



**REVIEW OF THE
EDUCATION PILOT**

**Chars Livelihoods
Programme (Phase 2),
Bangladesh**

PO: 4081

**Prepared for the UK
Department of
International
Development (DFID)**

September 2012

Table of Contents

Foreword	II
Abbreviations and Acronyms	III
Executive Summary	IV
Part I: Concise Summary of Findings and Recommendations	1
1. Review the CLP's Education Pilot and Lessons Learnt	1
2. Review CLP's Progress in Handing over School Infrastructures.....	4
3. Review CLP's Progress in Seeking "Partners" to Provide Educational Services to the Chars.....	5
3.1 The Partner NGOs.....	5
3.2 The CLP GIS.....	6
3.3 Communications with Government.....	6
4. Bringing Adequate Learning Centres and Additional Education Services to the Chars.....	8
4.1 Approaching Government and Donors for Bringing Adequate Learning Centres to the Chars	8
4.1.1 <i>The Next Generations</i>	8
4.1.2 <i>NGO- run Centres</i>	9
4.1.3 <i>Government Involvement</i>	9
5. Advocacy Strategy for Bringing Additional Education Services to the Chars.....	11
5.1 Recommendations for the CLP Team	11
5.2 Recommendations for DFID & AusAID.....	12
5.3 Interim and Short term Response to the end of the Education Pilot	12
5.3.1 <i>The Primary Completers in 2012</i>	13
5.3.2 <i>The CLP Structures</i>	13
6. Conclusions.....	14
6.1 The Education Pilot and it's Review.....	14
6.2 Government takes Responsibility for Education on the Chars	14
6.3 Support in 2012 by CLP	14
6.4 Additional funding is found to support some or all the Centres.....	14
Part II: Appendices.....	15
Appendix-1: Accounts of Meetings with Bogra and Dhaka-based Stakeholders.....	15
Appendix-2: Terms of Reference (TOR)	19
Appendix-3: Basic Primary Education Statistics 2011 (Draft)	22
Appendix-4: Estimates for Continuing the Primary Classes and for extending to full 8 years' curriculum	23
Appendix-5: List of Persons Met	24
Appendix-6: Distribution of Primary Schools in CLP Villages	27

Foreword

The Chars Livelihoods Programme (CLP) works with extremely poor households living on islands of north western Bangladesh, and aims to improve the livelihoods of over one million people. The first phase of CLP (July 2004 to March 2010) was solely funded by UKaid from the Department of International Development while the second phase (April 2010 to March 2016) is jointly funded by UKaid from the Department for International Development and the Australian Government (AusAID). It is sponsored by the Rural Development and Co-operatives Division of the Government of Bangladesh's Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Co-operatives, and implemented through Maxwell Stamp Plc. The major government input to the Education Pilot is the provision of free textbooks from the National Curriculum and Textbook Board (NCTB) thus enabling students in the Centres to follow the full national curriculum.

The CLP Education Pilot is a modest project within CLP, its aim being to set up schools, or more accurately Learning Centres, in un-schooled areas of the chars where the CLP is working. One full cycle of primary schooling was planned in 2007 and will be completed in late 2012. Being the member of the consortium for the CLP2 implementation, British Council was contracted to review the Education Component of the ongoing CLP. This Report summarises the findings of the two member team fielded by British Council that sought to assess the effectiveness of the Pilot and to suggest how the lessons on the pilot can be shared with other providers of primary schooling in remote areas of Bangladesh.

In the course of fulfilling its objectives the research team obtained support from many quarters and individuals. First of all, the British Council's team experts wishes to acknowledge UKaid / DFID, AusAID, Maxwell Stamp, and CLP management for their assistance given throughout the short period of the review. Second, the team wishes to thank the six NGOs who are delivering the education services in the chars and who extended assistance to the team in the form of logistics to reach the Centres and in other ways. Wherever the team visited the Centre, teachers, Community Management Committees (CMC), local community and even students were keen to contribute their views. The research team wishes to express thanks to all of them. Local government offices including the DC office, Bogra, Upazila Nirbahi Offices and local Upazila Education Offices were notably interested in the team's enquiry and cooperative in making time, at short notice, to meet the team. The research team met heads and concerned officials of various Organisations like Directorate of Primary Education (DPE), Bureau of Non-Formal Education(BNFE), BRAC (Building Resources Across Communities), Supporting the Hardest to Reach through Basic Education (SHARE), etc. and wishes to express their thanks to them.

Finally the team is indebted to all concerns at the CLP office, Bogra and in the field who extended their hands in organizing meetings, visits and transportation as well as in keeping the team watered and fed.

Note on Methodology

Formats were devised for conducting interviews and holding focus group discussions with students, teachers, CMC members, parents, and government officials in the field, NGOs implementing the pilot. These are available on request. Each visit to a Centre used three sources of data namely observation, interview and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). Notes of the field visits are available on request. Accounts of meetings held in Bogra and Dhaka with various stakeholders are reported in Appendix 1.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AUEO	Assistant Upazila Education Officer
BNFE	Bureau of Non Formal Education
BRAC	Building Resources Across Communities
CAMPE	Campaign for Popular Education
CLP	Char Livelihood Programme
CMC	Centre Management Committee
DC	Deputy Commissioner
DFID	Department for International Development
DP	Development Partner
DPE	Directorate of Primary Education
EC	European Commission
FIVDB	Friends in Village Development Bangladesh
GIS	Geographic Information System
GoB	Government of Bangladesh
GPS	Government Primary School
HSC	Higher Secondary Certificate
IMO	Implementing Organisations (NGOs)
JARM	Joint Annual Review Mission
LGED	Local Government Engineering Department
MIS	Management Information System
MOPME	Ministry of Primary and Mass Education
NCTB	National Curriculum and Textbook Board
NFPE	Non Formal Primary Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PEDP	Primary Education Development Programme
PLCE	Post Literacy and Continuing Education
PSC	Public Service Commission
PSCE	Primary School Completion Examination
RDCD	Rural Development and Cooperative Division
RNGPS	Registered Non-Government Primary School
ROSC	Reaching Out of School Children
SHARE	Supporting the Hardest to Reach through Basic Education
SMC	School Management Committee
SSC	Secondary School Certificate
TOR	Terms of Reference
UEO	Upazila Education Officer
UNO	Upazila Nirbahi Officer
UPEP	Upazila Primary Education Plan

Executive Summary

The Chars Livelihoods Programme (CLP) works with extremely poor households living on islands of north western Bangladesh, and aims to improve the livelihoods of over one million people. The Education pilot is a small component within CLP, its aim being to set up Learning Centres, in un-schooled areas of the chars where the CLP is working. One full cycle of primary schooling was planned in 2007 and will be completed in late 2012. The Report summarises the findings of the two member team that sought to assess the effectiveness of the Pilot and to suggest how the lessons on the pilot can be shared with other providers of primary schooling in remote areas of Bangladesh.

The CLP education pilot is proving to be successful in delivering high quality education at low cost in some of the most inaccessible and inhospitable parts of Bangladesh. It is expected that 80% of those who enrolled in the pilot will complete in December 2012, a notably better completion rate than in regular primary schooling. Their achievement can be traced to three key factors: (i) well-trained teachers, from the community, teaching the students the competences of the NCTB curriculum along with facts; (ii) close and informed supervision and support of the teacher, (iii) repeated cycles of teacher training specific to the curriculum for each class, Shishu (nursery) to Class V. Community and parental support is also evident resulting demands for education from communities that have few educated members. It is an achievement of CLP management, working through partner NGOs, to have established such an effective scheme. The design of the Education Pilot had an in-built assumption that, if it proved successful, as it has indeed done, then funding from unidentified sources may step in so that the Centres could remain open. The timing of present assessment, just 6 months before closure, has left very little time for other sources of funds to be found.

A number of suggestions are put forward in order to bring attention of the successful Education Pilot implemented under CLP and to press for enhanced commitments from GOB and development partners to primary education on the chars. These include

In the long run the GOB in accepting that the children on the chars are as much Bangladeshi citizens as those on the mainland and should not be denied their rights of access to education will include those children in their education plans. There is some hope that a project which aims to build 1500 primary schools in unschooled areas represents a growing commitment on the part of GOB to providing primary education on the chars.

Education Plans for the chars are also needed. CLP has excellent data on areas where there are no primary schools. That data could help GOB develop a medium and long term plan for education on the chars as part of the Upazila Primary Education Plans funded as part of PEDP-III and required by government.

Presentations of the findings of the assessment of the Education Pilot could be made to the Education Local Consultative Group and to CAMPE which is an umbrella organisation for all education-providing NGOs with a view to augmenting the number of development partners involved in provision of education in the chars.

A short video or other multi-media presentation could be prepared by CLP and distributed to government agencies, education development partners, NGOs etc.

National philanthropists may be persuaded that support to a batch of several Centres would be one way to express their social responsibility.

In the short term, we propose that CLP through the 6 partner NGOs explore how some Centres may be kept going through community management and funding. Two NGOs have taken the initiative to search for funding and while no commitments have yet been given it is possible that 41 of the 140 present Centres will remain open for a further batch of students.

We believe that, if funds can be found from one or more sources, the Centres should remain open for at least one more batch of students. This is a holding measure until the government can provide education services on the chars. The estimated cost of providing primary education to 5000 children of the chars is US\$ 1.5 million over four years.

Part I: Concise Summary of Findings and Recommendations

1. Review the CLP's Education Pilot and Lessons Learnt

TOR¹ 1: Review the CLP's Education pilot and, from the review, develop a series of "Lessons Learnt." The CLP is interested to know the thoughts of the stakeholders concerned in the pilot (children/parents, teachers, SSP/NGOs, GoB/donors and the CLP staff concerned with the project).

1. A school is more than its physical structure. The term school, or education centre, encompasses the teacher and her/his training, the students, the curriculum including teaching learning materials, support and supervision of the teacher and the school, the involvement of parents and community.
2. Unlike formal schools the CLP Learning Centres each has only one teacher, a limited number of students (in this case 30 with equal numbers of boys and girls) and covers the curriculum in 4.5 hours per day for six days. One more important aspect of these Centres is that they cover a six year full cycle (shishu class to class five) in just four years. The number of physical centres at the start (2008) was 150 and 18 of them were used to run double shift classes. 10 physical centres have been lost to river erosion leaving 140 physical centres and double shift classes are conducted in 21 of them.
3. A first lesson learnt is that the very fact that the CLP has set up Learning Centres (Centres for short) in the most remote and inhospitable char lands is a lesson in itself. Government has tended to avoid provision of schooling on the chars though in the case of a large char such as Bhola island its relative permanence and other infrastructure has meant that its one time char status is lost. Even large NGOs have avoided the smaller char while concentrating on some large chars, such as Naturapara². The difficulties in finding sites, negotiating for land, recruiting and training teachers and supervisors are immense. CLP is to be congratulated in having established so many Centres and for having sustained them for a full cycle of primary education.
4. The Centres are found to be functioning well. There has been a loss of some students since admission to the beginners' class but, that is to be expected in areas where migration is forced on households due to erosion and persistent poverty. Drop-out for reasons of poverty or other reasons is lower in general than in the mainstream primary schools.
5. In 2007 some 4997 students started the CLP education pilot. In mid 2012 there are 3952³ or 79% students remaining. Completion rate is well ahead of that in the formal primary schools where completion of the primary cycle takes an average of 7.2 years. The draft 2011 statistics for primary education show a drop-out rate (at national level) of almost 30%, combined with high repetition the duration of the primary cycle is more than two years greater than in the CLP Learning Centres. See Appendix 3 for details.
6. The acid test of the success of the Centres will come at the end of this year when all students will sit the Primary School Completion Exam. Indications, based on the "model" tests moderated and marked by Friends in Village Development Bangladesh (FIVDB), are that the Centre students will perform very well and many will be awarded scholarships for secondary school though how many will a) receive the scholarships⁴ and b) how many of those who actually get the award will find a place in a secondary school are unknown at this time.

¹ Detailed Terms of Reference (TOR) is at Appendix 2

² A Union consisting of a large char with more than 200,000 people., Kazipur Upazila, Sirajganj District.

³ Figures from CLP Management, July 14, 2012.

⁴ GoB awards scholarships for those who attain certain marks in the Primary School Completion Exam, However, shortage of funds means that not all who are awarded scholarships actually receive the cash.

7. A second major lesson learnt concerns the training of teachers and their supervision. The teachers' education qualifications range from SSC to graduate.

Table 1: Teachers' Educational Background in CLP Schools of the Char Areas		
Educational Qualification⁵	Number of Teachers	Percentage (%)
Eight Pass	06	04%
SSC Pass	98	61%
Dakhil Pass equivalent SSC	07	04%
HSC Pass	41	25%
BA Pass	09	06%
Total	161	100%
Gender	Number of Teachers	Percentage (%)
Female	118	73%
Male	43	27%

8. Nearly two thirds of the teachers are Secondary School Certificate (SSC) or equivalent and one quarter with Higher Secondary Certificate (HSC) pass. 73% of the teachers are female.

9. Teachers have been trained by FIVDB as have the supervisors. The total amount of training was 69 days⁶ --- an initial input of 18 days followed by specific training for each class i.e. 9 days for each of Classes I and III, and 12 days for each of Classes IV and V. There is also monthly refresher training. Compared to the teachers in Government Primary School (GPS) and Registered Non-Government Primary Schools (RNGPS) who must have a residential one year training to qualify for the Diploma in Education, the training under CLP looks thin. However, the teachers are supported by supervisors who have undergone the same teacher training and have responsibility for an average of 7 Centres. They visit one day per week for the whole school time. Their duties include teaching 2 classes per month. Supervisors are themselves supervised. A typical Assistant Upazila Education Officer (AUEO) has between 20 and 30 schools to visit and spends little time in the classroom since the duties are mainly to ensure compliance of the headteacher and School Management Committee (SMC) to rules and regulations of the Directorate of Primary Education (DPE). Remote GPS and RNGPS schools may get only very irregular visits.



⁵ Information from CLP management.

⁶ Only those teachers who have been in the scheme from the beginning would have enjoyed all the days of training.

10. What comes over clearly from the interviews with the students, parents and community members is that the teachers are skilful, sincere, attend on time and regularly and are respected by all. How does this happen? Close supervision and support – not policing – is generally required for teachers at least at the beginning of their careers. The support from FIVDB in the form of monthly training is probably crucial to teachers teaching topics for the first time. Reinforcement by the supervisor helps the teacher gain confidence. Moreover, the teacher is from the community and committed to it. (See *Text Box below*)

11. The third lesson is that secure bonding of school and community has been generated by the close contact between teachers and parents. Students' learning works in the Centres as the catalytic factor of the bonding. Parents see that their children are learning. Parents are now keener to continue their children's education, some even considering schooling beyond the char. The closeness of the Centre to its community ensures attendance of students and teachers and has unintended positive benefits for the community. Parental and community involvement in running the school is again a standard feature of a good school. The Centres are all clearly within small communities. The students travel less than a km to school many live within shouting distance of the Centre. The Centres have gained from being close to their communities which have donated the land in many cases. Meetings of the Centre Management Committee (CMC) are held monthly with an agenda and minutes. Items discussed include attendance of students, teacher's regularity, early marriage, and maintenance of the centre's plinth. CMC Members look in on the Centre regularly: in one centre, members, on a weekly roster, visit the Centre. In another Centre, all parents are invited to a monthly meeting with the CMC.

12. A fourth major lesson is that students can achieve the national curriculum competences through routes other than those in GPS and RNGPS. The Centre uses the NCTB textbooks supplemented by materials supplied by FIVDB. The students therefore follow the national curriculum which is competency- based. Observation of the classroom shows that the teaching learning method is active, with group learning prominent and students' work in evidence. A fifth lesson is that there are positive though unexpected benefits of the Centres. The CLP tube well and latrines have had the effect of improving community hygiene where the students inform their parents of the need for hand washing after latrine use and of the need to wear sandals in the latrine. Early marriage of girls is discouraged by their attendance at the Centres. (The average age of students in 2012 is 12 or 13.) Parents' attitudes towards education have changed as expectations of further education or better jobs (more obviously for sons) increased.

13. In short the model adopted by CLP is low cost in structures, which are removable if need be, but intensive in investment in human resources of the teacher, supervisor and teacher training.

One teacher made the point that in the "school" the teacher attends and assumes the students learn. She ensures the students learn.

A parent: CLP gave us a cow. School is more effective since it will be with the children for their lifetime.

CMC member told a personal story that his son refused to go with his mother to visit grandparents in Dinajpur. He did not want to miss school. Later when the father went to collect his wife the boy again insisted he had to attend school.

More than once it was reported that anyone can distinguish between a Centre child and others by observing their manners.

2. Review CLP's Progress in Handing over School Infrastructures

TOR 2: Review CLP's progress in handing over the classrooms to suitable organisations and help the CLP staff concerned to define better the priorities and process of handing over the school buildings so that they may continue to benefit as many poor families as possible

14. For time restraints visits to sites where the facilities/ structure had already been handed over were limited. However, in the course of conversations with the Implementing Organisations (IMOs), communities and government officials a number of positive suggestions were made that could ensure the use of the structures for education and/ or community purposes.

15. Two NGOs – ARCHES and Friendship – believe that they will have funding for the following 4 – 6 years to enable some 41 Centres, or 30% of the existing 140 Centres, to remain open.

16. Other NGOs have started to talk to communities about the end of the pilot and to explore how to use the CLP Centres through community mobilisation. It is doubtful if communities could fund the full range of services provided under CLP including the teacher, the learning materials, uniform, school bag as well as the teacher training and supervision. With some funding from other NGO projects, some CLP Centres may remain open with a teacher and NCTB textbooks, but little else.

17. As explained in TOR 4 the structures themselves are moveable. Government may use some of them to expand high schools and/ or GPS/ RNGPS on the chars or mainland.

18. The planning of the education sector, particularly primary, is complicated by its size – at least 18 million students in 11 different types of primary school. Also the National Education Policy (NEP) emerged suddenly in 2009, after the preparation of PEDP-III was underway. NEP was approved by the National Assembly in 2010. But, PEDP-III was already well into negotiation by then so that primary is defined as Classes I- V whereas the NEP defines primary as I- VIII. Furthermore, all planning activities are under the Planning Commission which has since Liberation issued a series of 5-year Development Plans. NEP is not consistent with the present Sixth Development Plan. It is feasible for the GOB for instance the DPE to initiate a discussion of how to include all char children within future years of PEDP-III. This could be done at a Joint Annual Review Mission (JARM). Also, we suggest that the DG (DPE) issues an instruction to all UEOs to include chars in their updated Upazila Education Plans. Further details on PEDP III and JARM are available on section 4 of the report.

19. A priority for CLP staff in the remaining time is to work with the IMOs to explore how to support those communities that are interested in trying to keep the Centres open for education. More follows on this suggestion in TOR 4.

3. Review CLP's Progress in Seeking "Partners" to Provide Educational Services to the Chars

TOR 3: Review the CLP's progress in seeking "partners" (in its widest sense) to provide educational services to the chars; especially those where schools are currently absent or non-functional. The CLP possesses a small but performing GIS⁷ and the consultants are invited to work with the team members on using the GIS as a tool to define priority education sites on the chars

3.1 The Partner NGOs

20. The CLP in its livelihood development activities created partnership with six local NGOs for providing education to young children. CLP supported its partners to establish a one room school house, CLP Learning Centre, to enrol only 30 children aged between 6 and 8 years. The entire six year education is completed in four years following the approach of FIVDB.

Table 2: Distribution of Centres among 6 NGOs

NGO	District	No. of Centres	No of Double Shift Centres
AID-Comilla	Kurigram	28	10
Friendship	Kurigram	20	-
Akota	Gaibandha	23	-
GBS	Bogra	24	-
Arches	Sirajgonj	20	3
Gonochetona	Jamalpur	25	5

21. The six organisations are AID-Comilla, Friendship, Akota, GBS, Arches and Gonochetona. Table 2 shows the distribution of the 140 present centres. A few Centres have been moved and some Centres have been eroded and continued in rented buildings. In addition, Friends in Village Development Bangladesh, FIVDB, has delivered all the teacher training and provided some additional teaching learning materials. CLP chose their NGO partners with care. All except one had substantial experience of delivery of non-formal primary education prior to the CLP.

22. Time did not allow the consultants to visit and assess char areas where schools are not available or non-functioning⁸. The second part of this ToR was not therefore addressed. Nor could it have been without a more extensive tour of the chars and access to a considerable amount of information and knowledge of government perspectives in the various Districts and Upazilas. The information from the CLP GIS database shows the considerable extent of non-schooled populations of children on the chars. The issue of coverage of primary education in the chars is addressed below under CLP GIS and also under TOR 4.

⁷ Geographic Information System

⁸ The schedule of visits to the chars and to the Education Centres was compiled by CLP management bearing in mind that the consultants had limited time in Bogra and a visit to one char takes one day. The choice of Centres allowed the consultants to observe students and, teachers at work as well as to assess the degree of support of the communities.

3.2 The CLP GIS

23. The GIS material from CLP is impressive. While it covers only those locations where CLP has core beneficiaries, the database and the maps generated from the database enable one to see at a glance where there are no schools and what the size of the communities are that have no school⁹. The Local Government Engineering Department, LGED, also has GIS-informed databases of educational institutions for many Upazilas though the extent of coverage of the char areas is not known. DPE's Management Information System (MIS) section has very detailed data on all existing schools which are subject to the Annual Primary School Census. Only in this year will the census attempt to include NGO Learning Centres, including the CLP Centres. Clearly collaboration between LGED, DPE and CLP would be an essential step in identifying un-served areas. In the long run, a properly prepared Chars Education Plan is required using all available sources of data. Indeed, one plan would be needed for each char since they are varied in population, its dispersion, communications, existing educational institutions etc. The lead in such an exercise needs to be with the GOB since the education plan has links with infrastructure, disaster management, social development etc. It makes sense to use the existing local educational planning machinery. There is provision within the third Primary Education Development Programme, PEDP III, for Upazila Primary Education Plans, UPEP. While some UPEP were developed under previous primary education development programmes they did not cover the chars. To include the chars in a UPEP would be recognition by the GOB of the rights of the people of the chars¹⁰. The chars, however, need special consideration due to their inaccessibility and lack of existing government education infrastructure. Moreover, since the National Education Policy of 2010 requires primary education to be extended to Class VIII, education plans for the chars should logically encompass the whole cycle from "shishu" to Class VIII. More is written on education plans for the chars in Recommendations.

3.3 Communications with Government

24. While CLP is led by the Rural Development and Cooperative Division (RDCCD) of the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Co-operatives the relevant education ministry—Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, MOPME, and its Directorate of Primary Education, DPE, as well as the Bureau of Non-Formal Education (BNFE), have not been central to the education pilot. However the Government's contribution in the form of the distribution of NCTB textbooks free to all the students of the pilot is not underestimated by the teachers, students and communities. Moreover, this year students from all non-formal forms of primary education, as well as from Ibtedaye Madrasahs, will be counted in the annual census of primary schools and those who have reached Class V will be permitted to sit the same Primary School Completion exam. Counting students and sitting the national examination indicate formal recognition of non-formal education centres by government and marks a departure from earlier education policy. One can view these changes as consistent with the National Education Policy of 2010 which made a "unified" education a central argument.

25. Under DPE there has been a World Bank –funded project, entitled Reaching Out of School Children (ROSC), the present phase of which is coming to a close. Time did not allow the consultants to explore with ROSC whether, under the next phase, there may be potential for ROSC to use some of the Centres and to use the partnership with NGOs model.

26. BNFE is in a formal sense responsible for the delivery of Non-Formal Primary Education, NFPE. At present it has one project running with the target of providing NFPE to urban working children in Dhaka and Chittagong. This project ends in December 2012. No follow up is expected. The

⁹ See Appendix 3 for an example of the kind of data available from the CLP database.

¹⁰ DFID and other 10 DPs have been working with GOB over more than 15 years in a succession of PEDPs to have primary education more inclusive of all children. The present PEDP-III was prepared over the period 2009- 2011 and represents the best hope of capturing all the previously neglected groups.

long term Post-Literacy and Continuing Education Project, PLCE-2, targets the 15 – 45 years age group. It works in 11 Districts only one of which, Kurigram, is in the CLP working zone. It delivers a mix of literacy activities and skill development. It also is winding down. There seems little synergy likely between these BNFE projects and CLP education pilot. One possibility for increasing access to primary education on the chars lies in a component of PEDP III – Access and Inclusion¹¹. It is intended that this component will be managed by BNEF and provide "second chance" schooling.

¹¹ Interestingly this provision in PEDP III was not mentioned by BNEF during our discussions.

4. Bringing Adequate Learning Centres and Additional Education Services to the Chars

TOR 4: Support the CLP in further approaching both GoB, to bring adequate learning centres to the chars, and the donors (especially the Education Advisors) to provide support to the initiative. The consultants will develop an advocacy strategy for bringing additional educational services to the chars

4.1 Approaching Government and Donors for Bringing Adequate Learning Centres to the Chars

27. In order to explore the issues of increasing access to education on the chars we breakdown the first part of this TOR into three parts in order of priority.

1. The next generations of learners in the chars.
2. The future of those who complete the primary cycle in December 2012.
3. The CLP structures.



4.1.1 The Next Generations

28. Since in 2007 children of age 6 years to 8 years were selected for the pilot there are younger (and older) siblings of the Centre students and other children of unschooled households waiting for education. Only one child from the family got the chance once in a period of four years. The demand for primary schooling is certainly there. Supply must now respond. CLP has data from the chars on which CLP works showing that there are more than 26,000 unschooled children. We have two key points:

29. Different solutions to increasing access to primary schooling will be required in the different chars.

30. Advocacy with government and interested Development Partners (DP) will have to be followed up by detailed local level planning. The consultants have only touched on the former during the round of consultations¹². The latter will require inputs from CLP – particularly their GIS

¹² In an interview with the Education Adviser to the European Commission (EC) Delegation we were informed that, had we come with a request to fund the Centres in late 2011, there would have been a good chance since there were some surplus

database of population and schools - and government, particularly DPE and LGED, leading to education plans for those Upazilas that have chars covering Classes 0 - VIII. See also Recommendations below.

31. Possible solutions to the lack of supply of primary school places in the Northern Chars are explored below.

4.1.2 NGO- run Centres

32. One or more NGOs could take over the CLP structures and system in particular char where the NGO has already a presence and compatible approaches to the provision of primary level schooling. By this we mean a similar approach to teacher training and support/ supervision, NCTB curricula, active learning pedagogy etc. For instance, on the Naturapara char in Sirajganj BRAC also has learning centres in rented accommodation. CLP has 21 structures. BRAC could take over the funding of the Centres and run very similar programmes to CLP. BRAC has a formal process for opening new "schools" where they work through partner NGOs. These would have to be followed before BRAC could commit to continuing the CLP centres. The existing NGO - Arches - could be sub-contracted to BRAC.

33. Moreover, the NGO, Friendship, reports that discussions are well advanced with representatives of the Government of Luxembourg for funding 20 existing centres and the opening of 12 more centres in two of the Kurigram chars.

34. A comprehensive education plan for the chars, probably generated through the procedures used in developing Upazila Primary Education Plans (UPEP), will in all likelihood include provision for NGOs to continue to provide primary education in some chars. The rather stringent conditions that are set by government for opening a school and the difficulties that the government has in posting teachers to schools in the chars are two factors which will make NGO-provision a feature of the education landscape for some time to come.

4.1.3 Government Involvement

35. The "Establishment of 1500 New Primary School Buildings in Unschooled Areas Project"¹³ has listed, in one batch of 66 sites, seven that seem to cover areas presently covered by CLP Centres. Future plans may include further schools in char areas¹⁴. NGOs may help government to find land in the chars and establish a school. We understand that the Public Service Commission, PSC, has established teaching posts for these 1500 schools but there is doubt as to how and when teachers will be posted and take up their posts. As mentioned in para 34, fully staffed schools cannot be expected for some years. Hence, some interim solution must be found to providing primary school to those communities which have got the taste for education.

36. The existing CLP structures could be removed to the mainland in a few cases and handed over to GOB, thus providing additional accommodation at a GPS or RNGPS. The char children would travel daily or board with relatives. Dry season transport could involve walking for those aged 8 upwards. Wet season may mean provision by GOB of boat transport. This suggestion would be more of an interim solution pending a comprehensive plan for primary education provision on the chars.

funds under the Supporting the Hard to Reach through Basic Education, SHARE, project. Those funds were returned to EC headquarters. Interview summary is in Appendix 2.

¹³ This Project is being run by DPE and though separately funded from PEDP III it is linked to PEDPIII which is a sub-sector wide programme.

¹⁴ 806 places for schools were identified and are tendered. Another 336 school sites are in the process of finalization. Out of these over 1100 schools 66 schools are situated in char land in different places of Bangladesh. See Appendix 2, Meeting with DG DPE, and PD of 1500 Schools in Unserved Areas Project.

37. As part of a plan for provide schooling on the chars, GOB may also consider providing a floating school where the river erosion threat is serious. It is a feasible proposition since BRAC already has 10 boat schools and is planning for 90 more for use in the riverine areas. The boat school could be fixed in one place on the land during dry season and float in the wet season. The boats can be used in the same manner as in the CLP Centre. The suggestion is not that floating or boat schools are alternatives to fixed structures such as the CLP Centres but, rather in a few places there may be insufficient dry land available on which to construct a fixed Learning Centre/ School.

Ongoing Primary Education Development Program and the Joint Annual Review (PEDP-III, JARM)

38. The principal context in which the education of children on the chars can be considered is that of the Third Primary Education Development Programme (PEDP- III). It adopts a sector-wide approach to improve learning outcomes of the whole primary education sector including pre-primary. Comprehensive results and financing frameworks of PEDP-III cover all interventions and funding support for the pre-primary and primary education system. It is a US\$ 8.3 billion programme jointly financed by the Government of Bangladesh and 11 Development partners. External financing is linked to achievement of annual targets for disbursement linked indicators, general sector performance as per key performance indicators, financial expenditure reports, and other conditions.

39. PEDP-III aims to improve equitable participation in higher quality, better governed, and resourced primary education services for all children. The components and focus area for programme outcomes are (i) Learning and Teaching, (ii) Participation and Disparities, (iii) Decentralisation and Effectiveness, and (iv) Sector/Programme Planning and Management. Clearly, the first and second outcomes provide the space for consideration of the education of char children.

40. The progress of PEDP-III towards its goals is considered annually in the Joint Annual Review Mission when all the DPs, the concerned government ministries and departments, including the Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, its Directorate of Primary Education and Bureau of Non-formal Education, Planning Commission, Ministry of Finance, meet for up to two weeks to review evidence of the performance of PEDP-III. A JARM was held in May of 2012, the programme having begun in July Of 2011. DPs are represented by their Education Advisers or programme officers while normally heads of Aid attend the opening and wrap-up sessions. Major issues of policy are discussed and changes agreed at each JARM. It is the obvious forum for raising the issue of the education of previously neglected populations including the education of char children.

5. Advocacy Strategy for Bringing Additional Education Services to the Chars

41. In the long term, the Government of Bangladesh will provide on the chars the range of services in education and health that are available on the mainland. Each successive investment programme for primary education has moved towards increasing provision of schooling to un-served populations. While a start to planning for education services on the chars can be made during PEDP-III, it may be several five year national development plans before the real needs of the chars' populations are met.¹⁵ CLP has demonstrated that running of school community-based primary schools on the chars can be done effectively. What needs to be done is to bring the successful pilot to the attention of GOB and Development Partners, DPs, in order that the present Centres can be kept open and that the CLP Centre "model" can be considered as a possible solution to the shortage of access to primary education on the chars. There will probably be a delay in obtaining new funding to keep the centres open. Some interim measures can be considered and these are addressed after our recommendations for advocacy.

5.1 Recommendations for the CLP Team

42. Presentation to the Education Local Consultative Group by the Education Pilot management, with support from FIVDB and the IMOs. British Council / Professor Nazmul Haq may be available to undertake this work. This group, on which the GoB is represented through the Directorate of Primary Education, meets monthly.

43. Contact with the Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE), as the umbrella organisation to which most education NGOs are affiliated with a view to a) informing education NGOs of the work of the CLP education pilot; b) using the offices of CAMPE to advocate with the MOPME and others for the rights of the children on the chars. CAMPE is also part of the Joint Annual Review Mission, JARM, for PEDP-III and would be well placed to advocate for primary education on the chars and for NGOs to deliver that education.

44. A 15 minutes documentary video using clips of interviews with stakeholders, illustrative student activities, sites on the char etc. Part scripted by CLP pilot team then professional TV script with professional shooting of interviews. Distribute widely to education NGOs through CAMPE, DPME, DPE, Bureau of NFE etc. A screening by one TV channel is feasible. A good follow up would be a high level ceremony for GOB officers, some education DPs, CAMPE and education NGOs to mark the end of the pilot. (Other less costly options for "marketing" to CLP Education Pilot may be considered. The aim is to get the positive outcome of the pilot to a wide audience.)

45. CLP website could include a link to this report, or to its one page summary, augmented by photos of the Centres and the communities. This item may be linked to CAMPE's website and to that of NGOs offering NFPE.

46. To what extent CLP can execute all these activities within its present contract is not known to the consultants. The co-funding entities- DFID and AusAID – may have to supplement the current management contract with Maxwell Stamp.

¹⁵ The planning of the education sector, particularly primary, is complicated by its size – at least 18 million students in 11 different types of primary school. Also, the first National Education Policy (NEP) emerged suddenly in 2009, after the preparation of PEDP-III was underway. NEP was approved by the National Assembly in 2010. But, PEDP-III was already well into negotiation by then so that "primary" within PEDP-III is defined as Classes I- V whereas the NEP defines primary as I- VIII. Furthermore, all planning activities are under the Planning Commission which has, since Liberation, issued a series of 5-year Development Plans. NEP is not consistent with the present Sixth Development Plan.

5.2 Recommendations for DFID & AusAID

47. To date, Upazila Primary Education Plans, UPEP, have not extended to the chars. Chars have been excluded from the UPEP due to the inaccessibility of many chars to the normal circuit of government officers and because there is little in the way of existing government provision of schools in the chars.

48. UPEPs are developed in a participative way led by the UNO and other government officials and involve school management committees. There are two possible routes to having UPEP include education of the char children. First, during PEDP-III, the guidelines for carrying out the process of developing UPEP may be reviewed and amended. Second, the controlling ministry, MOPME, could instruct DPE to inform District and Upazila Education Officers to include the primary education of char children in UPEPs for those Upazilas which include populated chars. We therefore recommend that DFID and AusAid, at the earliest opportunity, raise the issue of ensuring that UPEP include education of the char children. This could be done at the monthly meetings of the Education Local Consultative Group and /or by direct approach to the Secretary MOPME.

49. DP pressure may also ensure that in the next batch of sites for new schools under the 1500 New Primary School Buildings in Unschooled Areas Project some priority is given to the chars. Finally, at the Joint Annual Review of PEDP- III, when major themes such as those of access and equity are addressed the education advisers of DFID and AusAid will have the chance to press the case for educating children of the chars.

50. Some major philanthropists of the nation may be approached to sponsor one or several Centres (with teachers salary and students learning materials) for a second cycle of 4 years or to allow the 2012 Centre leavers to continue in the CLP structures to Classes VI – VIII. The estimated costs of one philanthropic donor taking on just 10 CLP Centres is less than Taka 2 lakh per year or under Taka 8 lakh for the 4 year cycle. The co-funders, using knowledge of the Bangladesh commercial and industrial sectors may be able to persuade a few philanthropists to take on some Centres as part of the social responsibility visions.

5.3 Interim and Short term Response to the end of the Education Pilot

51. It is prudent for CLP to consider planning for a period after December 2012 when there is, at least in some chars, no replacement for the Education Pilot. One possibility is for CLP to prepare the communities to run the Centres. Funding of the monthly recurrent costs will be of the order of Taka 4,000/-. Parents alone may not manage to pay their full share of say 200/- per month. On the other hand, a few communities may explore with the teacher (the main cost) if she/ he would take a reduced salary¹⁶. Also, other members of the community may be persuaded to offer cash or in kind contributions. The supervision and support by NGO staff would disappear. The CMC would have to take on supervision of the Centre. Quality of the process and output would be impaired relative to the present Centre set-up. But, there would be a place for learning for the children of the community.

52. The NGOs that are running the CLP schools may consider some alternative sources of funds that would be used to continue the Centres. Amongst these sources contact with possible donors may be of worth trying.

53. CLP may have some contingency funds or staff time in the present year that could be used to help the IMOs to prepare some communities to take over the management of the Centre.

¹⁶ The monthly salary is Taka 3,300/- and that is about half of the salary of the government primary teacher who also has benefits of pension etc. However low the Centre teacher's salary is, the fact is for many teachers, particularly female teachers, generally there is no alternative source of income without moving.

5.3.1 The Primary Completers in 2012

54. It is anticipated that the CLP students will do well in the terminal primary school test – PSC Exam. Many express their desire to go on to high school, or at least to Class VIII. If the students miss the opportunity to go in Class VI and beyond then, in the absence of a literate environment, it is possible for some students that, within another 3-4 years, their literacy and numeracy and accumulated knowledge will be lost or severely reduced. Therefore, opportunities for continuing education are required if the investment to date by CLP is to be maximised for the good of the char communities and for the individual student. (There are on a few chars opportunities for skill development in small skill training centres.)

55. While the demand for secondary schooling, at present from Class VI- Class VIII, may exist, and some parents may be willing and able to pay the costs, existing non-government schools and colleges in the char area are reported to have little capacity to absorb the numbers of students coming from the CLP centres. In that case, transferring of the some of CLP structures to the sites of secondary schools, where there is land, could partly solve the problem of lack of capacity. Furniture and relevant equipment would have to be added. Communities may also arrange a hostel near the high school in the main land for the students graduating from CLP schools and continuing their education. Informal boarding with willing relatives and households is another option. Recruiting teachers to Non-Government Secondary Schools is problematic since certain education qualifications are required and a pass in an examination run by the Non-government Teachers' Registration and Certification Authority. Moreover, many teachers are reluctant to take up posts in the chars. Neither the additional teaching and hostel accommodation nor the teachers are likely to be available by January 2013.

56. Another possibility is for the CLP Centres to be used in an afternoon session for conducting Classes VI- VIII. This will of course only be feasible if the Centres can continue under new funding. A recommendation to this effect is made below.

5.3.2 The CLP Structures

57. There was no hint in any discussions with stakeholders that these structures would be occupied by the elite of the villages for their personal use. Such a possibility can be circumvented by a detailed plan, char by char, for the use of the 140 CLP structures. Since they are cheaply disassembled and re-erected they could continue to provide temporary "kaatcha"¹⁷ facilities at primary and secondary Non-Government schools on the mainland and chars. The government officials in the char area welcomed this idea. If they remain on their present sites the present CMCs may run a learning centre or the community may use the facilities for community meetings and wedding ceremonies.

58. Of these 140 physical structures there are strong possibilities that Arches with BRAC funding, and Friendship with funding from the Government of Luxembourg, could take over 41 Centres of 20% of the total number. Arches have 21 CLP Centres on Naturapara Union of Sirajgonj and Friendship is the IMO for 20 Centres in one char in Kurigram. If these arrangements are confirmed it means, post December 2012, 99 Centres would be available for a variety of other education or community uses.

¹⁷ Bangla term for roughly built of local materials and not expected to be permanent.

6. Conclusions

6.1 The Education Pilot and it's Review

59. The Education Pilot as documented in this report has seen significant improvements in educational outcomes for children upto Grade V and the CLP team should be congratulated such an impressive achievement. The pilot has been well designed with excellent learning outcomes in terms of the recruitment of teachers from local community rather than a reliance on teachers from outside the CHARS. This evaluation has picked up on these lessons and with the benefit of hindsight could usefully have happened earlier in the programme to plan for scaling-up success as urgent action is now needed to secure investment either from the government, DFID and other donors or a combination of these options.

6.2 Government takes Responsibility for Education on the Chars

60. In the long run the GOB, in accepting that the children on the chars are as much Bangladeshi citizens as those on the mainland and should not be denied their rights of access to education will make primary education provision for char children. There is tacit acknowledgement of this fact in the recent establishment of the New Primary School Buildings in Unschooled Areas Project. Some of these schools (government supported schools) will be on the chars. Completion of the civil works and posting of teachers will be a long and slow process. As mentioned above, there is a pressing need for education planning in the chars. In the present primary education development programme, as in the previous two programmes, there is provision for Upazila Primary Education Plans, UPEPs. Clearly the chars ought to be included within UPEPs for those Upazilas that have populated chars. It is clear that some interim measures from various quarters are needed to sustain the success of CLP in raising the demand for schooling.

6.3 Support in 2012 by CLP

61. CLP, working with their partner NGOs, could prepare communities to run the Centres themselves or with the help of the NGOs for some time. The support from CLP would be in staff time to identify, with the IMOs, which communities were most likely to manage Centres.

6.4 Additional funding is found to support some or all the Centres

62. We are strongly of the view that the system developed under CLP is a cost-effective way of delivering education in the chars and should be continued. Moreover, through using the physical facilities twice in a day the Class V leavers of 2012 can continue their education through to Class VIII. If funds can be found to keep the Centres open then two recommendations are presented.

63. First, take a second batch of students and repeat the four year cycle. The estimated costs of running the same 140 Centres would be US\$1.5m over four years. If the potential funders of Centres in Kurigram and Sirajganj were forthcoming, the total would be reduced by about 30% to just over US 1million. Detailed calculations in Appendix 4.

64. A second recommendation is to develop a three year curriculum based on the NCTB curriculum to allow the 2012 leavers to extend their education to class VIII, Their literacy and learning will be maintained if they have 8 years schooling. After completing successfully 8 years of basic education some may travel to, or board near, a secondary school and continue to Class XII. Subject based teachers will be needed, possibly two or three teachers who can teach all the five basic subjects (Bangla, English, Mathematics, Social Science and Science) at Classes VI- VIII. These subject teachers could move between several Centres on the one Char. The costs over a 3-years will be approximately US \$1.5m. Detailed calculations in Appendix 4. A period of one year would be needed to develop the curriculum, identify and train teachers and extend the capacity of the existing field supervisors.

65. If both recommendations are funded the cost would be approximately US\$3m over 4 years.

Part II: Appendices

Appendix-1: Accounts of Meetings with Bogra and Dhaka-based Stakeholders

Interview with Reza Ahmed, Manager CLP Education Pilot, FIVDB. Saturday 14 July.

Present: RA, ANH, CC,

Impressions of the Education Pilot

The modalities of the pilot are different from the regular school. E.g. attendance at the centres is almost 100%. Reasons include the attractive learning environment, active learning, one teacher to whom the students relate. "Learners feel free".

Demand and Supply

Demand for schooling certainly exists now in the Char. Communities now notice the behaviour of school students. More respect is shown to community by CLP Centre students. Students also pass on knowledge to parents. Some parents can now read a little and many can sign names. All these signs feed into community and make members positive towards education.

Compare with Schools

There have been no formal studies comparing Centre students and regular school students. Informally, government officials say that CLP students are "better" in terms of attendance and achievement. (How they come to make this judgement is puzzling since government officers by their own admission hardly visit the char.)

Strengths and weaknesses

The strengths of the pilot lie in the teacher training and the monthly testing of students. The "model" tests were developed by the interviewee based on his field experience, examples from the HQ of FIVDB and knowledge of the question types in the PSLE. One weakness of the pilot was that at student entry there was social pressure to admit students under 6. Some of those have not stayed the course. (Only time this was mentioned.)

The major obstacles in delivering the pilot were erosion (causing some Centres and households to move) and migration – due to erosion and poverty. Some teachers were replaced mainly female teachers who marry and migrate. A few were found unable to cope with Class IV work and were replaced (2009).

Student learning

Students do achieve the main competences which are tested regularly. The NCRB books are supplemented by teachers' manual which shows the teacher how to teach the topics in the NCTB textbooks. Teachers go beyond the book in encouraging students to be well behaved, well mannered and to respect others.

Communities' Changes

Changes in the communities are noticeable. "Maybe school is not required. Why send children there?" At first the communities came and looked to see what was in the "school". Now they can see that the students have learned and can help their parents through reading documents for them and in teaching how to write a signature.

In the event of the CLP structures not being used as a school, they could be used as a community meeting place though its maintenance may be a problem.

Other points for the future

Save the Children (USA) may be persuaded to take over some. NGO "Friendship" is interested in taking over the Centres on char in Kurigram.

The existing provision for secondary schooling is inadequate to cope with the outputs of the pilot. Gave the example of Sirajgani Naturapara Union where there are 21 Centres with some 20 students each. There is one College/ high school and it cannot accommodate the predicted number.

One idea is to prepare for a later take-over by other NGOs or for GOB provision to come on stream. Communities could be trained in this last year of CLP education pilot to run the Centres for a period of say two years until other arrangements could be made.

Discussions with senior management of IMO's delivering the CLP education Pilot.

CLP office, RDA, Monday 16 July, 2012.

List of participants is given in the consolidated list of persons met (Appendix 5).

Observations:

The education project is different from others. It is effective. In Kurigram it has given an education to 1200 children who, otherwise, would not have had schooling. What is the future for other children in those chars?

The char present challenges in delivering services. The government generally has avoided providing for the population on the char.

The project is "exemplary" and should have lessons for others including GOB to follow.

750 students started on one char and 597 (80%) will sit the Primary Leaving Exam in November. The loss is more due to migration following erosion than true "drop-out". At least one of the IMO's keeps records of the destinations of students who leave early. Many find admission on the mainland.

One IMO noted that where there is drop-out it is in the Classes IV-V. It may be that some parents require the labour of the children when they reach 10 +.

Other projects have tried to solve the remote areas problem. For instance, ROSC, Reaching Out-of-School Children, made "lots of noise to begin with" but later ran into trouble and delivered little. ROSC was a government programme. There was little effective monitoring of how resources were spent.

Other NFE programmes focus on delivering education in classes I- III after which the students are passed on to GPS or other regular schools. CLP managed to compress 6 years (0 - 5) into four calendar years with one teacher. One teacher is responsible for all subjects in contrast to GPS where there is subject teaching.

GPS schools in the char suffer because the teachers do not attend regularly and send substitutes to the char school. Parents know that the Centre delivers effective schooling while they are reluctant to send to the GPS, where they exist. On one char, students studying at Class IV in the CLP Centres teach the Class V students of the GPS.

In the CLP Centre communities a demand for schooling has been created. The success of the students in learning is known and appreciated by their parents and the communities.

CLP Centres have toilets and water which many schools do not have. Generally Centres are clean.

The main weakness lies in the design which takes one batch through the programme. It is clear that there is a large number out of school.

Note of discussion with Enamul Haque Programme Manager (Education) for FRIENDSHIP. CLP offices Bogra 16 July

He reported that the government of Luxembourg has "almost" committed to supporting a continuation of the CLP centres in Kurigram for 6 years. Discussions are advanced and a confirmatory email is imminent.

Some changes to the CLP model are being made. 12 new Centres will be added to the existing 29 Centres. There will be 2 shifts in 18 Centres. The education programme will be of 6 years duration, shishu plus 5. January 2013 is the targeted start with the time from now till then being used to recruit and train teachers and supervisors.

There are 2 NGHS in the area. They are exploring how the leavers of 2012 can be accommodated.

A total of 1500 students can be accommodated in the January 2013- December 2018 scheme. (30 x 32 + 30 x 18).

This project will ensure the follow up of the CLP education activities and utilization of the closed down school house in future. Since this project will use the NCTB curriculum therefore, the outcome of the project will also correspond to the national goal and objectives.

Meeting with Valerie Emblen, Team Leader SHARE Project, Road 91 House 1b, Gulshan.

AZ, NH, CC + VE. July 17, 2012.

SHARE started in Feb 2012.

EC has made contracts with 4 partners – including Dhaka Ahsania Mission, Save the Children – to deliver education services to populations unserved by government and other agencies. Long project of 6.5 years with a wide range of targets , including working children, children handicapped in various ways, char and remote areas etc. Main thrust is on primary education. Her role and that of SHARE is in Knowledge Management that includes research, advocacy, building communications between government and NGOs at the local level etc.

She ruled out being able to influence where the resources actually go. Each NGO partner has a contract and designated zones for working.. Suggested we contact Laila Baqee in EC delegation. She is hopeful that Laila may help in this regard and she knows further source of funding.

She pointed out that schooling should improve the life choices of children. If they stay on their char after their schooling it is a waste of education if they revert to fishing and household care. We should explore with various agencies how they are responding to increasing demand for secondary. E.g. Caritas is setting up hostels for girls attached to high schools. Caritas though working mostly for ethnic people might be interested to do something in chars.

UNESCO has a project – a pilot in NFE to determine possible uses of buildings for education. UNESCO is now in fund crisis however, it is worthy to talk to them. Country Director Kichi Waisu.

BRAC is said to be keen to work in char now. DFID has given large sum direct to BRAC. Appointment with ED of BRAC will be sought.

Azad is to send to VE the data and maps of the CLP areas – the school parts.

She will send soft copy of the Inception Report

Meeting with DG DPE, and PD of New Primary School Buildings in Unschooled Areas project

At DPE, Saturday 21 July, 2012. Shymol Kanti Ghosh. DG, DPE; Md Sirajul Islam, PD of 1500 schools project, Rafiqul Islam Deputy Director 1500 primary schools project. Romij Ahmed, World Bank Consultant for Student Achievement Testing, NH, JF, CC

In the discussion the PD of 1500 schools Mr. Sirajul Islam mentioned that government has sanctioned 1500 primary schools in the unschooled areas. Amongst them so far 806 places of schools were identified and tendered out for construction. Another 336 schools are in the process of finalization. Out of these over 1100 schools 66 schools are situated in char land in different places of Bangladesh. All the 1500 schools to be set up in different parts of Bangladesh are four roomed either semi-pucca or pucca houses. In case of pucca house it would be four storey foundation with one storey construction. Four storey foundation is made because of its future extension. However, the char houses would be all tin roof semi pucca house.

DG mentioned that the char schools under CLP project can be taken by BNFE but DPE is providing all full length primary schools

DG also reported that from this year all learning centres would be included in the Annual Primary School Census.

Meeting at BRAC, Sunday 22 July, 2012.

Monwer Hossain Khandker, Programme Coordinator Education, Profulla Chandra Barman Sr Programme Manager, Education, NH, JF, CC

MHK confirmed that there was no agreement yet on BRAC taking over some or all of ARCHES' CLP learning centres. Students in their LCs came from nearby. The CLP Centres in Naturapara may be out of their reach. BRAC had a formal process for establishing new schools and it entailed consideration of the capacity of the partner NGO to run the schools to the standards BRAC sets. They target areas with low literacy rates, sufficient students mainly girls. It seeks not to provide schools where is already sufficient provision. BRAC has constant contact with GOB at Upazila level.

Meeting at BNFE, Sunday 22 July 2012

Present: DG, BNFE; DD of BEHRTUWC; PD of PLCE 2. JF, NH, CC

The DG referred us to DPE and the ROSC project. BNFE dealt with non-formal education while DPE and the CLP learning centres used a formal curriculum. BNFE had one project for urban working children and one for adults in the age range 15 – 45. The first ends in December 2012 and the second in June of 2013. ROSC has a second phase and runs a formal programme. It may be able to help the CLP centres.

Meeting at the EU Delegation, 23 July, 2012.

Laila Baqee, NH, CC

All the funds under the SHARE project are committed now. She advised that the applications for small grants (1 or 2 million Euro) can be made by online application to the website www.delbqd.ec.europa.eu

From time to time requests are made for applications for areas such as child and human rights, extreme deprivation etc. CLP or the partner NGOs/ IMOs could watch for such requests over the next year.

Appendix-2: Terms of Reference (TOR)

Evaluation of CLP's Education Pilot & Related Tasks

1. Background

The Chars Livelihoods Programme (CLP) is now in its second phase (CLP-2) that is scheduled to end in 2016. The first phase began in 2004, finished in March 2010 and moved seamlessly into the second phase. The programme purpose during the two phases is to improve the livelihoods, incomes and food security of up to 1 million extremely poor women, men and children living on island *chars* in the north west of Bangladesh. The Programme is co-financed by DFID and AusAID, managed by Maxwell Stamp PLC and led by the Rural Development and Cooperative Division (RDCCD) of the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Co-operatives of the Government of Bangladesh (GoB).

In 2007, as the first phase expanded both its geographical range and activities, it was decided by DFID and by the management team of CLP to begin to provide primary education in the chars, in the form of a pilot project offered to approximately 5,000 primary school age children. The chars possess relatively few schools and, those that do exist, frequently lack teachers. Thus there was and still is a dearth of schools on the chars. This is considered to be one of the underlying causes of intergenerational poverty in the char population. It was clearly understood by all involved that the small CLP pilot could only scratch the surface of the real demand. Nonetheless, it was seen as an opportunity to instigate a non-formal approach that would attract other education service providers as well as directly benefitting some 5,000 families on the chars.

The donors and the management team agreed that the pilot should continue until the enrolled children graduated from primary school, and thus it crossed from phase 1 into phase 2. The children will graduate at the end of 2012. The CLP pilot has been operating in 7 upazilas of the districts of Kurigram, Gaibandha, Bogra, Sirajganj and Jamalpur with oversight provided by 6 of its NGO partners while Friends In Village Development, Bangladesh (FIVDB) are contracted as special service providers (SSP). FIVDB designed the education project and have been responsible for developing the curriculum and providing continual training and support to the teachers and NGOs concerned.

Now that the CLP's pilot education project is drawing to a close, the CLP wishes to have a quasi-independent review that will develop a list of lessons learnt that can be shared with and benefitted from and by other actual and potential education service providers.

Considerable investment has been made into the infrastructure of the CLP schools: not only the class buildings but also in raising plinths, providing water sources, latrines, and so forth. A few of the original buildings have been lost to erosion but the CLP still operates its pilot education project in 143 out of 150 sites. The CLP does not wish simply to abandon these buildings but rather – with DFID agreement – to hand them over for suitable use that can benefit (in order of preference) education, pro-poor development or community development. However, there is a real danger on the chars that many of these buildings will be taken over by the village elite for their own use. The CLP and the donors wish to avoid this scenario and therefore seek advice from the consultants as to the best manner to proceed¹⁸.

Finally, a key mandate accorded CLP-2 is to identify and bring in other service providers to the chars that may benefit the char population, especially the poorest families. Such service providers could

¹⁸ The CLP has started to investigate hand-over of several of its classrooms and the consultants will be expected to review progress and continue to investigate other and better alternatives.

potentially cover a multitude of disciplines but in the context of the current ToR, we wish to concentrate on possibilities for sustainable education; particularly at the primary level. The CLP will be unable to allocate any further financial resources to education after the current batch of children has graduated in late 2012.

Possible service providers of education to the chars are Government, large NGOs (such as BRAC) or smaller piecemeal providers from the development world (either other donors or smaller NGOs).

The CLP has already made initial contacts with the Division of Primary and Mass Education (DPME) of the Government of Bangladesh and is supported in this initiative by both the Secretary of the Rural Development and Cooperatives Division as well as by the donors. PME is currently executing a programme called "Establishment of New Primary School Buildings in Unschooled Areas" that seeks to establish learning centres in under-served locations, such as the chars where the CLP operates.

2. Objectives

The objectives of the study are as follows:

- Review the CLP's Education pilot and, from the review, develop a series of "Lessons Learnt". The CLP is interested to know the thoughts of the stakeholders concerned in the pilot (children/parents, teachers, SSP/NGOs, GoB/donors and the CLP staff concerned with the project);
- Review CLP progress in handing over classrooms to suitable organisations and help the CLP staff concerned to define better the priorities and process of handing over the school buildings so that they may continue to benefit as many poor families as possible;
- Review the CLP's progress in seeking "partners" (in its widest sense) to provide educational services to the chars; especially those where schools are currently absent or non-functional. The CLP possesses a small but performing GIS¹⁹ and the consultants are invited to work with the team members on using the GIS as a tool to define priority education sites on the chars;
- Support the CLP in further approaching both GoB, to bring adequate learning centres to the chars, and the donors (especially the Education Advisors) to provide support to the initiative. The consultants will develop an advocacy strategy for bringing additional educational services to the chars.

3. Methodology

The consultants will be expected to develop a work plan to execute the objectives of the mission and lead the work while liaising closely with two members of the CLP's senior management: Abdul Momin (Unit Manager responsible for the education pilot) and Julian Francis (Partnerships Director).

In summary, the role of the consultant will be to:

- Review all relevant literature;
- Agree a work plan to achieve the objectives of the mission;
- Meet with the personnel/stakeholders involved in the education pilot, both in the field and at the CLP headquarters in Bogra;
- Develop a concise evaluation of the pilot, to include lessons learnt;
- Develop and explain clearly the best use to be made of the CLP's educational facilities on the chars post-2012;

¹⁹ Geographic Information System

- Meet with senior-level stakeholders i.e. CLP senior managers, Programme Director, donors (especially the CLP lead advisors and the Education Advisors at DFID and AusAID) and relevant government officials at RDCD and PME;
- As possible, advocate for further educational facilities to the chars, particularly but not exclusively from the GoB programme entitled Establishment of New Primary School Buildings in Unschooled Areas
- At the end of the mission, present findings to relevant stakeholders (donors and CLP staff);
- Draft final report, incorporating feedback from key stakeholders.

4. Timeframes and Deliverables

The consultants should mobilize in early June 2012. The Study is expected to require a total level of effort of 40 days with all work occurring in-country. The proposed timing of inputs will be incorporated into the work plan and agreed with Messrs Momin and Francis.

Deliverables will be as follows:

1. An agreed work plan;
2. A concise report containing all details of the evaluation of the pilot including lessons learnt, proposals for the future use of educational facilities, results of meetings with stakeholders, progress achieved in advocating for bringing additional educational facilities to the chars and recommendations for further partnership activities in education.

5. Reporting

The consultants will work closely with the two individuals mentioned previously. They will also liaise with Ric Goodman (Operations Director) and the IML team (led by Stuart Kenward). IML can provide a record of results and demonstrate the GIS. The Team Leader (Malcolm Marks) has overall responsibility for all consultant work.

6. Competencies

The British Council (Bangladesh) will field two consultants (one international and one national) with the skills and experience to undertake the listed activities.

Appendix-3: Basic Primary Education Statistics 2011 (Draft)

Indicator	Boys	Girls	Average
Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER)	108.3	114.1	111.2
Net Enrolment Ratio (NER)	98.3	99.1	98.7
Survival Rate to Grade 5	77.0	82.1	79.5
Coefficient of Efficiency	67.7	70.5	69.1
Primary Cycle Completion Rates	67.6	73.0	70.3
Primary Cycle Dropout Rates	32.4	27.0	29.7
Years Input Per Graduate	7.4	7.1	7.2

Appendix-4: Estimates for Continuing the Primary Classes and for extending to full 8 years' curriculum

Option 1: Repeat "Pilot" in 140 Centres			
Annual cost per student	BDT	6,000	
Number of students	BDT	5,000	a few double shifts
Total per year	BDT	30,000,000	
	USD	375,000	1 US\$=BDT 80
Over 4 years	USD	1,500,000	
Option 2: Use Centres for double shift to extend to 8 years basic education cycle			
Annual cost per student in Class VI-VIII	BDT	10,000	2 or 3 teachers in rotation
Number of students	BDT	4,000	
Total per year	BDT	40,000,000	
	USD	500,000	1 US\$=BDT 80
Over 3 years	USD	1,500,000	

Notes:

- (i) The present annual cost is used by CLP.
- (ii) A rate of exchange of the US \$ against the Taka is set at 80.
- (iii) The annual cost of a student in Class VI-VIII, using the facilities of the CLP-built structure in the afternoon is estimated by the consultants at Taka 10,000/-. Two or three teachers would be needed on a rotation basis to deliver the 5 main subjects of the Class VI- VIII curriculum.

Appendix-5: List of Persons Met

(A) Field visits to Gaibandha, Bogra and Sirajganj.

Gaibandha

North Lalchamar Shishu Shikha Kendra

Students attended in FGD

1. Noyan Mia (M), 11 years
1. Awal Mia (M), 11.5
2. Mukul Mia (M), 12
3. Lablu (M), 11.5
4. Jannati (F), 11
5. Ronjina (F), 11.5

Parents and CMC members North Lalchamar Shishu Shikha Kendra

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Sattar (M), CMC member | 60 years |
| 6. Shahinoor (F), parent | 40 |
| 7. Noyoni (F), parent | 40 |
| 8. Rasheda (F), parent | 30 |
| 9. Afroja (F), parent | 35 |
| 10. Kohinoor (F), parent | 30 |
| 11. Teacher interviewed Badruddoja Lablu | SSC |

Teachers interviewed in Sundarganj Upazila char

- | | |
|------------------|-----|
| 1. Mahbubor | SSC |
| 12. Mohasina (F) | HSC |
| 13. Monalisa (F) | HSC |
| 14. Salma (F) | HSC |
| 15. Romana (F) | BA |
| 16. Mamataz (F) | BA |

Bogra

Sariakandi Upazila, Karnibari Union

Teachers: all live within one km of Centre.

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| 1. Abbas Uddin, | HSC , age 32 |
| 17. Nasima Khatun, | SSC, age 27 |
| 18. Ayub Ali, | SSC, age 30 |

Parents: Age range 30 – 65.

Al-amin
Azjal Sheikh
Karim Sheikh
Majeda Begum
Rabina Begum

CMC Members. Age range 30 – 48.

Badsha Mondol
Shaheb Ali
Beauty Akter
Rahena Akter

Sirajganj

Kazipur Upazila, Natuarpara, Centre Dakkhin Rehaisuriber Mannan Member.

Teacher:

Khatun. HSC, age 25. Lives within one km.

Parents: All female age range 35 – 48.

Kohimur

Fulkuni

Deliara

Sufia

Mamitu

Golinurr

Asia

CMC Members

Mannan, male

Amjad, male

Habibur, male

Monjuara, female

Students, age range 10 – 13.

Bithi, Female

Sabina, Female

Nayem, Male

Kabir, male

Suma, Female

Akhi, Female

Monirul, male

Centre Supervisors

Beauty Akhter

Abdul Momin

Khayrul Kabir

(B) Other persons met in Bogra and surrounds

Reza Ahmed, Project Manager Education Pilot for FIVDB.

Smita Premchander Social Development Consultant

Dr Malcolm Marks, Team Leader CLP

Julian Francis. Partnerships Director, CLP, until July 31, 2012

Mrs Gabriella Wright, Partnerships Director, CLP From July 1, 2012

Abdul Haque, Deputy Team Leader, CLP

Md Abdul Momin, Human Development Unit Manager responsible for education pilot. CLP

Stuart Kenward, IML Director, CLP

Abul Kalam Azad, Coordinator, Education Pilot, CLP

Sarwar Mahmud, DC Bogra

Abida Sultana, ED, ARCHES
Md Jamil, PM AKOTA
Md Lutfor Rahman, ED, AKOTA
Md Aminul Islam, DED ARCHES
Nassim Uddin Ahmed, AD (AP-Programme) GBS
Md Nazir Hosain, Chief Executive, GBS
Md Javed Ali, Programme Officer, GBS
Rokeya Begum Safali, ED AID-Comilla.
Md Enamul Haque, Program Manager (Education) FRIENDSHIP

(C) Persons met in Dhaka

Valerie Emblen, Team Leader SHARE Project. Supporting the Hardest to Reach Through Basic Education
Shyamal Kanti Ghosh, DG DPE
Md Sirajul Islam. Director, New Primary School Buildings in Unschooling Areas Project
Md Rafiqul Islam. Deputy Director New Primary School Buildings in Unschooling Areas Project.
Romij Ahmed, Consultant National Student Achievement, DPE.
Monwer Hossain Khandher, Programme Coordinator, Education. BRAC
Profulla Chandra Barman Sr Programme Manager, Education. BRAC
Md Alamghir DG BNFE
AAM Kamal Deputy Director Basic Education for Hard to Reach Urban Children, BEHTRUWC
M A Mannan Howlader, Director, Post-Literacy and Continuing Education – 2, PLCE 2.
Laila Baqee, Education Adviser, European Union Delegation to Bangladesh

Appendix-6: Distribution of Primary Schools in CLP Villages

