT remain without suitable access to basic education services.
2. The project achieved its overall objective of contributing to “improved socio-economic development of the CHT in line with the principles of the CHT Accord”. It did so over two phases through intensive interventions in 315 school communities, supporting school improvement in another 180 GPSs, and building capacity at the HDC, DPEO, upazil and union levels to manage, monitor and support basic education. The improvements in education levels of the children in the project schools should have a long-term benefit to themselves, their families and their communities. The training provided to teachers and the capacity building at various levels will also have long-term, positive impacts in the CHT.
3. The SBECHT-2 project also substantively fulfilled its purpose to “establish and promote access to a quality primary education system in the CHT.” It did so over two phases by building 120 new schools and implementing a range of other quality improvement initiatives at a further 375 government and project schools. The quality of teaching and learning was improved by recruiting local teachers, training teachers in child-friendly and MLE methods, supplying teaching and learning materials, developing MLE materials, improving infrastructure, and building the capacity of SMCs, MGs and PTAs. The education system in CHT was strengthened by empowering and enabling HDCs and other education officials in the districts to manage the schools. The sustainability of most of these achievements is almost certainly going to be assured through the policy advocacy efforts that

facilitated the process of nationalization of the NGPSs, despite some schools and communities not meeting the GoB's original criteria. However, it is uncertain exactly how nationalization will impact on quality particularly child-friendly approaches, the use of the less common CHT languages in school, and the role of the HDC in the management of the schools when they become GPSs.

4. The activities were highly relevant to the objectives, purpose and intended impacts of the project, and to the schools and their communities. They were also relevant to the GoB's goals for basic education as enshrined in legal documents and international commitments. In particular, the project contributed to extending the extent to which the Hill Districts Acts are being implemented, by empowering the HDCs to play a greater role in managing the education system in CHT. However, expanding the role of the HDC or integrating the project activities into the education SWAp has proved problematic because of the lack of recognition in major GoB primary education development programs of the contents of the Hill District Acts including the role of the HDCs.

5. The project was implemented efficiently, with reasonable per student costs. The project took longer to implement than expected, mainly due to the slow pace of the GoB's school nationalization process. Future projects need to anticipate very slow government responses and allow for them if hand over to the government for sustainability is an expected outcome.

6. The policy advocacy and system strengthening activities were all quite effective, apart from the slow pace of nationalization. The activities to improve access and quality were also effective. Some respondents had reservations about the quality of locally recruited teachers and the effectiveness of the relatively few days of teacher training. Child-friendly student behaviour management was one area needing improvement. Improvements to access and quality were also limited to 13 upazilas, whereas the original project design covered all 25 upazilas. This meant the project had little or no impact on remote communities in the remaining 12 upazilas. The project was well managed and coordinated, with no major administrative, technical or operational problems.

7. The project had a major impact on basic education. Teacher attendance improved and monitoring and data collection were enhanced. Many SMCs, MGs, and PTAs became more active in and supportive of schools. The HDCs became more adept at managing and coordinating education activities, particularly liaising with their counterparts in DPE. The DPE officials also became accustomed with methods for supervising and monitoring remote schools, empowering SMCs and implementing MLE. NER and GER both increased, and the number of schools with clean toilets and access to drinking water also rose significantly. However, some aspects of hygiene need work, including the cleanliness of toilets, access to soap for hygienic hand washing, and avoidance of sharing cups for drinking. The vast majority of schools had at least some classrooms with furniture arranged in student centred ways, and over two-thirds of schools were using active-learning approaches. Student : teacher ratios were at acceptable levels, and the number of contact hours neared or surpassed international standards. All classes had a teacher with at least some training, although the actual number of days of training was quite low. Head teachers also had received some training. MTB-MLE was introduced into 132 schools, using seven of the 11 CHT languages, and some other form of MLE was added to all the other schools. The MLE project was a big improvement on the previous situation where the project schools did not have MLE. However, compared to international standards of MLE, the program introduced in this project was rather modest. Nevertheless, it formed a good foundation for further development of MLE as the GoB rolls out its new MLE policy.

8. This was a time-limited project, which in the end extended access to education to 13 of the 25 upazilas. An unintended impact of this was to create a situation where some remote areas of the CHT had been supported, but others had not. This could have been avoided by the donors agreeing to fund the project for a third phase, especially since the donors continue to agree that even the revised PEDP-III does not adequately address the basic education needs of remote parts of the CHT.

9. As noted above, the 228 HDC managed schools in this project should be sustainable once the nationalization process is complete and the funds start flowing. There is a short term (thought to be up to 12 months) funding gap between the end of this project (December 2014) and when the GoB funds will start to flow through. This has created some hardship for the schools. The HDC believes it can fund the teachers and some infrastructure in the interim, but that still leaves unfunded all the quality assurance mechanisms such as monitoring and reporting, ongoing teacher training, and refresher training for SMCs, MGs and PTAs. The problem for the community groups is that most parents cease to be active in these organisations when their children leave school. Without project funds, these organisations may lack ongoing training and lose their efficacy. The capacity building of HDC is less sustainable. The HDC officers employed through HDC's own funds can continue to use

their knowledge in managing schools. However, all the MOs, TOs, and EFSs were employed through project funds, and their positions are now unfunded. A mechanism for transferring these positions to HDC and funding them through HDC funds should have been built into the project from the start. The sustainability of some of the MLE aspects of the project are also questionable. This particularly applies to the languages that are not being supported by the NCTB under the GoB's new MLE policy.

5. Lessons Learned, Recommendations and Future Projects

5.1 Lessons Learned

1. Contributing to the implementation of the Peace Accord provisions for the transfer of responsibility for basic education to the HDCs, and providing quality basic education to remote parts of the CHT, is possible with appropriate resources and a comprehensive strategy. This strategy includes building and renovating schools, recruiting and training local teachers, providing teaching and learning resources, providing ongoing support for monitoring and supervision, ensuring clear communication and sound coordination between various actors, and empowering HDC officials and local communities to support basic education.
2. Implementing projects in areas where UNDP already works and hence using existing structures and support mechanisms such as para development committees provides a sound basis for new development projects, but also may not serve the most needy if other factors such as security intervene.
3. Although the Peace Accord and the HDC Acts intend for subjects such as education to be transferred to the HDCs, this process is a work in progress. Therefore, project formulation needs to include close liaison not only with HDCs and GoB line ministry representatives in CHT, but also with those in central ministry offices in Dhaka. Furthermore, while this project advanced liaison between HDCs and the line ministries in the CHT, *it perhaps should have done more to clarify the division of labour between the HDCs and the line ministries.*
4. The speed at which the GoB partners can fulfil their commitments to the project or undertake actions relevant to the project (such as nationalizing schools to ensure their sustainability) should not be overestimated.
5. Using LNGOs to build the capacity of MGs, SMCs and PTAs is effective, but at the same time the training did not explicitly teach the MGs etc how to pass that knowledge on to future members, nor did it include capacity building for HDCs on how to train members of these groups.

5.2 Recommendations for Way Forward and Future Projects

1. UN agencies and other donors to continue to advocate for the greater inclusion of HDCs in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of PEDP-III activities for the remainder of that project, as well as the planning, accountabilities and other aspects for the next PEDP.
2. The UN Agencies and other donors to continue to advocate for the democratic election of HDCs as per the Hill District Councils Act.
3. That UN agencies and other development partners support the government officials to not only understand the context of the CHT but also to have well developed understanding of concepts of equity and how these concepts apply to the provision of services for a diverse population.
4. That UNDP and other development partners, as part of the process of harmonizing laws and regulations, support the GoB to develop a clear understanding of the roles of MoPME and other line ministries in supporting HDCs to manage education in the CHT, and develop a road map and mechanism for the staged and full transfer of responsibility of education to the HDCs, including the division of labour between the HDCs and the line ministries.
5. That in future projects, to allow for slow GoB processes, CHTDF should provide sufficient project funds (or maintain a contingency fund) to maintain project activities until they are handed over to GoB or HDCs.
6. That future CHTDF project designs should focus first on equity, identifying the most needy communities using a participatory needs analysis, and then shape administrative, management and funding modalities accordingly.

7. To ensure participation by high-level officials from other ministries who can make policy decisions (i.e. joint secretary or above), TAC's should be chaired by officials of at least the level of Additional Secretary.
8. UN agencies including UNDP should advocate for MoPME, MoE, MoEF, MoF and other relevant line ministries to appoint a CHT focal point person at joint secretary level to be responsible for CHT matters, to liaise with relevant officers in MoCHTA and to ensure CHT matters are progressed in that line ministry.
9. Support DPE officials at district and upazila levels to increase their experience in monitoring and supervising remote CHT schools, as well as their knowledge of the methods and costs (e.g transport, TA, DA) of conducting high-quality supervision and monitoring.
10. Explore alternative modalities for monitoring such as the use of upazila and union parishad officials, mobile phone technology, civil society organisations, further capacity building of SMCs, and so on
11. Future training of MGs/PTAs should include training for teachers and MG/PTA members in how to train the next generation of MG/PTA members to ensure continuity of the capacity of members to run the group.
12. Ensure that project budgets contain funds to provide a practical and effective orientation for newly appointed DPE and MoPME national, district and upazila level officials who take up their positions in CHT.
13. Projects that involve provision of drinking water should also ensure for hygiene purposes that students have their own cup for drinking water, which can usually be brought from home, and soap provided at the place where hand washing occurs.
14. Continue construction and renovation of schools (including hostels) in un-served or under-served areas based on a comprehensive mapping exercise
15. Future training of SMCs should include training for teachers and SMC members in how to train the next generation of SMC members to ensure continuity of the capacity of members to run the group.
16. WFP should continue to seek funds to extend the SFP to more remote schools in CHT
17. Extend the GoB ALP programme to illiterate parents including MG, SMC and PTA members in needy school communities, adapted to the local context of CHT.
18. Support the further provision of teacher accommodation to enhance the recruitment and retention of teachers.
19. Advocate for a change in the criterion for nationalization to allow for the small number of teachers (less than four) required in schools in remote parts of the CHT, while maintaining student: teacher ratios of less than 30; and/or advocate for the development of a policy that allows for satellite schools with less than four teachers, supervised by a larger central school.
20. Strengthen the implementation of child-friendly teaching methods, including non-violent and dignified behaviour manager, interactive teaching and learning methods, student-centred classroom arrangements, more extensive and varied displays of students' work, adequate supplies of teaching and learning materials, use of the local environment as a learning and teaching resource, multi-grade teaching, lesson planning and co-curricular activities, by using trainers with knowledge of the local social, cultural and linguistics context, by continuing to explain child-friendly methods to community members, and by using methods that minimize the time teachers are away from their schools.
21. Support the PTIs in CHT to teach student-centred, active, and child-friendly methods in all teacher education programs.
22. Continue to provide opportunities for local teachers with knowledge of Indigenous languages and cultures to upgrade their subject knowledge and teaching qualifications through distance learning or other suitable modes.
23. Conduct a dialogue with HDCs, all UN agencies and other agencies working with communities in CHT to move towards harmonization of TA and DA allowances.
24. The electronic files for all of the MLE big books, picture series, charts and other supplementary materials for all 11 languages should be collected and saved on files or servers, as well as copies supplied to each HDC for preservation for future use, in coordination with the NTCB
25. A future project could involve implementing the materials for the other four Indigenous languages that have not yet been implemented, as well as continuing to implement the other materials such as picture cards, big books, charts.

26. Monitor the GoB's MTB-MLE policy, to ensure that eventually the NCTB develops materials to support the policy for the eight languages not currently being developed, namely, Bawm, Chak, Tanchangya, Lushai, Khumi, Khyang, Mro, and Pangkhua.
27. Appoint an M&E officer from the formulation stage of project design in order to ensure robust development of monitoring and evaluation plans, log frames, indicators, and so on.
28. A mechanism should be included in CHTDF projects for the ongoing funding by HDCs or line ministries of positions created with project funds. Otherwise, the capacity built and experience gained is dissipated at the end of the project.
29. CHTDF to work with HDCs to put in place interim monitoring procedures using monitors for other projects to undertake basic monitoring, or using MDG acceleration funds to employ specialist education monitoring officers.
30. Undertake a comprehensive mapping exercise of pre-primary and primary education needs throughout the CHT drawing on existing knowledge at the upazila level as well as primary data
31. Since CHTDF has developed an effective model for delivering basic education in remote parts of the CHT, CHTDF could promote its model to relevant development partners who could for example, implement an interim two-year project based on the CHTDF model until the end of PEDP-III to reach schools and communities not reached in the current project, using the structures and processes already established, incorporating modifications recommended in this report, and based on community needs.

6. Annexes

Annex 1. Terms of Reference

The Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) is one of the most diverse regions of the country in terms of geography, ethnicity, culture and tradition of the peoples. The estimated population in the CHT is approximately 1.58 million which is about 1% of the total population of Bangladesh. There are eleven indigenous groups in the CHT speaking distinct languages. These are Bawm, Chak, Chakma, Khyang, Khumi, Lushai, Marma, Mro, Pangkhua, Tangchangya and Tripura. The three largest of these (Chakma, Marma and Tripura) represent about 90% of the total 'indigenous/tribal' population, which altogether make up only about 50% of the overall population of the CHT at present, with the rest consisting of Bengalis, the majority of whom were relocated into the CHT a little over three decades ago. The majority of the CHT population lives in rural areas.

Basic education was one of the heavily affected sub-sectors during the long conflict in the CHT. Villages in the CHT have lower access to education as compared to the rest of the country. For children, especially the younger ones, it is difficult to walk through the hilly terrain and reach the schools. Due to grossly inadequate basic education infrastructure and facilities, closures, relocation of schools and displacement of elements of the population combined with personal and livelihood insecurity the progress in terms of enrolment, literacy and completion of children of the indigenous minority population is much lower than the national averages. A substantial number of households still remain excluded from the educational process. In addition, the distance to education facilities seems to be a significant deterrent to enrolment of 6 year olds, with parents often delaying enrolment until their child is older (thus the disparity between Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) and Net Enrolment Ratio (NER)). An appropriate distance (2 km as defined by the government) in the plains areas is different from an appropriate distance in very hilly or marshy areas. Difficult terrain makes the journey much longer and potentially unsafe.

UNDP through the Chittagong Hill Tracts Development Facility (CHTDF) implemented the Phase I of Education project from January 2008 to 2009 with an aim to support and work to complement the government's plans as described in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) (2005 and 2008). From December 2009, the CHTDF has been implementing education project "Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts-Phase 2" (SBECHT-2) to support the government to realize its commitments to basic education in the CHT. The project was scheduled to end on 30 September 2013. However, the project has been extended to March 2015 (no budget extension). The EU has been the main donor for both phases, with CIDA and UNDP sharing some of the costs.

Within the scope of the overall objective "Improved socio-economic development of the CHT in line with the principles of CHT Accord", the project purpose is to "establish and promote access to a quality primary education system in the CHT." The project purpose is set around targeted results related to advocacy, strengthening systems, increasing access to basic education, improving quality of education, and multilingual education.

The project operates in 13 of the 25 upazilas in CHT, including 4 upazilas in each of Khagrachari and Rangamati Districts and 5 upazilas in Bandarban district. Among the five Bandarban District upazilas, four participated from the beginning of the project and Naikhongchari Upazila was included from January 2014. The project supports 315 schools (100 schools in each district of Khagrachari and Rangamati, and 115 schools in Bandarban district) in which 228 are HDC managed Non-Government Primary Schools (NGPS), 65 are Government schools and the remainder are Non-Government Private Schools. In addition, the project provided capacity development support to an additional 180 School Management Committees (SMCs) of selected government primary schools in the three districts of CHT (60 schools in each district).

The project targets CHT remote communities that are most vulnerable and have limited access to primary education services. Direct beneficiaries of Phase 2 include more than 20,000 children who have access to school, and to an improved classroom or school environment.

The project is being implemented in close collaboration with the Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs (MoCHTA), Ministry of Primary and Mass Education (MoPME), Directorate of Primary Education (DPE), and National Curriculum and Textbook Board, and in partnership with the three Hill District Councils (HDCs), and national and CHT based NGOs.

The project was consciously designed to complement 2nd Primary Education Development Program (PEDP-II), and in particular the Action Plan for Mainstreaming Tribal Children in Education. The contribution of the project is visible in achieving the Tribal Action Plan. It has addressed the main learning barriers including language barriers by establishing schools in remote areas, recruiting community based teachers who speak local languages, organizing training courses to promote child-friendly learning, introducing mother-tongue based Multilingual Education (MLE) for children belonging to 7 CHT ethnic groups and developing culturally sensitive relevant materials as well as strengthening of School Management Committees (SMCs) of 315 remote schools in un-served or underserved communities in the CHT.

CHTDF, UNDP took part in a pre-appraisal mission for 3rd Primary Education Development Program (PEDP-III) and in liaison with MoCHTA, in subsequent processes of developing and implementing PEDP-III as well. At present PEDP-III focuses on marginalized communities including 'tribal groups' in hard to reach areas under the heading of 'inclusive education', in the context of which the CHTDF education component has the potential for harmonization and alignment. From the very beginning of the 2nd phase, the project has been implemented by having the Hill District Councils (HDCs) as the main implementing partners. This has been done, as education is one of the subjects transferred to HDCs as per the provisions of the CHT Accord and related legal provisions for the CHT. At the same time, however, CHTDF has tried to facilitate closer working relations between HDCs and relevant line departments at various levels. Thus, at the start of phase 2, the Directorate General of DPE issued a letter urging all DPE officials at District and upazila levels to extend necessary support to SBECHT. At the national level, the Technical Advisory Committee for Education (which functions as an advisory committee to the CHTDF National Steering Committee), comprising of members from MoPME, Ministry of Education (MoE), DPE, UNICEF etc., has identified potential areas of collaboration between SBECHT and PEDP-III. However, in this context, it was also noted that relevant provisions under PEDP-III are rather limited at the moment.

Objective:

- The evaluation will assess major achievements and overall impact of SBECHT-2, and review effectiveness and efficiency of the overall project interventions in establishing and promoting access to a quality primary education system in the CHT particularly focusing on the assessment of capacity development of HDCs and issues of sustainability of HDC managed schools as well as recommendations for way forward and UN Joint Programming for CHT.

Specific objectives of the final evaluation are:

- To assess major achievements and overall impact of the project, providing evidence-based results of its contributions in establishing and promoting access to a quality primary education system in the CHT, especially focusing on targeted results related to advocacy, strengthening systems, increasing access to basic education, improving quality of education, and multilingual education;
- To provide a forward-looking plan on future programming and modalities of implementation in the CHT emphasizing sustainability, engaging with national actors and institutions, ensuring linkages across institutions, and partnering with other UN agencies for a One-UN approach in the CHT.

Scope of Work:

The final evaluation team will undertake the following, but is not restricted to:

- Analyze the project's alignment/synergy with government's policies and programs (E.g. National Education Policy 2010, and the new SWAp, the PEDP-III), identify the roles of HDCs and different duty bearers, and recommend scope for better alignment/integration for sustainability (including but not limited to the impact of the Government's policy of nationalisation on the HDC schools and ways that these schools may be supported in the future);
- Identify major achievements of the project in line with the expected results and assess their sustainability prospects with appropriate recommendations;
- Analyze the role of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and HDCs feeding in the project learning to the PEDP-III and provide recommendations for effective engagement and better coordination with the line departments for effective inclusion of ethnic minority children in mainstream education;

- Identify constraints and challenges that the project have faced, overcome, learnt lessons from, and make recommendations for the implementation of future projects;
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of project coordination and management, including specific reference to:
- Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the various partner institutions involved in project execution;
- The effectiveness of the monitoring mechanisms currently employed by the project management in monitoring progress on a regular basis;
- Administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that have influenced the effective implementation of the project (including recommendations for necessary operational changes and alignments);
- Institutional capacity building of HDCs for better delivery of education services and national level advocacy in favor of strengthening primary education system in CHT in line with CHT peace accord.

Methodology

The Team Leader, along with other two team members, is expected to coordinate with CHTDF, UNDP offices in the districts and upazilas during field work. The detail of the evaluation's methodological approach is to be determined by the consultants.

However the data collection techniques can primarily be focused on:

- Desk review and content analysis of key project documents including data/information included in earlier project progress reports, monitoring reports, evaluations and surveys;
- Focus Group Discussion with a selection of School Management Committee (SMC), Mother Groups, and school teachers;
- Interview/meeting with concerned ministries including MoCHTA, CHT Regional Council, HDCs, representative of concerned line department of the govt. NGOs and key project staffs.

Deliverables/Outputs of the assignment/service:

- Inception report: An inception report in consultation with, and incorporating written inputs from the National Expert and CHT Expert to be shared and agreed with CHTDF Education Cluster within one week of commencement of contract. The report will consist of detailed methodology of the evaluation, stakeholders to be met and detailed work plan approved by CHTDF. This report will also clearly specify the distribution of tasks among the team of consultants, and different parts of the final report that different team members will be responsible for;
- Presentation of evaluation findings and draft evaluation report: Present the draft findings of the evaluation team at a debriefing to CHTDF, EU, HDC and GoB representatives and submit the draft report (both hard and soft copy) to CHTDF, UNDP;
- Final report*: Submit a final report combining written inputs from the National Expert and CHT Expert and in consultation with them delivered both in soft and hard copy. The report will incorporate feedback from all concerned (CHTDF, UNDP/EU/HDC/MOCHTA) and accepted by CHTDF, UNDP.

The final report contains:

- Executive Summary (Brief description of the project, context and purpose of the evaluation and main conclusions/findings, recommendations for way forward and lessons learned);
- Introduction (Project background, Purpose of the evaluation, Key issues addressed, the outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used, Methodology and Structure of the evaluation);
- The development challenges and project response (how the challenges are addressed by the government, and how they are reflected in national policies and strategies; and information on the activities of other development partners in response);
- The main findings: project relevance, integration potentials, clarity of roles, efficiency, effectiveness, impact of project activities, and sustainability with recommendations for way forward and future projects;
- Conclusions;
- Recommendations and lessons;
- Annexes - TOR, Itinerary, List of people met, List of documents reviewed, questionnaire used and summary of results.

Annex 2. Itinerary

1. Team Leader

Date	Place	Purpose
27 January 2015 – 24 February 2015	Dhaka	Interviews, Desk Review, Data Cleaning and Analysis, Report Drafting, Presentation Preparation and Evaluation Coordination

2. CHT Expert and Education Expert

District	Period of Visit	Place of Visit	
		Origin	Destination
Rangamati	31/1/15 Saturday	Rangamati	Dak Bangla GPS, Bangalhalia, Rajsthal
		Bangalhalia, Rajsthal	Rajsthal sadar
	1/2/15 Sunday	Rajsthal sadar	Arachari NGPS, Ghilachari union, Rajsthal
		Arachari NGPS, Ghilachari union, Rajsthal	Rajsthal sadar
	2/2/15 Monday	Rajsthal sadar (Team-1)	Nakkhyachara GPS, Banglahalia, Rajsthal
		Nakkhyachara school, Banglahalia (Team-1)	Rajsthal sadar
		Rajsthal sadar (Team-2)	Shilchari Nowa para NGPS, Rajsthal
		Shilchari Nowa para NGPS, Rajsthal (Team-2)	Rajsthal sadar
	3/2/15 Tuesday	Rajsthal sadar	
	Khagrachari	6/2/15 Friday	Bandarban
Hazachara NGPS Mohalchari			Khagrachari Sadar
7/2/15 Saturday		Khagrachari Sadar	Durpajyanal NGPS, Mohalchari
		Durpajyanal NGPS, Mohalchari	Khagrachari Sadar
8/2/15 Sunday		Khagrachari Sadar	Rangamati
Bandarban	9/2/15 Wednesday	Rajastali	Team-1 Jamachanrda para NGPS, Rowangchari
		Jamachanrda para NGPS	Bandarban
		Rajastali	Team-2 Silchari NGPS Rowangchari
	5/2/15 Thursday	Silchari NGPS Rowangchari	Bandarban
		Bandarban	Masumui NGPS
	6/2/15 Friday	Masumui NGPS	Abulamba para NGPS
		Abulamba para NGPS	Bandarban
	7/2/15 Saturday	Bandarban	Ruifu para NGPS, Ruma
		Ruifu para NGPS, Ruma	Shakkhoi commender para NGPS
	7/2/15 Saturday	Shakkhoi commender para NGPS	Thanchi
	8/2/15 Sunday	Thanchi	Bandarban
	9/2/15 Monday	Bandarban	Rangamati

Annex 3. Interviews and Focus Groups

Interviews in Dhaka

Date	Name	Position
28/1/15	Mr Abdul Mozid Shah Akond	Joint Secretary, MoCHTA
28/1/15	Mr Serdar Md. Keramat Ali	Deputy Secretary, MoPME
28/1/15	Mr Henrik Larsen	Director, CHTDF-UNDP
29/1/15	Dr Kiichi Oyasu	Programme Specialist, Education, UNESCO
29/1/15	Mr M Shahidul Islam	Programme Officer, Education, UNESCO
29/1/15	Mrs Shereen Akther	Programme Officer, UNESCO
29/1/15	Mrs Meherun Nahar Shapna	Project Director, MLE, Save the Children
29/1/15	Mr Deba Pria Chakma	Manager, MLE, Save the Children
Various	Mr Rob Stoelman	Chief, Project Implementation, UNDP- CHTDF
Various	Mr AHM Mohiuddin	Senior Education Advisor, UNDP- CHTDF
1/2/15	Mr Jefarson Chakma	M&E Officer, PMR Unit, UNDP- CHTDF
2/2/15	Mr M. Zahirul Islam	Senior Programme Officer, School Feeding Programme, WFP, Dhaka
2/2/15	Mr James Jennings	Chair, PEDP III Donor Consortium
11/2/15	Mr Fabrizio Senesi	Programme Manager, Governance and Human Rights, Delegation of the EU to Bangladesh
11/2/15	Mr Jurgen Heimann	Head of Section, Human and Social Development, Delegation of the EU to Bangladesh
11/2/15	Ms Nadia Rashid	Senior Programme Officer, Human and Social Development, Delegation of the EU to Bangladesh
12/2/15	Mr Murshid Akhter	Research Officer, National Curriculum and Textbook Board, MoPME
15/2/15	Mr Ali Md. Shahiduzzaman	Education Advisor, Program Support Unit, DFATD
15/2/15	Mr Joseph Sebhatu	First Secretary (Development), High Commission of Canada

Interviews in CHT

Date	Name	Position
3/2/15	Manas Mukul Chakma	UEO, Rajastali Upazila
5/2/15	Shahidul Azam	DPEO (In-charge), Bandarban Hill District
6/2/15	Mr. Mintu Marma	EFS, BHDC
6/2/15	Mr. Dinendra Tripura	ED, Toymu
7/2/15	Ritan Kumar Barua	DPEO, Khagrachari
7/2/15	Ms. Parichita Khisa	TO, KHDC
7/2/15	Mr. Nikhil Chowdhury	TO, KHDC
7/2/15	Mr. Mathura Bikash Tripura	ED, Zabarang Kalyan Samity
7/2/15	Md. Jasim Uddin	URC Instructor, Mohalchari Upazila
9/2/15	Mr.Pankojmoy Tripura	Education Officer, BHDC
9/2/15	Mr. Mominur Rashid Amin	CEO, Bandarban
10/2/15	Mr. Palash Khisa	MO, RHDC
11/2/15	Mr. Nikhil Kumar Chakma	Chairman, RHDC
11/2/15	Mr. Aung Sui Pru Chowdhury	Member, RHDC
12/2/15	Mr. Subarna Chakma	EO, CHTRC
12/2/15	Mr. Nilu Kumar Tanchangya	Councilor, CHTRC
15/2/15	Mr. Sukheshwar Chakma	Programme Officer, CHTDF
15/2/15	Mr. Lalit C Chakma	ED, SAS, Rangamati
16/2/15	Mr. Shwe Aung Prue	Education Cluster Leader, CHTDF

Interviews and Focus Group Discussions in CHT Schools

Date	Place	Type (FGD or IV)	Participants	Males	Females	Total	Notes ⁴⁷
Rangamati District							
31/1/15	Dak Bangla GPS, Bangalhalia Union, Rajasthali	FGD	Learners	6	4	10	Mixed
		FGD	SMC	4	2	6	
		FGD	MG & PTA	0	10	10	
		IV	Teachers	2	2	4	
1/2/15	Arachari NGPS Ghilachari Union, Rajasthali	FGD	Learners	6	6	12	Khyang, MLE, ALP, SF
		FGD	SMC	8	2	10	
		FGD	MG & PTA	0	11	11	
		IV	Teachers	3	1	4	
2/2/15	Nakkhyachara GPS, Banglahalia Union, Rajasthali	FGD	Learners	5	5	10	Marma, ALP
		FGD	SMC	4	4	8	
		FGD	MG & PTA	0	8	8	
		IV	Teachers	2	1	3	
2/2/15	Shilchari Nowa para NGPS, Rajasthali	FGD	Learners	6	4	10	Tanchangya, MLE, SF
		FGD	SMC	18	4	22	
		FGD	MG & PTA	0	10	10	
		IV	Teachers	2	1	3	
Khagrachari District							
4/2/15	Durpajyanal NGPS, Mohalchari	FGD	Learners	4	7	11	Chakma, MLE
		FGD	SMC	7	1	8	
		FGD	MG & PTA	0	8	8	
		IV	Teachers	2	2	4	
5/2/15	Hazachara NGPS, Mohalchari	FGD	Learners	6	4	10	Tripura, MLE
		FGD	SMC	3	7	10	
		FGD	MG & PTA	5	5	10	
		IV	Teachers	2	1	3	
Bandarban District							
4/2/15	Jamachanrda para NGPS, Rowangchari	FGD	Learners	6	4	10	Mixed
		FGD	SMC	2	2	4	
		FGD	MG & PTA	0	7	7	
		IV	Teachers	2	2	4	
4/2/15	Lapaigoy NGPS	FGD	Learners	4	7	11	Marma, MLE
		FGD	SMC	8	3	11	
		FGD	MG & PTA	0	11	11	
		IV	Teachers	2	0	2	
5/2/15	Masumui NGPS	FGD	Learners	3	3	6	Marma, MLE
		FGD	SMC	5	2	7	
		FGD	MG & PTA	0	6	6	
		IV	Teachers	2	0	2	
6/2/15	Abulamba para NGPS	FGD	Learners	4	5	9	Mro, ALP
		FGD	SMC	5	0	5	
		FGD	MG & PTA	0	10	10	
		IV	Teachers	2	0	2	
7/2/15	Ruifu para NGPS, Ruma	FGD	Learners	5	5	10	Mro, MLE, SF, ALP
		FGD	SMC	9	8	17	
		FGD	MG & PTA	0	8	8	
		IV	Teachers	2	0	2	
8/2/15	Shakkhoi commender para NGPS	FGD	Learners	5	5	10	
		FGD	SMC	9	2	11	
		FGD	MG & PTA	0	13	13	
		IV	Teachers	2	0	2	
Totals				172	213	385	

⁴⁷ The notes comment on the language community involved, and whether the school had MLE in Pre-Primary, or participated in the School Feeding Program (SF) and Adult Literacy Programme (ALP)

Annex 4. List of Documents Reviewed

- Asian Development Bank. 2011. *3rd Primary Education Development Project. PEDP III Results Framework*. ADB, Manilla.
- Bandarban Hill District Council. 2014. *Education Strategy* (Draft, November 2014).
- Bangladesh. Legislative and Parliamentary Affairs Division. 2011. *The Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh*. Legislative and Parliamentary Affairs Division, Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs.
- Bangladesh. 1989. *Khagrachari/Rangamati/Bandarban Hill Districts Local Government Parishad (Amendment) Acts, 1989*.
- Bangladesh. Directorate of Primary Education. [2006]. *Primary Education Situational Analysis, Strategies and Action Plan for Mainstreaming Tribal Children*. Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka.
- Bangladesh. Directorate of Primary Education. 2010. *Indigenous Peoples Framework. Primary Education Sector Development Program 3*. Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka.
- Bangladesh. Directorate of Primary Education. 2014. *Program Overview and Implementation Guide. Third Primary Education Development Program (PEDP 3)* (Revised Program Document, December 2014). Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka.
- Bangladesh. Ministry of Education. 2010. *National Education Policy 2010* [English]. Ministry of Education, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka.
- Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2010. *Bangladesh Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2009. Technical Report Vol. 1*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Planning Division, Ministry of Planning, and UNICEF, Dhaka.
- Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Bandarban*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka.
- Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Khagrachari*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka.
- Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2013. *District Statistics 2011 Rangamati*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Statistics and Informatics Division, Ministry of Planning, Dhaka.
- Bangladesh. Ministry of Planning. 2014. *Bangladesh Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2012-13. District Key Findings*. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Planning Division, Ministry of Planning, and UNICEF, Dhaka.
- Bangladesh. Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs. 2010-2014. *Minutes of the Technical Advisory Committee for Education [1st to 7th meetings]*. MoCHTA, Dhaka.
- Bangladesh. 2010-2014. *Minutes of the Inter-Ministerial Meetings*. MoCHTA, Dhaka.
- Barkat, Abdul, et al. 2009. *Socio-Economic Baseline Survey of the Chittagong Hill Tracts*. Human Development Research Centre and UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- Barkat, Abdul et al. 2013. *State of Development in the Chittagong Hill Tracts* ["Household Survey"]. UNDP-CHTDF Dhaka.
- Chakma, Kirti Nishan and Barman, Shyamal Kanti. 2013. *Project Review: Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- Cummins, P., Chakma, A. K., and Rahman, S. F. H. 2012. *Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts Phase II. Mid Term Review*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- European Union. 2011. Monitoring Report. *Strengthening Basic Education in CHT Phase 2*. European Commission.
- Khagrachari Hill District Council. 2014. *Education Strategy* (Draft, November, 2014).
- Owens, L., Poyck, G., and Uddin, F. 2009. *Primary Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts - Phase II. Mission Report, Vol. 1*. European Union.
- Rahman, A. N. S. Habibur. 2014. *Adult Literacy and Life Skills Program (ALP) April 2013 – December 2013. Evaluation Report*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- Rangamati Hill District Council. 2014. *Education Strategy* (Draft, November, 2014).
- United Nation Organisation, Bangladesh. *CHT Joint Programmatic Framework Post-2015*. Presentation to MoCHTA, 20 November. UN Task Team on CHT, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2006. *Support to Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Component Formulation Mission*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.

- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2008. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2007*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2009/2011. *Project Proposal: Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts Phase II*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2009. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2008*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2010. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2009*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2011. *Progress Report on Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts - Phase II* (January – December 2010). UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2011. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2010*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2012. *Progress Report on Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts - Phase II* (January – December 2011). UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2012. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2011*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2012. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Project Completion Report (31 March 2008 – 30 June 2012)* Report Prepared for Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2013. *Progress Report on Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts - Phase II* (01 January – 31 December 2012). UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2013. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2012*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2014. *Progress Report on Strengthening Basic Education in the Chittagong Hill Tracts - Phase II* (Reporting Period: 01 January 2013 – 15 June 2014). UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- United Nations Development Programme, Bangladesh. 2014. *Promotion of Development and Confidence Building in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Annual Report 2013*. UNDP-CHTDF, Dhaka.
- World Bank. 2003. *Bangladesh - Second Primary Education Development Project : Plan for Expanding Primary Education of Tribal Children*. Washington DC; World Bank Group.
- World Bank. 2014. *Bangladesh - Second Primary Education Development Project [Project Performance Assessment Report]*. Washington DC; World Bank Group.
- World Food Programme. 2013. *Progress Report on the School Feeding Program Implemented in CHT in Collaboration with UNDP*. WFP, Dhaka.

Annex 5. Data Collection and Analysis Instruments

Annex 5a. Interview Protocols

For Joint Secretary, MoCHTA

1. Please describe the role your ministry plays in providing or supporting basic education in the CHT and implementing the project
2. Please describe your role as joint secretary in MoCHT, and in relation to CHTDF SBECHT-2 in particular
3. How well has SBECHT-2 been aligned or linked with MoCHT's work in CHT? What are best examples of this alignment? (probe for issues re implementation of the CHT peace accord). How effective have these linkages been? How can alignment, linkages and synergies be improved?
4. How well has the project been coordinated with MoCHTA's work? How could coordination be improved?
5. Over the course of the SBECHT-2 project, what have been the major challenges from the point of view of MoCHT? (probe for issues re MoCHT limitations, impact of other ministries, resource constraints, coordination, awareness of the CHT context, capacity limitations in CHT etc.)
6. What had to be done to meet these challenges and how successfully were they met?
7. In what way has the SBECHT-2 project influenced GoB policy and practice (probe for specific examples, such as making policy and regulations more flexible to allow for diverse contexts such as CHT)
8. The project has supported the HDCs in a number of ways including capacity building for the HDC officers, building and renovating schools, training teachers, strengthening school governance through SMCs and MGs, and promoting MLE. Now that the project is finishing up, how sustainable will these achievements be? What are the factors constraining sustainability? How can sustainability be achieved? (probe for issues around nationalisation and registration of schools)
9. What have been the achievements of the TAC?
10. Any other points.

For Deputy Secretary (with responsibility for nationalisation) of MoPME

1. Please describe the government's purposes for the nationalisation program.
2. Please describe the nationalisation process.
3. What stage is the 3rd phase of nationalisation at and when will it be concluded?
4. Any other points.

For MLE Officer, NCTB

1. Please describe the role the NCTB plays in providing or supporting basic education in the CHT.
2. Please describe your role as Officer for MLE in NCTB, and in relation to CHTDF SBECHT-2 in particular
3. From your perspective, what have been the major achievements of the project (probe for issues re access, improving quality of basic education, MLE curriculum materials)
4. How well has SBECHT-2 been aligned or linked with NCTB's work? What are best examples of this alignment? (probe for issues re PEDP-II and PEDP-III) How can alignment, linkages and synergies be improved?
5. How well has the project been coordinated with MoCHT's work? How could coordination be improved?
6. Over the course of the SBECHT-2 project, what have been the major challenges from the point of view of NCTB? (probe for issues re inflexible policies and regulations, NCTB limitations, impact of other ministries, resource constraints, coordination, awareness of the CHT context, capacity limitations in CHT etc.)
7. What had to be done to meet these challenges and how successfully were they met?
8. In what way has the SBECHT-2 project influenced GoB policy and practice regarding curriculum and teaching and learning materials? (probe for specific examples, such as making policy and regulations more flexible to allow for diverse contexts such as CHT)
9. The project has supported the HDCs in a number of ways including capacity building for the HDC officers, training teachers, strengthening school governance through SMCs and MGs, and promoting MLE. Now that the project is finishing up, how sustainable will these achievements be? What are the

factors constraining sustainability? How can sustainability be achieved? (probe for issues around nationalisation and registration of schools)

For Donors

1. What do you think have been the main achievements of the project?
2. Do you think the achievements are sustainable? Why or why not? What would need to be done to make them sustainable?
3. Did you have any opportunity during the PEDP-III MTR to encourage the integration of the CHTDF activities and approaches in the PEDP-III? e.g. funding of HDC education staff?
4. Was there any scope to discuss in the Local Consultative Group issues to do with sustainability and nationalization and some of the issues arising for education in remote places like CHT?
5. The PEDP-II and PEDP-III don't seem to acknowledge the role of the HDC in delivering education in the CHT. What do you think about that and how do you explain it?
6. How satisfied have you been with the monitoring and reporting for the project? What issues have arisen and how well have these been dealt with?
7. Do you think the achievements are sustainable? Why or why not? What would need to be done to make them sustainable?
8. The original plan had a SBECHT phase 3 but no funding has been forthcoming from the donors. Why is that?

For TNGO Partners

UNESCO

1. Please describe the role your organisation has played in supporting or being involved in the SBECHT-2 project (Adult Literacy Program)
2. What do you think have been the major achievements/impact of the project from the point of view of your organisation? Why have these things been successful?
3. What have been some of the constraints? Have these been addressed and if so, how successfully?
4. How satisfied have you been with the monitoring and reporting for the project? What issues have arisen and how well have these been dealt with?
5. Have any administrative, operational or technical problems impacted the project? What were they and how were they addressed?
6. Has your contribution to the project helped build the capacity of the HDCs? In what way? How effective and efficient has that capacity building been?
7. What is the future of the ALP part of the project? Is it sustainable? Can it continue without UNDP support? Why or why not?, If not what support will be needed?

UNICEF

1. Please describe the role your organisation has played in supporting or being involved in the SBECHT-2 project (member of TAC; using MLE materials?)
2. What do you think have been the major achievements/impact of the project from the point of view of your organisation or your involvement? Why have these things been successful?
3. What have been some of the constraints? Have these been addressed and if so, how successfully?
4. What about the way the UNDP education project has worked in relationship to the overall UN work in CHT? Has it contributed to a "One-UN approach in the CHT"? If not, why? What needs to be done to get a more coordinated approach?
5. How effective has the TAC been? What are its achievements and limitations? How could it be improved?
6. Are the project activities sustainable? Can the program continue without UNDP support? Why or why not? If not what support will be needed?
7. Please describe the work you are doing in CHT. What role do the HDCs play in that work? What role do government line ministries play?

WFP

1. Please describe the role your organisation has played in supporting or being involved in the SBECHT-2 project (School Feeding)

2. Regarding the the WFP school feeding program run in 12 schools in 12 upazilas in the CHT 2012-13, as described in the interim report. How many months did the program run altogether? Have you continued or expanded the program since then? Why or why not? With what effect?
3. What have been some of the constraints? Have these been addressed and if so, how successfully?
4. What about coordination/collaboration between your organisation and the local NGOs?
5. What about coordination/collaboration between your organisation and the HDCs?
6. Have you been satisfied with the coordination/collaboration between your organisation and CHTDF? If so, what practices helped? If not, why not?
7. What about the way the project has worked in relationship to the overall UN work in CHT? Has it contributed to a "One-UN approach in the CHT"? If not, why? What needs to be done to get a more coordinated approach?
8. Has your contribution to the project helped build the capacity of the HDCs? In what way? How effective and efficient has that capacity building been?
9. Two of the goals of the SFP were to increase enrolment and attendance, and both increased during the course of the trial. Were there any other factors that might have contributed to this increase, apart from the SFP?
10. The SFP involves distributing biscuits to students rather than providing a school meal. Please explain the reasons behind that approach.
11. Is the school feeding program in this project sustainable? Can it continue without UNDP support? Why or why not?, If not what support will be needed?

SCI

1. Please describe the role your organisation has played in supporting or being involved in the SBECHE-2 project (MLE)
2. What have been some of the constraints? Have these been addressed and if so, how successfully?
3. Was there coordination between the materials development and the teacher training? If so how well did it work?
4. What are your future plans for MLE in CHT?
5. Different organisations are taking different approaches to MLE in CHT - what sort of coordination is happening or is it a diverse approach.
6. Has your contribution to the project helped build the capacity of the HDCs? In what way? How effective and efficient has that capacity building been?
7. What do you see as the key issues for promoting MLE in CHT?
8. What do you see as the key issues in sustaining the gains made in MLE in CHT?

Chair, PEDP-III Donor Consortium

1. What impact might PEDP3 have on education in CHT and other under-served or remote areas?
2. What's happening with the nationalization process and how is it related to PEDP3?
3. Have the HDCs played any role in formulating PEDP3?
4. Are the HDCs playing any role in implementing PEDP3?
5. What role do you see consortium members playing in the future in terms of supporting the provision of basic education in under-served parts of the CHT?
6. How is the PEDP-III addressing MLE issues in CHT?

For CHTDF Officers (Dhaka)

1. What are the achievements of and how effective has the TAC been?
2. This project has somewhat overlapped with PEDP-III both in time and in focus. How good have synergies and linkages between the two projects been? Why? How could they be improved?
3. How effective have the monitoring mechanisms been? What issues have arisen and how effectively have they been addressed?
4. Have any administrative, operational or technical problems impacted the project? What were they and how were they addressed?
5. How effective and efficient has been the capacity building of the HDCs? What issues have arisen and how have they been addressed?

6. There have been a lot of achievements in terms of policy development and adjustment to suit the CHT context, in terms of building and renovating schools, MLE curriculum development, teacher training, capacity building of the HDCs and so on. But how sustainable is all this? What are the crucial factors in ensuring sustainability, who can address them and how?

For Director, CHTDF

1. As director of CHTDF, what are the key things that you think I should know or understand in undertaking this final evaluation of SBECHE-2?
2. What do you think are the particular unique achievements and lessons learned of the education project?
3. What are the key issues in terms of sustaining the gains that have been made in the project going forward?
4. What are the key issues for aligning with PEDP-III and how should they be addressed?
5. What are the key issues in terms of One-UN programming for CHT and how should they be addressed?
6. Is there anything else you would like to say about the project?

For CHTDF Officers (Rangamati)

1. What are the main roles of CHTDF for implementation of the SBECHE Phase-II project?
2. What have been the major achievements of the project in terms of-
 - a. policy advocacy,
 - b. strengthening ed systems,
 - c. increasing access to education in CHT,
 - d. improving quality of ed in CHT,
 - e. developing MLE
3. What have been challenges in achieving the objectives of SBECHE project phase 2?
4. How is the programme supplementing GoB's policy of access and retention of all children in schools?
5. What constraint has the project faced and how were they overcome and what lessons were learned?
6. How effective has the coordination between the project and line ministries been?
7. What are the achievements of and how effective has TAC been?
8. What kind of linkage and synergies are there especially with the ethnic minority education and how effective are these linkage?
9. How do the LNGOs supported in capacity building of SMCs?
10. What measures have been taken by CHTDF in developing MLE curriculum and materials?
11. What mechanism was taken in coordination with the LNGOs?

For HDC Officials

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| For Chairman and Convener | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How effective and efficient has been the capacity building of the HDCs? 2. What measures can be taken by HDCs if the UNDP withdraws support? 3. What are the constraints to HDC supporting the schools? |
|---------------------------|--|

- | | |
|---------|--|
| For CEO | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How effective and efficient has been the capacity building of the HDCs? 2. What are the main constraints and issues in implementing the education project? 3. What are the main roles of HDC for implementation of the education (SBECHE Phase-II) project? 4. How well was the work of the HDC coordinated with MoPME and GoB Personnel during the education (SBECHE Phase-II) project? |
|---------|--|

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| HDC Education staff | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the main roles of HDC for implementation of the education (SBECHE Phase-II) project? 2. What roles is played by HDCs in establishing or enlisting NGPSs? 3. What is the role of HDCs in nationalization process of NGPSs? 4. What supports have been provided by HDCs to GPSs? What progress has been made after this intervention? 5. How effective and efficient has been the capacity building of the HDCs? 6. What are the main constraints and issues? |
|---------------------|--|

7. How have the monitoring mechanism been?
8. What are the challenges for monitoring and supervision of the schools? How have you overcome these challenges?
9. How do you arrange the training of the teachers and SMC members? What was the constraint in organizing and providing training to the teachers?
10. How did you develop the MLE materials? How the MLE materials are promoting the quality education among the CHT children?
11. How do you support regular interactions (meetings, workshop, students examination etc.) of the teachers?
12. What are the teacher's development programs in addition to training?

For LNGO Officials

1. What was the process that made you the partner of CHTDF?
2. How long did you work with CHTDF and what were your assignments?
3. What major success did you have and what constraints did you face in mobilizing the community?
4. How did you overcome the constraints?
5. How did you ensure the quality of the activities you were assigned for?
6. Did you find any problem in working with the CHTDF for programme implementation? How was the problem solved? Or remain unsolved?
7. In your opinion, what are the impacts of MLE?
8. During your presence in the community what were your observations regarding monitoring of the schools and teachers?
9. What gaps did you notice in the process of recruitment of teachers? What is your suggestion for future?

For DPEO

1. What have been some of the challenges and successes of working with HDCs in implementation of the project?
2. How good was the coordination between the DPE and HDC? How could it be improved?
3. What have been the positive achievements of the project?
4. What changes have been made by the GoB in CHT through implementation of the project? Why?
5. What are the main constraints and issues in implementing the education project?
6. What are you doing for supporting nationalization of schools?
7. What steps can be taken for ensuring access and retention of children in CHT in the future?

For UEO

1. What have been the positive achievements of the project?
2. What is your experience in working with HDCs in implementation of the project?
3. How good was the coordination between the UEO and HDC? How could it be improved?
4. What have you done for teacher's development?
5. How have the monitoring mechanism been? What are the challenges for monitoring and supervision of the schools and teachers? What did you do to address these challenges?
6. What steps can be taken for ensuring access and retention of children in CHT in the future?

For URC Instructor

1. What is your role in capacity building of the teachers of SBECST project phase 2?
2. What is your experience in working with HDCs in implementation of the project?
3. How good was the coordination between the UEO and HDC? How could it be improved?
4. How has the monitoring mechanism been? What are the challenges for monitoring and supervision of the schools? What did you do to address these challenges?
5. What input have you got for your professional development from this project? Did this input help you improve your performance? In what way? Or why not?
6. What steps can be taken for ensuring access and retention of children in CHT in the future?

Annex 5b. Focus Group Discussion Questions

For Teachers

1. Break the ice by finding out the teachers' names and what year levels they teach.
2. Ask them what teacher training they have received from HDC – what year, how many days.
3. What were the most important things that you learned from the teacher training? (Get each teacher to suggest what was important to them)
4. Which aspects of the training have you been able to apply in your teaching? Why?
5. Which aspects have been difficult or impossible to apply? Why?
6. Have you changed the way you teach as a result of the training? If so, what effect did that have on the students? (Note to FGD facilitator: they might say something about attendance, enjoyment of learning, better learning, etc., but don't suggest an answer. We want to know what they have observed themselves, if anything.)
7. What curriculum materials do you have to support your teaching, including MLE materials.
8. What do you like about the content of these materials?
9. What do you not like about the content of these materials?
10. Do you have enough MLE materials for each student? Which areas have shortages or gaps?
11. Do you have enough teacher's guides for teaching? If not, where are the shortages or gaps?
12. What do the parents think about MLE?
13. Have you had supervision visits by your their teacher or by HDC/GoB officers? How often?
14. Please give specific examples of useful advice you received as a result of supervision visits.
15. What sort of support do you need in the future to improve your work as a teacher? (Look for specific examples).

For Students

1. Ask the students their names and what class they are in. Note the total number of students and numbers of males and females.
2. Do you like school? (most of them will say 'yes'). What kinds of things do you like most about school? (get an answer from each child).
3. What sort of things do you not like about school?
4. What sort of things do you do each day in the classroom?
5. Are all the children in your classroom in the same class level (i.e. is it single grade or multi-grade)
6. Do you usually sit by yourself or in a group? If you sit in a group, what sort of things do you do in the group?
7. What do your teachers do to you if you do something wrong or make a mistake? What do you think about that?
8. What do your teachers do to you when you get a right answer or do something well or do a good thing?
9. Do you always study in a classroom, or do you sometimes go outside to study something? If so, what kinds of things do you study?
10. What sort of objects do you have in your classroom? (We are interested in whether they mention various manipulatives/ teaching and learning materials, but don't put answers into their mouths).
11. Do you ever play games as part of your lessons? Please describe the games.

For SMCs

1. Please tell us your names and designation (Name game)
2. Have the people on the SMC changed from its establishment up to now?
3. Have you received training for managing the school? When and what training? How has the training help you? (Give specific examples)
4. What support has the SMC received from the project to improve your school facilities?
5. What role has the SMC played to improve the academic /school's performance? If so, what effect did that have on the school?
6. What is your opinion about the adequacy of the school's resources- (teacher, furniture, classrooms, playground, contingency) ? Which areas have shortage or gaps?
7. Do the parents cooperate in running the school? Please give the examples.

8. Explain what the SMC has done to seek nationalization of your school?
9. In establishing and continuing the school what contributions has the community has made? What constraints did the community meet for being involved in school management?
10. After withdrawal of CHTDF support, how do you plan to continue the school?
11. What sort of support do you need in the future to improve your school? (Look for specific examples)
12. About the last SMC Meeting
 - a) Who called the meeting?
 - b) What was on the agenda?
 - c) When was the meeting held?
 - d) How many attended?
 - e) Did all member participate? If not, why not?
13. For ALP schools only
 - a) How many SMC members participated?
 - b) How have the SMC and its members benefited from the course?
14. MLE
 - a) What do think about the MLE materials? Why?
 - b) What are the impacts of the MLE materials?
15. SF
 - a) Is the school feeding contributing to the school? If so how?
 - b) Have there been any problems with SF? How have you solved the problem?
15. About the Teachers
 - a) What is your opinion about the performance of the teachers? What can the SMC do to support them more?
16. SDP
 - a) Do you have a SDP? And where is it?
 - b) Please describe how the SDP was developed.

For MGs/PTAs

For MG

1. Please tell us your names and designation (Name game)
2. Have you received training for managing MG? When and what training? Did you apply what you learned in the training in your group? If so, how, and with what effect? If not why?
3. What are the supports you have received from the project to improve your school facilities?
4. What is your opinion about the adequacy of school's resources? Which areas have shortage or gaps?
5. Is the lesson in the classroom adequate for the learning or do the learners need additional support? If so, are you able to provide the additional support? What sort of support do you provide?
6. How many meeting were held so far? When was the last meeting held? What was the agenda of the meeting? How have you documented the decisions (are minutes of the meeting available)?
7. What sort of support do you need in the future to improve your school? (Look for specific examples)
8. Do you feel confident for running this group and supporting the school? Why?
9. What do your children like and dislike about school? Why?

For PTA

1. How long have you been in the PTA?
2. Have you received training for managing PTA? When and what trainings? Were you able to put the training into practice? How? Or why not?
3. Do you discuss the progress of your children in the meeting? If so, what do you discuss? What action do you take? (probe for specific examples)

4. Can you give some examples of how the school has improved recently? [They might say – students' work displayed in the classroom, toilets built, water supply etc etc.] What do you think about these improvements?

Annex 5c. School Observation Checklist

Name of School:.....

Union:..... Upazila:..... District:

Infrastructure
1. What are the buildings made from?
2. What condition are they in?
3. Have repairs/renovations been carried out as part of SBECHT? If so, what?
Water and sanitation
4. What is the water supply source?
5. Toilets. how many? sep boys and girls? With water?
6. Hand washing - is there water? Soap?
7. Drinking water - available? One cup per student?
Classroom
8. Seat/Desk condition and quantity
9. Seat/Desk arrangement - rows? U-shaped? Groups?
10. Students' work displayed
11. Is there a teacher's desk? Where is it (at the front, side, back?)
Grounds/ Environment
12. Cleanliness
13. Trash management - are there bins, how often is the trash collected, where does the trash go?
Management
14. Is the SDP displayed? Where?

Name of Consultant:

Signature and date:

Annex 5d. Curriculum Materials Analysis Rubric

1. Item/Book name:
2. Subject:
3. Grade Level:
4. Type (S=student book; T=teacher's guide; C=chart):
5. What is the main language of the item/book?
6. What script is used in the book?
7. Are any other languages used? Which ones and for what purpose (e.g. instructions)?
8. What script is used for these other languages?
9. What proportion of people in the item/book look like various people from CHT? (A=All or most; S=some = about half; F=few; N=None; blank cell = no pictures of people in the book)
10. List the aspects of CHT culture or everyday life that are mentioned or shown in the book e.g. poems, legends, songs, daily life, cultural activities, food, work, tools, buildings, local issues and problems, stories about successful CHT people etc. If in doubt, include it. For each item, put the page number in brackets after it for future reference (if applicable).
11. Is the cover of the item/book in colour (C) or black and white (B)?
12. Is the chart or the inside of the book in colour (C) or black and white (B)?
13. How many illustrations does the book have? (M=many = about one per page; S= some = about one every 2 to 5 pages; F= few or none = less than one every 5 pages; for Charts, M=many=5 or more per page; some=1-4 per page; N=none)
14. What is the quality of the paper used? (G = good quality = smooth); P = poor quality = rough)
15. How large is the print? (L = large and easy to read; M = medium size and readable; S = too small for primary school)

Annex 6. Project Achievements against the Indicators

Component 1: Policy Focused Advocacy and Support

Objectively Verifiable Indicator	Achievement as of January 2015	Comment
<p>GOB formulating circulars/guidelines/policies in relation to education needs in the CHT</p>	<p>The nationalization proposal submitted by the MoCHTA to the Prime Minister's office (PMO) and the PMO directives the Ministry of Primary and Mass Education (MoPME) for sending a complete proposal with opinion of Ministry of Finance (MoF) on financial implication of nationalization of 228 schools. The MoPME duly sent a letter to MoF and MoF is currently processing with regard to financial implication of 228 schools.</p> <p>In 2013, Government approved the process of de-reserving 13.20 acres of land for granting leases in favor of 44 project supported NGPS established in the reserved forest land of CHT to ensure that the schools met the criteria required for school nationalization, indicating further progress towards sustainability.</p> <p>In 2013, the MoPME made a circular on inclusion of HDC representative in the district and upazila level scrutinizing committees which vet the nationalization of project CHTDF supported NGPS in the CHT as decided in an inter-ministerial meeting.</p> <p>In 2011, the MoPME amended school registration policy, allowing flexibility of registration criteria for the non-government primary schools (NGPS) in the CHT. For example, number of students required to establish a primary school in the CHT was softened to 50 from 150. In addition MoPME in principal agreed to reduce the population required for establishing a school from 2000 to 666 in the CHT region.</p> <p>In 2010, the Director General of Directorate of Primary Education (DPE), MoPME issued a letter to all concerned govt. stakeholders (all DPE officials in the CHT) requesting to provide necessary support to this project.</p>	<p>Achieved.</p>

<p>HDCs have targeted an increase in the resource allocation for the primary education sector in the CHT</p>	<p>HDCs are in a process of finalizing their own district specific education strategy (draft has already been done) in each district that accelerate in identification of resource requirement as well as mobilizing required resources for primary education sector in the CHT.</p>	<p>Partially achieved</p>
<p>Recommendations put forward by Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)-Education are implemented</p>	<p>As per the decision of an inter-ministerial meeting, the MoCHTA submitted all documents of the 228 NGPS to the MoPME as per requirements of the Prime Minister's Office for nationalization in early 2014.</p> <p>Following directives by the PMO and a decision by the TAC, MoCHTA in 2012 sent a special letter to the MoEF. In 2014, the MoEF declared through gazette notification as de-reserved, land for 43 project-supported schools.</p> <p>In 2013, TAC determined to form a joint committee chaired by the Deputy Secretary, Development in MoCHTA, with representatives from MoCHTA, MoPME, DoE and CHTDF to prepare a status paper on CHT schools seeking nationalization. This committee never met and the work was done through the inter-ministerial meetings instead.</p> <p>MoCHTA also issues an official letter requesting MoPME for necessary amendment of the school registration circular taking into account the special character of CHT districts as decided in TAC meeting.</p> <p>As per the decision of TAC meeting, a commission led by the Convener (Education) of the HDC with members from the concerned line departments and educationist with sufficient expertise in primary education of the district was formed in 3 districts of CHT to lead the process of formulating HDC education strategy.</p> <p>As per the recommendation made by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), 11 school hostels are being operated by HDCs and CHT Development Board, enabling children from remote villages to attend schools. Out of them, 5 hostels are running under HDC in</p>	<p>Mostly Achieved</p>

	Rangamati; 3 under Khagrachari HDC and rest 3 hostels under CHT Development Board in Bandarban. Construction of 5 additional hostels (2 under RHDC and 3 under KHDC) completed but funds for operating these hostels have not been secured yet.	
--	---	--

Component 2: Strengthening Systems

Objectively Verifiable Indicator	Achievement as of January 2015	Comment
Teacher attendance at project schools increases by 10% per year	Teacher attendance: 2010 – No data available 2011 – No data available 2012 – 91.2% 2013 – 93.2% 2014 - 96.0% (Bandarban - 95.7%; Khagrachari - 95.2%; Rangamati - 97.2% <i>(Source: HDC database)</i>	Teacher attendance increased each year but not by 10%. In 2009-10, teacher attendance data was collected at school level but HDCs lacked capacity to collect and report on it.
Accurate demographic and ethnic data updated annually is available for planning & monitoring by HDCs and/or UEOs	2011: 19,909 students (46.6% girls) Chakma student 28 %, Marma 16 %, Tripura 16%, Mro 12%, Tanchangya 7%, Bangalee 16% and Others 5%. 2012: 19,088 students (47.2% girls) Chakma 28%, Marma 16%, Tripura 16%, Mro 12%, Tanchangya 7%, Others 5%, Bangalee 16% 2013: 20,007 students (46.8% girls) Chakma 27%, Marma 16%, Tripura 16%, Mro 12%, Tanchangya 7%, Bangali 16%, Others, 5%. 2014: 20,195 students (47.2% girls). Chakma 29.0%, Marma 17.0%, Tripura 16.4%, Mro 9.2%, Tanchangya 7.0%, Bangalee 16.8%, others 4.6 %. <i>(Sources: Annual reports, HDC database, 2014)</i>	Achieved
DPEO and A/UEO do 5 school visits per quarter per upazila in 2010, increasing to 8 per quarter by 2013	A total of 674 visits were made to the project supported schools by GoB line department officials (DPEO and A/UEO) between 2010 and 2014. This is 2.75 visits per quarter per upazila.	Not achieved
100% of SMCs which received minimum 3 days training are functioning by applying their training knowledge	2011: 2,494 SMC members received 2 day-long training on their role and responsibilities. SMCs engaged in a range of school activities including construction/renovation of school facilities, monitoring of enrolment and attendance (both for teachers and students) and the development of School Development Plans (SDPs). 2012: 5020 SMC members (28% female) of all 300 schools received day-long refresher training on their roles and responsibilities. In 2013: 5,521 SMC members (32% female) of all 300 schools received day-long refresher training on their roles and responsibilities. In 2014, 83.5% of SMCs were still functioning Over the course of the project, 2099 SMC members from supported GPS received training <i>(Source: HDC</i>	1. Partially achieved. Most SMC members in the 300 project schools have received two or more days training.

	<i>database)</i>	
A budget and School Development Plan (SDP) is publicly displayed, accurate and up to date, and understood by SMC, parents and Para members in 100% of project schools by end of 2010.	100% of planned SDPs were developed and implemented by SMCs in consultation with Mothers' Groups (MGs), Parent Teachers Association (PTAs) and parents. All SMCs at first publically displayed the SDPs with budget at respective schools.	Fully achieved
District-specific education plans/strategies developed by HDCs (at least one plan/strategy per HDC)	As per TAC recommendation, a district-based education strategy has been drafted by the three Hill Districts and is being finalized by the Education Strategy Formulation Commission and the HDCs.	Almost fully achieved
Stakeholders' coordination meetings on primary education held by HDCs (4/year/HDC), reflecting improved sharing of information/collaboration	HDCs organized 46 stakeholders' coordination meetings during the project period, that is, 3/year/ HDC	Mostly achieved

Component 3: Access to Education

Objectively Verifiable Indicator	Achievement as of January 2015	Comment
Net enrolment rates in project school catchment areas increases to at least national average (2008: 90.8%)	Project schools' NER in 2010: 90.7%, Project schools' NER in 2014: 92% (boys: 92.6%, girls: 92.1%). National NER in 2010: 94.8% National NER in 2013: 97.3% Enrolment in 150 project schools in 2009: 8,241 Enrolment in 315 project schools in 2014: 20,195 <i>(Sources: HDC database, 2014; Education Report 2010; CHTDF Annual Report 2009. PEDP-III revised program document)</i>	Not achieved. NER increased but not as much as or to the level of the national NER.
Gross enrolment rates in project school catchment areas increases to at least national average (2008: 97.8%)	Project schools' GER in 2010: approx. 95% Project schools' GER in 2014: 118% (boys: 120.7%, girls: 117.4%), National GER in 2010: 107.7% (boys: 103.2%, girls: 112.4%) National GER in 2013: 108.6% (boys: 106.8%, girls: 110.5%) <i>(Sources: HDC database, 2014; Education Report 2010; PEDP-III revised program document)</i>	Achieved. GER for project schools increased to 10% above the national average. This indicates that enrolments increased, as did the diversity of ages of primary school students. This suggests (i) the project was picking up students who enrolled late and/or (ii) there was substantial grade repetition
No. of new schools constructed (Target: 60)	60 school buildings were newly constructed in 2010.	Achieved
No. of school buildings renovated or extended (Target 272)	Cumulatively 343 facilities were renovated/extended from 2010 to 2014.	Exceeded
No. of project schools with clean toilets	2010: 120/300 = 40% 2011: 247/300 = 82%	Partially achieved by final year

increases (100% of project schools have clean toilets by 2013)	2012: 239/300 = 80% 2014: 75.4% <i>(Source: HDC database, 2014; Education Annual Reports)</i>	
No. of project schools with safe drinking water facilities increases (to reach a target of 100% coverage by 2013)	2010: 100% 2011: 100% 2012: 100% 2013 2014: 100% <i>(Source: HDC database, 2014; Education Annual Reports).</i>	Achieved

Component 4: Quality Education

Objectively Verifiable Indicator	Achievement as of January 2015	Comment
Increase in the proportion of schools that utilize child-centered, activity-based teaching methods against agreed criteria (e.g., seating, group work, manipulative) (75% of intensively supported schools by 2013)	Child-centered, activity based learning: 2010: 62% 2011: 67.5% 2012: No data 2013: 2014: 67.5% (<i>Source: HDC database, 2014; Education Annual Reports</i>) Innovative teaching materials (e.g. picture poster, ball, dice, stick etc ⁴⁸): 2010: No data 2011: No data 2012: No data 2013: 2014: 69% of supported schools (<i>Sources: Education Annual Reports</i>)	Almost fully achieved
Increase in the proportion of schools that arrange seating in a child centered way (to reach a target of 75% of intensively supported schools by 2013)	2010: 70% 2011: 44% (132 out of 300) 2012: 2013: 2014: 72.7% (<i>Sources: Education Annual Reports</i>)	Almost fully achieved
Project classrooms each year keep a student: teacher ratio within range of 20-30:1	2010 - 28:1 2011 - 34:1 2012 - 32:1 2013: 2014: 21-24:1 (Khagrachari-22:1, Rangamati-24:1 and Bandarban-21:1) (<i>Sources- HDC Database, 2014; 2012 Annual Report</i>).	Not achieved each year, but achieved by project end
Project classrooms each year keep a student: classroom ratio within range of 20-30:1	2010 – no data available 2011 – no data available 2012 - 23:1 2013: 2014: 20-23:1 (Khagrachari 22:1, Rangamati 23:1 and Bandarban 20:1) (<i>Source: HDC Database, 2014; 2012 Annual Report</i>).	Achieved
Annual school contact hours move towards the UNESCO recommendation of 850+ in classes 3-5, and 680 hours in pre-primary, classes I and II	600+ hours/ year for Pre Primary and Class I-II: 850+ hours/ year for Class III-V (<i>Source: HDC database,</i>	Achieved

⁴⁸ Barkat, Abdul et al. 2013. *State of Development in the Chittagong Hill Tracts* ["Household Survey"]. CHTDF Dhaka.

	2014)	
10% more classes each year use teaching aids and/or supplementary reading materials	2010: 72 classes using (no info on % or total number of classes provided) 2012: 69.7% (209 out of 300 classes) 2013: 86.7% 2014: 79.8 % (Sources: HDC Database 2014; Education Annual Reports)	Unreliable data (see narrative)
All project school teachers receive initial training for a minimum of 18 days	2010: 337 teachers, 18 days 2012: 121 teachers, 18 days 2014: 23 teachers, 18 days	Mostly Achieved
100% project classes each year have a trained teacher in charge	2010: 100% 2011: 100% 2012: 100% 2013: 100% 2014: 100%	Achieved
All teachers receive annual in-service (follow-up) training for a minimum of 10 days	2010: Refresher training organized for teachers for 384 teachers (2 days). 2011: Refresher training for 3,490 teachers (male - 2,252 and female-1,238) (2 days) 2012: Refresher training for 1,454 teachers (male-1032 and female-422) (2 days) 2013: Refresher training for 1,693 school teachers (male-1,259 and female-434) (2 days) 2014: Refresher training for 1,829 school head teachers and teachers (543 females) (2 days)	Achieved. Each refresher training went for two days and five or six sessions were held each year. The number of teachers includes multiple counting of teachers who attended more than one session.
Project school head teachers have received minimum 4 days initial management and pedagogy training and follow up training within 12 months (Target: 300 project school head teachers)	All target head teachers were trained. The year wise breakdown was: 2010: 145 head teachers received initial management and pedagogy training (4 days) 2011: 300 head teachers received follow up training (1 day) 2012: 121 assistant head teachers and head teachers receive basic training (2 days)	Achieved, except for head teachers in the schools in Naikhyongchari, which joined the project in 2014. For those head teachers, key aspects of head teachers' work was covered in the basic teacher training course that they attended.

Component 5: Mother tongue-based Multi-Lingual Education (MLE)

Objectively Verifiable Indicator	Achievement as of January 2015	Comment
No. of schools in which teachers and pupils are actively using MLE (Target: at least 120 schools)	2010: 72 schools 2011: 135 schools 2012: 132 schools 2013: 2014: 132 schools (Source: HDC Database, 2014; Education Annual Reports)	Achieved
Decrease in student absenteeism in project schools in which MLE is used (drops at least 5% per year)	Absentee rates: 2010: no data collected 2011: no data collected 2012: 18% 2013: 15% 2014 16.8% (boys-16.6%; girls-16.8%) National rate: 19% (2009) (Sources: HDC Database, 2014; Annual Sector Performance Report 2009)	Could not be assessed. Absenteeism data is for 300 project schools, not just the MLE schools. Data is from two different sources. Project staff reported that the indicator means 5% of the previous year's amount/rate e.g. 20% then 19% then 18%.
Decrease in repetition rates in project schools (drop by 5% per year)	2010: No data 2011: No data 2012: No data 2013: 11% (boys 10%; girls 13%) (Source: CHT Household Survey Report, 2013). 2014: 10.0% (Boys: 9.1%, girls: 11.2%) (Source: HDC Database 2014)	The indicator should say "for project schools in which MLE is used" Could not be assessed. Repetition data is for 300 project schools, not just the MLE schools. Data is from two different sources.
Drop-out rates reduce by 5% per year	2010: No data 2011: No data 2012: No data 2013: 3.4% (boys: 3.8%; girls 3%) (Source: CHT Household Survey Report, 2013) 2014: 2% (boys: 1.7%; girls 2.4%) National rate: 1.2% (boys: 1.4%; girls 1%) (Source: MICS, 2009 ⁴⁹).	Could not be assessed. Drop-out data is for 300 project schools, not just the MLE schools. Data is from two different sources.
MLE materials developed from pre-primary to class 3 in languages of the CHT (MLE Material for PP-1 & PP-2 and Supplementary Materials for class 1 to class 2)	Pre-primary materials for 11 ethnic communities developed and 7 utilized in the supported schools. MT based supplementary materials alongside the NCTB curriculum for Class I–3 were also developed.	Only Pre-Primary I, Pre-Primary II and Class I had MT materials. Class II and III had local Indigenous stories written in Bangla.

⁴⁹ Multiple Indicators Cluster Survey, 2009