

External Review

Alternated Education and Vocational Training Project – Phase VI (CEFA VI)

Review Report (final)

Basel, 21 November 2011

External Review of the Alternated Education and Vocational Training Project – Phase VI
(CEFA VI), May 2009 – June 2012

Commissioned by the

Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation

Review Report (final)

Programme Manager: Silvana Mjeda, National Program Officer
Swiss Cooperation Office Albania, Embassy of Switzerland
Rruga Brigada e VIII, Nd.23, H.9, Ap.1, Nj.B.5, 1019 Tirana, Albania
Phone: +355 42 22 40 102 or 22 53 182, E-Mail: silvana.mjeda@sdc.net

Evaluator / Team Leader: Harald Meier
Evaluator: Mirela Muça
B,S,S. Economic Consultants, Steinenberg 5, CH-4051 Basel
Tel: +41 61 263 05 58, E-Mail: harald.meier@bss-basel.ch

Content

Abbreviations	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Management Summary	vi
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Background and Context.....	2
2.1. Project Context	2
2.2. SDC Cooperation Strategy.....	4
2.3. Other Interventions	5
2.3.1. European Union	5
2.3.2. United Nations Development Programme	6
2.3.3. United Nations Children's Fund.....	8
2.3.4. Other Programmes and Projects	9
3. Review of Implementation	9
3.1. Relevance	9
3.2. Effectiveness	12
3.2.1. Achievement of Project Objectives	12
3.2.2. Organisational Performance Assessment	22
3.3. Efficiency	26
3.4. Impact.....	28
3.5. Sustainability	30
4. Conclusions and Lessons Learned.....	31
5. Recommendations	32
Annex 1: Terms of Reference.....	43
Annex 2: Performance Indicators	50
Annex 3: Specific Evaluation Questions	57
Annex 4: Organisational Performance Assessment – Methodology and Tool.....	64
Annex 5: NPF strategic documents, monitoring and reporting system samples	69
Annex 6: Workshops.....	70
Annex 7: Interview Guidelines	82
Annex 8: Interview Partners.....	86
Annex 9: Field Mission Plan	88

Annex 10: Literature (selected) 91**Tables**

Table 1: Key data of Component 1 beneficiaries	13
Table 2: Dynamics of entry into / exit from CEFA classes (Technical Report 2010-2011) ..	17
Table 3: VET training beneficiaries	18
Table 4: Successful project acquisition May 2009 – June 2011.....	25

Abbreviations

CHF	Swiss Franc
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EC	European Commission
EIDHR	European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights
EU	European Union
EUR	Euro
FOSA	Fund for an Open Society Albania
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
LRAB	Local Roma Advisory Board
MIPD	Multi-annual Indicative Planning Document
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MoES	Ministry of Education and Sciences
MoLSAEO	Ministry of Labour Social Affairs and Equal Opportunity
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NSDI	National Strategy for Development and Integration
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe
OSI	Open Society Institute
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
ProDoc	Project Document
REF	Roma Education Fund
SC	Steering Committee
SCO-A	Swiss Cooperation Office in Albania

SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SWG	Sector Working Group
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
YPO	Yearly Plan of Operations

Acknowledgements

The evaluators would like to thank all those who co-operated with us in the organisation and conduct of this external review, particularly for allowing themselves to be interviewed.

We wish to thank specifically Ms Anne Savary and Ms Silvana Mjeda who greatly facilitated our work and Ms Shpresa Spahiu, NPF Executive Director, for providing us expeditiously and transparently with all documents and information we requested for purposes of this review.

The views expressed by the evaluators do not necessarily represent the opinions of SDC and the implementing partner. The conclusions, recommendations and eventual remaining errors are ours.

Harald Meier and Mirela Muça

Management Summary

Background

The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) implements, through its partner Foundation Ndihmë për fëmijët (NPF), the project *Alternated Education and Vocational Education Project – Phase VI (CEFA)*¹ in four municipalities in Albania. The project aims at contributing to improved social inclusion of the Roma and Egyptian minorities through education, employment, community empowerment and promotion of Roma minority rights. It also supports the implementing agency – Foundation Ndihmë për fëmijët (NPF) – in its institutional and organisational development process.

The three year project, implementation of which started in May 2009, is funded by the Swiss Government with an amount of CHF 2.2 million. It is SDC's flagship intervention in the sub-domain on social inclusion in Albania. The Government of Albania contributes financially and with in-kind support.

SDC commissioned two evaluators to design and carry out an external review of the project. The purpose of the review is to assess to what extent the current phase of the CEFA project reached its planned objectives, purposes and results to date. The review shall specifically provide recommendations as regards a possible exit or further support with new support modalities, including in the form of a potential forthcoming project phase. Covering the period until October 2011², the evaluation thus contains summative and formative evaluation elements.

Methodology

The evaluation is based on the OECD-DAC methodological framework for evaluating development co-operation and the specific evaluation criteria included therein: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. We carried out a comprehensive analysis of various documents and sources of information, including the Project Document, a previous Evaluation Report (March 2008), Technical Reports and other reports, Yearly Plans of Operations, Steering Committee Meeting minutes, selected outputs produced by the project, contracts and financial reports. Furthermore, the evaluation team performed i) semi-structured interviews with representatives of the contracting agency, the implementing partner, beneficiaries and government counterparts, other project stakeholders and donor representatives and ii) organised two workshops. To this purpose a mission was fielded to

¹ The project is also referred to as *Classes for Education and Alternated Formation*. The writing language in the first three phases of the project has been French. The project was known as CEFA because of the abbreviation of the project title in French: *Cours d'education et la formation en alternance*.

² Most of the performance data are updated until June 2011 based on the second technical report.

Albania between 26 September and 6 October 2011. Additional interviews, including phone interviews, were performed before and after the field mission. The Annexes include additional information and documentation regarding the evaluation.

Findings and Lessons Learned

The key findings and lessons learned of this external review are summarised below:

- Project stakeholders – central, regional and local authorities, school principals, teachers, pupils and parents alike – commend NPF for their technical and service quality as well as their continued commitment in rendering the project services;
- Project stakeholders commonly opine that the project had an impact on the educational attainments of the target group and changed attitudes and mindsets of direct and indirect beneficiaries, particularly at the local and community levels; the reported enrolment, attendance and passing rates of pupils who benefited from the support of the CEFA support are noteworthy;
- Project actions and activities address real needs and priorities and are aligned to current Government strategies, policies and the legal framework on social inclusion of minorities; some concern was voiced regarding the potential incoherence of the “CEFA approach”, specifically the “catch-up classes”, with the inclusion approach of other organisations; this concern warrants to be addressed also in light of SDC’s forthcoming strategy on social inclusion;
- Across all levels of government the project receives strong recognition and appreciation; the review suggests that the project *complemented* existing public services and undertook best efforts to avoid *substituting* public services; more could be done to improve the involvement of Roma and Egyptian community members in the service delivery of the project and as regards the contribution (financial and/or in-kind) of local authorities;
- Project Components show good progress; several outputs / indicators will be achieved at target;
- Impact – other than at beneficiary level – has been achieved as there is a growing understanding of the service quality that non-governmental organisations are able to render; several VET graduates have opened small businesses and some have been retained as trainers in VET training centres; system impact and/or gradual handover to relevant public authorities as envisaged in the ProDoc, was achieved only partially;
- Chances of sustainability of the “CEFA approach” – that is to say the multidimensional approach to tackle the challenges of social inclusion of Roma and

Egyptians in Albania – are high; the Government of Albania has repeatedly recognised the validity and effectiveness of the approach; in fact, it is already applied by other interventions; however, only few (if any) project activities would continue to be implemented if donor funding ceases at this stage as Albania continues to be reliant on donor support; at the same time, the element of creating separate classes for Roma and Egyptian children may be overtaken by the trend for more integrative and inclusive education.

- NPF experienced a significant improvement of its management structure and organisational performance; despite proven efforts the likelihood of sustaining NPF at its current staffing levels is low if funding of SDC ceases;
- SDC is recognised for its active role and long-term engagement in the Roma / social inclusion sphere – both by the Government of Albania as well as organisations such as the European Union; it is considered to be a reliable and valuable partner.

Recommendations

The implementing agency NPF as well as the project stakeholders generally expressed their wish that the project be continued. Yet, it was argued that a forthcoming project should focus on achieving policy and system reform at local, regional and central level alike based on the experiences and results of a local level intervention. It emanates from the interviews that the political environment in Albania is now conducive to implement further reforms in the field of social inclusion, not least due to Albania's bid for European Union membership.

In the following we summarise our key recommendations (shortened version) for the design and the implementation of an eventual forthcoming phase; for the full set of the recommendations we refer to Chapter 5.

Overall recommendation:

- *Extend the project for an additional duration of two to three years:* The evaluators are of the opinion that the project, i.e. one that is implemented at beneficiary level, should be continued. Our view is based on the following considerations: i) the project is delivering quality and much required services to beneficiaries which, in the immediate future, have little prospect of being provided by the respective authorities in Albania; ii) the sustainability of the implementing partner NPF has not been secured yet to sufficient extent and exiting the project at this stage will likely lead to a reduction of the current staff capacities; iii) the focus of the Government of Albania on Roma education has become manifest only in the last two-three years offering now a “window of opportunity” for changes at policy and system level. iv) Albania continues to be reliant on external support to master its social inclusion reform agenda. The continuation of the project fits with the lessons

learned that are contained in the Concept Note for sub-domain Social Inclusion (June 2011) that “*donors should go for supporting a combination of interventions at system/policy level with those at the beneficiary/direct assistance level.*”

Specific recommendations:

The overall recommendation comes along with the requirement that a forthcoming project phase needs to work more – explicitly – at system/policy levels.

- *Design and implement activities that have an impact at system / policy level and that embed the “CEFA approach” in actions at central / regional / municipal level, thereby contributing to “institutionalisation”:* Regions and/or municipalities should be supported i) in breaking down e.g. the Roma Decade National Action Plan to the respective level and define which and how their actions best support the realisation of the national strategic goals and objectives; ii) in delineating responsibilities and tasks among different actors at local level, including governmental and non-governmental organisations, specifically Roma NGOs and Roma representatives, to put actions at local level into practice and to determine the respective costing and source of funding for these actions. Such activities are likely to support the recently started reform efforts of social protection and social services. The project could play a facilitation role in setting-up and managing working groups that develop what may be called “local plans of actions”.
- *Negotiate with the MoES to continue making available funding required for teaching personnel and in-kind support for the “catch-up classes”:* The evaluators recommend that a renewed commitment on behalf of the Ministry is negotiated. Ideally, however, there is no particular “cap” of this commitment; the MoES should provide full funding for whatever personnel resources are required in the project locations to cater for education in “catch-up classes” of *all* Roma and Egyptian children who are eligible under the project.
- *Negotiate with municipalities to co-fund selected project services, particularly the community development services, thereby contributing to “institutionalisation”:* The evaluators recommend that the municipalities be invited to contribute to the overall costs of the services, perhaps by funding some or all of the costs of the classroom / social workers, especially as they have other community development tasks as well. (The actual funding of project services may also be stipulated in a “local plan of action”.) This is feasible since several municipal representatives stated that they have – albeit small – funds at their disposal to co-fund project activities and respective legislation that allows such co-funding is in place.
- *Define issues / topics to which the project could contribute with (small scale) research and analysis of project impact:* We encourage SDC to develop tools that

help monitoring the long-term impact of their programme activities. Such research will increase the knowledge base in Albania and support the design of evidence based policies and actions.

Recommendations regarding the organisational set-up:

- *Consider collaboration between the implementing partner with a / other strategic partner(s) for specific components or activities:* The evaluators recommend that the implementing partner is supported as regards policy dialogue and system/policy change with a potent, technically versatile and reputed partner such as UNICEF. The Children's Fund roles could be manifold including fostering policy dialogue and policy development vis-à-vis the Government of Albania; quality control, quality enhancement and diversification of the services rendered in the project; capacity development of the implementing partner.

Closely related to this are the following recommendations:

- *Engage in a comprehensive project design process:* The evaluators recommend that there be a careful participatory project design / planning process; it should be ensured that Roma representatives are actively involved. The planning process should ideally be one element within the planning process of the entire social inclusion sub-domain.
- *Consider UNICEF to assume a backstopping role of the entire social inclusion domain:* The Concept Note on Social Inclusion makes reference to planned liaison and alignment with UNICEF. Rather than considering only a “project-by-project” collaboration, the evaluators recommend that SDC considers entering into a “strategic partnership” with UNICEF to advance SDC’s social inclusion efforts.
- *Consider that project management remains with a local organisation:* To the extent possible, the evaluators recommend that NPF continues to be responsible for project management. The organisation has proven its ability to implement quality projects and it has become a trusted partner of SDC.

Recommendations as regards the content of the project:

- *Education Component:*
 - *Consider forms of mitigating the risk of segregation in schools:* This could take two forms:
 - i) Developing and implementing more extracurricular activities that are open for Roma / Egyptian as well as non-Roma children and

exchange between classes (i.e. children in CEFA classes attend part-time their respective mainstream class).

- ii) Integrating children into the mainstream classes that correspond to their age and provide “social / teaching assistance” to these children. This might require entering into dialogue with the MoES, the RED and school principles as regards engagement of more personnel/teachers, in-kind support such as additional class rooms etc
 - *Consider shifting the focus to children at school entry stage:* We recommend that the project – gradually – shifts its support services to children in the age group of 6-10 and assists these children and their families to have a good start into the school but also to retain in school. This, however, would result in scaling down the education component, in which NPF has most capacity, in terms of content and finances to the benefit of the other components.
 - In the long-run the possibilities to shift focus to children that require pre-school education should also be fathomed, given the experience NPF is building up in its ongoing EU project.
- *Vocational Education and Training Component:*
 - On a general note: *Ensure alignment with the IPA Component IV (HR Development) and forthcoming projects such as YEPA:* The Government of Albania is in the process of developing an HR Development Operational Programme that will govern the reform efforts in this field. It is suggested to contribute to this document in terms of its content regarding training, coaching and employment of vulnerable and marginalised people. Also, complementarities and synergies need to be explored with the forthcoming YEPA project.
 - *Invest into measuring the effects and impact of VET training and small-business support:* see below.
- For both components – particularly the VET Component: *Invest into research of the effects and impact of the project activities:* The project should undertake efforts, possibly with support of external research institutes or experts, to move towards data analysis and interpretation rather than mere reporting. Research products would: i) add to the knowledge base in Albania, ii) sharpen the organisational profile and visibility of both the implementing agencies and the donor, iii) support the advocacy and policy dialogue, and iv) improve quality and validity of the project in its entirety.

- *Roma Empowerment Component:*

- *Assess feasibility and define opportunities to link the planned Roma community empowerment component under the social inclusion Concept Note:* The evaluators recommend that a future project closely collaborates with / is aligned to SDC's forthcoming intervention as planned in the Concept Note (collaboration could be sought in the context of the development of “local Decade action plans”).

Recommendations to the contracting agency:

The following recommendations are addressed to the contracting agency and relate to contract and project management as well as promotion and visibility:

- *Consider extending the contract with the current implementing partner:* We recommend that the contract with the current implementing partner be extended so that the same team could be deployed again, to the extent it is allowed by SDC's procurement rules.
- *Substitute core funding payment with a management fee according to NPF procedures and re-negotiate terms of collaboration:* In the forthcoming phase such costs should be covered by a management fee of 6-10 % (negotiable, according to NPF Strategy Document) to be applied to the project implementation costs (i.e. total budget less staff costs). In the same light any support in terms of organisational development should be limited, given the advances the organisation made in the recent past.
- *Improve the collaboration with key partners and the sharing information and good practices:* A platform for sharing information and good practices should contribute to policy development and replication of positive experience across Albania and at different government levels.
- *Cease expenditure for “humanitarian” action and for items that are the responsibility of the public authorities:* The evaluators suggest that the budget be reviewed in terms of “humanitarian” action such as expenditure for clothes; there are several humanitarian agencies that offer such assistance to persons in need. Also, the project should not cover the costs for items that are covered by the Government (e.g. for school books).

***Recommendations to NPF:*³**

The evaluator recommends that NPF continues its efforts in terms of institutional and organisational development, including in particular related to:

- *Organisation sustainability:*
 - Develop appropriate partnerships and service agreements with potential donors: NPF can benefit from appropriate partnerships and alliances to secure requisite institutional, financial, and local support.
 - Develop and institutionalise partnerships with local government: NPF should undertake efforts to position NPF as a (future) service provider at community level.
 - NPF should use its human resources (social workers, VET advisers) to diversify its products, projects and services.
- *Transparency:* NPF should continue to improve its reporting towards more transparency and analysis of achieved results. It is recommended that NPF compiles an annual report that records NPF's activities and performance for a given financial year.
- *Increase human resource capacities:*
 - The evaluator recommends the participation of Roma in senior level roles be enhanced.
 - Set up close relationship with Roma organisations and Roma individuals that are successful in education, entrepreneurship, etc.
 - NPF should develop a training plan tailor-made to the respective staff profiles to ensure that the team has appropriate skills and knowledge relevant for specific services.
- *Communication and visibility:* Public relations, communication and visibility are instrumental for the organisations sustainability. In this view the evaluator recommends:
 - NPF management needs to develop and improve knowledge and methods of conducting effective strategic internal and external communication.

³ These recommendations were developed by the local evaluator, Ms Mirela Muça.

- NPF's website requires continuous update and improvement. Intranet would contribute to facilitate access of the organisation's headquarters to the project (field) offices and vice versa.
- *Improvement of management tools of NPF:* It is recommended that NPF seeks qualified external advice to review the organisations financial reporting system so as to assert full compliance with Albanian legislation.

Recommendations of actions in the current phase of the project:

In the time that is left until the end of the project (June 2011) the evaluators recommend actions that the project and/or implementing partners should undertake to prepare the ground for the recommended follow up. The evaluators generally recommend that SDC and NPF concentrate on administrative issues for a future support as opposed to introducing changes to the approach / content in the education or VET components during the ongoing school year.

- *Commence discussions with public authorities regarding a forthcoming phase:* SDC and NPF should start discussions with key project stakeholders – the MoES and the MoLSAEO as well as local authorities – regarding i) the potential scope of services to be rendered and ii) their eventual financial contribution to continue the project activities;
- *Commence discussions with UNICEF about an eventual backstopping mandate of the social inclusion domain:* SDC should build up on existing plans to collaborate with UNICEF in the context of SDC's future work in the field of social inclusion and sound the options for a closer collaboration.
- *Examine the possibilities to utilise existing data for research purposes:* NPF should examine possibilities to undertake a small-scale study / research (e.g. on the impact of the VET component) based on existing data and access to beneficiaries.

1. Introduction

The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation commissioned two evaluators, Harald Meier and Mirela Muça, to design and carry out an external evaluation of its *Alternated Education and Vocational Education Project – Phase VI (CEFA)*. CEFA is part of continued Swiss engagement in the field of social inclusion, stretching back for more than ten years. The current project phase has built on an external review that was carried out in 2008 and the subsequent planning process.

In Albania, as much as in other countries in the region, the Roma and, to a lesser extent, the Egyptian communities continue to be heavily affected by poverty and exclusion. Their level of poverty is estimated to be four times higher than that of the majority population in Albania. Poor living conditions, low income, lack of access to public service such as health and education, have been identified as key causes for poverty and social exclusion. As regards education it has been stated repeatedly that enrolment, attendance, and quality of education of Roma children is very low; associated drop-out rates are high and only few Roma children complete the obligatory nine-year education. Furthermore, Roma continue to be subject of discrimination and alienation.

The CEFA project aims at contributing to improved social inclusion of the Roma and Egyptian minorities through education, empowerment and promotion of Roma minority rights. It also supports the implementing agency – Foundation Ndihmë për fëmijët (NPF) – in its institutional and organisational development process.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference (ToR), the objectives of the external review are to review CEFA's results with regard to effectiveness and impact, to assess particularly the sustainability of the interventions, and to provide recommendations as to the strategic fit and contribution of the project in the broader context of SDC's forthcoming social inclusion programme.

In accordance with SDC requirements the evaluators neither perform a very detailed analysis of the achievements of the logical framework indicators at the activity level nor of the quality of for instance seminar content or training curricula; the latter are therefore not subject of this review. Several techniques have been applied while performing the evaluation such as document review, desk research, semi-structured and focus group interviews, phone interviews, as well as analysis and interpretation. The evaluators undertook to perform interviews with different stakeholders in order to eliminating bias that may result from specific vantage points.

This report presents our evaluation results.⁴ In the following Chapter 2 we provide a brief overview of the context within which CEFA operates. Chapter 3 then presents the main findings of the evaluation on the basis of the desk study and the field mission. We translate our findings into conclusions and lessons learned in Chapter 4 and formulate our operational recommendations for a follow-up (an eventual forthcoming phase, further support, new modalities) or exit in Chapter 5. More information, including a performance assessment overview, the field mission schedule, a list of the persons who were interviewed and a list of key literature the evaluation team reviewed is annexed to this report.

2. Background and Context

2.1. Project Context

The majority of the Roma and Egyptian population in Albania continues to live in poverty and continues to face very difficult living conditions, social and economic marginalisation as well as frequent discrimination. Studies, survey data and indicators of the World Bank (2005) or the UNDP (2006) are frequently cited to picture the often dire situation of Roma: the average monthly income of a Roma household amounts to approximately EUR 70, compared to EUR 175 for a non-Roma household living near Roma; the illiteracy rate of Roma reaches 48 %, compared to 3 % among non-Roma; Roma are faced with higher rates of unemployment, with more than 70 % of unemployed Roma never employed; Roma are not represented in parliament and only few Roma are members of local councils.⁵ Children are among the most vulnerable and excluded.

The impediment to obtain quality education is a significant factor in the perpetuation of their poverty and exclusion. Their enrolment, participation, retention and completion rates are significantly lower than that of the majority population. The inclusion of Roma children in the mainstream schooling system and quality education for them are therefore instrumental in achieving better life perspectives for Roma in the mid- to long-run.

The educational problems of children of the Roma and Egyptian communities have emerged as a priority topic of the Government of Albania; it features in the Government programme 2009-2013 and the *National Strategy for Development and Integration (NSDI) 2007-2013* (adopted March 2008). One of the key factors that is considered to contribute to this development is

⁴ The report was mainly written by the team leader, with the exception of the organisational performance assessment and the associated recommendations for which the local evaluator took the lead.

⁵ Roma Education Fund, Country Assessment Albania, October 2011 (forthcoming)

Albania's EU integration process that gained momentum with Albania's application for EU membership in April 2009. The European Commission, in turn, identified the fight against discrimination and the protection of the rights of Roma as key priority areas requiring particular attention from the Albanian authorities.⁶ This momentum is exemplified by different elements such as the ongoing social services reform, including the development towards integrated social services; the improved coordination among donors and government through e.g. the social inclusion Sector Working Groups and the converging of views of different actors in this field. Reference to these elements is made in the body of this report.

Albania is one of the twelve⁷ countries participating in the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015. Within this framework the Government adopted a *National Action Plan* in October 2009, which focuses on four national priority areas: education, employment and social protection, housing and infrastructure, health as well as two local priority areas (social inclusion and equal opportunities, cultural heritage). Already in September 2003 the Government adopted a *National Strategy to improve Roma living conditions*. Recent initiatives that stem from these two policy documents include: distribution of free textbooks for vulnerable children (though the system is said to be flawed); pre-school education free of charge; specific minority related awareness training for teachers; scholarships for Roma to attend higher education institutions; setting up of a Social Business Agency for Micro Credits; law that makes social welfare payments conditional upon compliance with school attendance; planned opening of 200 pre-schools (though the process to set up these classes remains vague). However, despite these efforts and the delineation of specific roles and responsibilities across government institutions in Albania, implementation of both the National Strategy and the Action Plan lags behind particularly due to inadequate (management of) human and financial resources, poor coordination at central, regional and local level, and deficiencies in the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the activities under the two documents.⁸ Across the board our interview partners were of the opinion that the documents are merely paper remedies. The Technical Secretariat in the MoLSAEO is not equipped to fully play its instrumental role in facilitating and monitoring the implementation of the Action Plan, let alone in driving the process and pushing the reform agenda forward.

Many of the obligations in the sphere of education are placed on local authorities. During the interviews municipal representatives reiterated their willingness to take remedial action for marginalised children. Yet, they equally state that they lack the appropriate funds to finance corresponding reforms and actions. At the same time the most recent Albania 2011 Progress

⁶ Commission Opinion on Albania's application for membership of the European Union, COM(2010) 680 final, Brussels, 9.11.2010

⁷ A thirteenth country, Slovenia, has observer status.

⁸ Ibid. Reports of UNDP, UNICEF, REF and international and local non-governmental organisations point into the same direction.

Report of the European Commission (page 20) notes that “[l]ocal level action plans for implementing the [National Roma] Strategy have not been developed and responsibilities have not been clearly devolved. ... there continues to be a general lack of awareness at local level.” Furthermore, the report notes that there “have been no specific budgetary allocations for the provision of critical social services for Roma and there is excessive reliance on civil society and international donors in this field.”

In light of the above there was a common opinion among the interviewees that the CEFA project is of utmost importance to alleviate the situation of Roma as well as Egyptian communities in the four project locations.

2.2. SDC Cooperation Strategy

The *Cooperation Strategy Albania 2010-2013* constitutes the framework of Switzerland’s engagement to support Albania in its efforts towards European integration. Swiss support is channelled in the domains of Democratisation and Rule of Law, with the sub-domain on social inclusion, and Economic Development. The Cooperation Strategy responds to and is aligned with Albania’s *National Strategy for Development and Integration* (NSDI). Switzerland participates in several Sector Working Groups (SWG), co-leading two of them: the SWG on “Decentralisation and Regional Development” and the SWG on “Employment and VET”.⁹

In the following we provide a brief summary of selected SDC projects, excluding CEFA for which a detailed description of the objectives and the specific activities will be provided further below (cf. 3.2). While the selection does not cover all relevant Swiss support, the following projects warrant to be mentioned to provide a snapshot of SDC’s support to Albania and to better understand where and how the CEFA project fits into this support:

AlbVET, the current (final) phase is implemented between 2011 and 2014, applies a market-oriented approach and aims at enhancing the capacities of public and private stakeholders to develop and deliver market-relevant, tailor-made and quality vocational education and training. Currently in its third phase the project aims at expanding know-how, good practices and lessons learnt across different stakeholders. AlbVET and CEFA are good examples in which synergies between two projects were created, namely as regards training and certification of CEFA’s VET advisors in the Counselling cycle approach, designed specifically for beneficiaries from vulnerable groups.

While not directly related, it is noteworthy that SDC is at present developing a project on Youth Employment.

⁹ Another SWG is established for *Social Protection and Inclusion* and the third one for *Education*.

Strengthening the capacities of regions, municipalities and communes to both master the ongoing decentralisation process and make efficient use of their resources are priorities under the Cooperation Strategy. The three key projects are *Decentralisation and Local Development Programme in the Shkodra and Lezha Region* and *Reinforcing Local and Regional Government Structures in Albania* and the *Regional Development Programme*. These projects' aim at strengthening local and regional government structures and democracy and improving citizens' access to quality public services correlates with CEFA's goal to, *inter alia*, empower Roma and Egyptian communities to seek fulfilment of their rights vis-à-vis governments at local level.

The Swiss contribution to the social sector is complemented with other support and contributions, including support to the work of Terre des Hommes, Save the Children in Albania, or Swiss Interchurch Aid (HEKS). Finally, Switzerland also provides substantial funds for the Roma Education Fund, which was established in the context of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015.

SDC is in the process of redesigning its interventions in the field of social inclusion. A Concept Note, completed at the time of this evaluation report, seeks to develop "*a programmatic approach towards social inclusion with a targeted focus on Roma...*". The Concept Note contains four components: i) commission research, data collection and analysis; ii) strengthen regional and local level capacities to improve implementation and monitoring mechanisms; iii) empower the Roma community through capacity building; and iv) an intervention that tackles problems at beneficiary level, such as CEFA. The Concept Note is designed to bring about reform and change at nation-wide and at system/policy level.

Information of the interview partners suggests that the Government is gradually recognising social vulnerability as the key rational for positive measures in favour of the Roma and Egyptian minorities rather than through a (linguistic) minority group lens. SDC's social inclusion Concept Note would be aligned to this shift of problem approach.

2.3. Other Interventions

Several other organisations – bi- and multilateral donors, international and local (non-) governmental organisations alike – attend to the issues of social inclusion through education, employment and empowerment of vulnerable and excluded groups in Albania. A selection of the actions of the most relevant organisations is provided in the following sub-chapters with a view to describe the environment within which a forthcoming project would be implemented.

2.3.1. European Union

Financial assistance under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) amounts to more than EUR 80.0 million for 2011. The Multi-Annual Indicative Planning Document (MIPD), which sets out the EU's priorities for assistance to Albania for the programming period 2011-

2013, adopts a sectoral approach with the focus on Justice and Home Affairs, Public Administration Reform, Transport, Environment and Climate Change, Social Development, Agriculture and Rural Development. Specific objectives in terms of social development include: creation of better links between the education system, the research and innovation policy and the labour market; improve social integration through employment and further training, in particular of women, youth and vulnerable groups.

Other than a project implemented by UNDP (cf. 2.3.2.) and the IPA 2010 Regional Initiative for Roma Integration (budget EUR 3.0 million) the EU does not have *concrete* plans to offer large scale technical assistance in the fields of education and social inclusion nor are *specific* technical assistance projects for the Roma and Egyptian communities currently planned. The EU will, however, continue to assist Albania with regard to Human Resource Development, including Vocational Education and Training (IPA Component IV). This assistance is aligned with Swiss efforts in this sector.

Civil society development and minority issues are and will be mainly addressed through the EU grant instruments under IPA and the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR). Support to civil society (2009-2011) focused, *inter alia*, on the fight against corruption, organised crime and human trafficking, education, and poverty alleviation.¹⁰ Changes to the disbursement mechanisms are currently being discussed in order to reach out better and more effectively to non-governmental and community-based organisations.

2.3.2. United Nations Development Programme

The UNDP has been providing support to the Roma and Egyptian communities and persons with disabilities for the past decade and its social inclusion agenda has been extended over the past four years. Of particular importance is the first *Empowering Roma Communities* project (2008-2010), which focused on community mobilisation, local decision making, and direct support for priority infrastructure. It was succeeded by the *Empowering Vulnerable Local Communities of Albania* programme that is implemented by One UN, with UNDP as administrative agent carrying project management responsibility. It has a budget of approximately CHF 2.5 million and is implemented in four municipalities in Albania (Tirana,

¹⁰ NPF has secured one grant contract in the amount of EUR 160'000. The project aims at supporting Roma children at the age of 5-6 years to start the academic year 2011-2012 with a variety of interventions such pre-school education and social support; training of education inspectors, school directors and teachers and raising awareness of parents; facilitating registration; establishing local Roma coordination bodies. The project is implemented in association with Romani Baxt and Intellectual Women of Pogradec. A mid-term review carried out by the EU states that the project was implemented according to plan; it noted the commitment, competence and conscious service delivery of NPF and the quality of the school and supplementary classes. The reviewers also noted that NPF would have to increase its efforts in “pushing local authorities” in living up to their responsibilities.

Durres, Elbasan, and Fier). Implemented in the period April 2010 – April 2013, the project is designed to

- i) support participation of vulnerable communities in local decision-making (e.g. infrastructure development with 20 % co-funding by the respective local authorities; support establishment of eight community based organisations); enable vulnerable communities to access their rights and public services (e.g. civil registration and community policing; network of Roma Mediators);
- ii) support regional employment and vocational education and training centres to provide employment services tailored to the needs of minorities; enrolment of 100 children in pre-school education or life skills courses; and
- iii) promote policies and institutional strengthening for social inclusion of vulnerable communities (local governments; support technical committees on Roma in four regions, which regularly report on the progress of National Action Plan implementation at local level; Roma NGOs).

Particularly noteworthy is the support it provides to the Technical Secretariat of the MoLSAEO by creating a web-based reporting and monitoring system, which shall facilitate the development of the annual progress reports of the Roma Decade National Action Plan. Furthermore, the programme seeks to strengthen the capacities of the Roma focal points in line ministries.

UNDP secured additional funding in the amount of EUR 1.5 million¹¹ from the European Union to implement the project *Supporting Social Inclusion of Roma and Egyptian communities* in the three regions Vlora, Berat and Korça. It is scheduled to comment in the first half of 2012 and to last for two years. Technical assistance will be provided in four components: participatory local planning, including grants for six community upgrading projects of average EUR 50.000;¹² strengthening civil society capacity to combat discrimination; promote entrepreneurship for Roma/Egyptian communities, including provision of at least 30 non-refundable grants; support for the implementation of Roma Strategy and Decade Action Plan, particularly to the Technical Secretariat. Critical differences of this programme in comparison to CEFA are the direct advisory services that the programme delivers to the Technical Secretariat and the requirement of a concrete commitment on behalf of the three regions benefiting from the (non-refundable) infrastructure improvement grants.

¹¹ UNDP contributes additional EUR 150.000, whereas the Government of Albania co-funds the project with an amount of EUR 45.000.

¹² One issue is of particular note: the benefiting local governments will be required through a Memorandum of Understanding to take over once the projects are completed and provide related.

2.3.3. United Nations Children's Fund

UNICEF is a key strategic partner of the Government of Albania working particularly with the MoLSAEO and the MoES. Its work programme is governed by the *Country Strategy 2006-2010* that is currently being renegotiated in the context of the One UN strategy. It is planned that UNICEF will focus on “policy development and system reform” in two main areas of work, namely governance for children and inclusive protection policies. The organisation implements a host of projects in Albania to support authorities at all levels of government to devise children-oriented policies in Albania, whereby emphasis is put on vulnerable children such as children belonging to minority communities. We will single out only a few of its activities that are relevant for the purposes of this evaluation.

UNICEF played an instrumental role in developing the *National Strategy on Children* and a *National Plan of Action for Children* as well as appropriate monitoring and evaluation tools (e.g. databases, national system of indicators). Furthermore, it assisted the MoLSAEO in the preparation of the first progress report to track the implementation of the *Strategy for Social Inclusion*, which was published in 2010. The report highlighted immediate institutional shortcomings (lack of data, lack of financial resources, shortage of human resources and/or professional qualifications) hindering the implementation of the Strategy. As a follow-up to the report UNICEF will assist the Government in validating the present Strategy as a “*conceptual, planning and monitoring instrument intended to guide a concerted inter-agency effort*”.

In the context of the Education for All programme UNICEF trained 200 teachers in new teaching and learning strategies such as interactive and child-centred methodologies to help teachers to reach also those children in the classroom, who have special needs. At local level it supports e.g. the municipality of Tirana in establishing a multi-purpose centre (psycho-social, legal and health services; food distribution and educational activities) to protect children; more than 230 families with 530 children and 470 adults are supported. UNICEF also supports the MoES with regard to its “zero-drop-out” strategy.

A particularly relevant intervention refers to the social protection and social services delivery reform. Assisted by an international consultant, five working groups have commenced to work out a comprehensive reform effort that is governed by two principle ideas: i) redefinition of the roles and responsibilities in terms of social protection across all government levels; ii) move away from residential (care) services towards community (care) services. As matters stand presently, the reform will bring about that regional social services will play the key role in (community care) *policy and planning* whereas local governments will focus on social services *delivery*, often in collaboration with non-governmental and community based organisations. The central level will be responsible for the formulation of community care objectives and outcomes and for ensuring that the relevant authorities at regional and local level are equipped with the re-

quired resources. This reform effort must go hand in hand with changes to the fiscal system. More concrete reform plans will be shared with the public towards the end of the first half year of 2012.

2.3.4. Other Programmes and Projects

Terre des Hommes, for instance, played a critical role in establishing Child Protection Units in nine municipalities; World Vision and Save the Children have joined this effort in other municipalities.¹³ Finally, there are programmes such as Children in Crisis of World Vision and the OSCE, the GIZ and Italy also implement programmes that target the Roma and Egyptian communities.

The above selection of projects is only a small snapshot of assistance that Albania receives in terms of social inclusion / inclusion of minorities. A full analysis of all ongoing and planned programmes and project would go beyond the scope of this assignment. It shows, however, that Albania continues to be heavily reliant on non-governmental and donor support as also noted by the European Union. The latter respond to this dependency with a host of projects and programmes which have in common to apply a multisectoral approach and – increasingly – work at system level. This warrants at the same time coordination and cooperation among donors, implementing agencies and the government alike; the increasingly prominent role of the SWG is thus a positive development in this regard.

3. Review of Implementation

The findings featured in this chapter are listed under the main headings Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. These headings correspond to the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria and constitute the framework of the evaluation.

3.1. Relevance

The focus of this sub-chapter is to assess whether and to what extent the objectives of the CEFA VI project are consistent with the needs of the beneficiary country and its institutions.

¹³ Child Protection Units (CPUs) are newly established structures based at the local government social services department; their work is focused on protecting children that are subject to or at risk of violence, abuse, neglect, exploitation and trafficking. It is expected that the recently approved *Law on the Protection of the Rights of Children* (November 2010) will improve the child protection system in Albania by institutionalising the CPUs as the appropriate municipal service responsible for coordinating and delivering child protection services, raising awareness and promoting child rights in the local community, and case management in collaboration with a number of multi-disciplinary public and non-public actors. This work was done within the project *Child Protection Safety Net in Albania* (October 2009 – April 2012).

Relevance looks at whether the project meets the needs of the specific beneficiary group, is aligned to the policies and interventions of the partner organisations as well as the donor's own policies.

Relevance against requirements of beneficiary state / institutions: Our desk research and document review as well as the interviews with the various project stakeholders confirm that the programme is highly relevant to the needs of the Roma community in Albania. The past external review (March 2008) confirmed relevance of the project. Since then the situation of Roma not alter significantly as noted, for instance, in the most recent EU Progress Report (cf. 2.1): Roma continue to face impediments to access quality education and the Government of Albania has not been able yet to remedy these impediments to sufficient extent.

The project's focus on fostering inclusion of Roma and Egyptians into mainstream society has been recognised in various policy documents, sectoral strategies as well as primary and secondary legislation in Albania. Enumerating all of these would go beyond the scope of this review, yet some of the most pertinent are listed below:

- *National Strategy for Improving the Roma Living Conditions 2003-2015*,
- *Roma Decade National Action Plan 2010-2015*,
- the national crosscutting *Strategy for Social Inclusion 2007-2013* and the overarching
- *National Strategy for Development and Integration (NSDI) 2007-2013* stipulate the commitment to undertake a concerted and comprehensive effort to integrate the Roma minority into the socio-economic life in Albania. The NSDI emphasises education, health and infrastructure as priorities for addressing poverty and providing a basis for long-term growth and competitiveness.

Relevance against European Union strategies and policies: The protection of minorities is an integral part of the EU political criteria for accession. CEFA complements EU strategies and policies in Albania such as the *Opinion on Albania's membership request* and the *Stabilisation and Association Agreement*, which commonly include reference to education, the situation of marginalised and vulnerable groups, human rights and good governance. It is also in line with the *Europe 2020 Strategy* on social inclusion.

There are other international instruments that address issues of children, minorities and Roma in particular to which Albania committed itself, including different UN Conventions (Rights of the Child, Elimination of Racial Discrimination and Discrimination of Women) as well as the *OSCE Action Plan on Improving the Situation of Roma and Sinti within the OSCE Area* and a related Ministerial Council Decision on Roma integration.

Relevance against Swiss commitment to supporting Albania's transition: In assessing the relevance it is also necessary to refer to the objectives of SDC, which are summarised in the

Swiss Cooperation Strategy 2010 – 2013. As stated above, the Cooperation Strategy puts emphasis on actively promoting the social inclusion of vulnerable groups including specifically the Roma. Furthermore, SDC aims at fostering local implementers and building local capacity. This principle is mirrored in the fourth component of the CEFA project under which NPF is benefitting from assistance with regard to its organisational development.

Relevance of the locations, approach and modalities of CEFA: The project has been delivering its services in four municipalities that have a sizable Roma population¹⁴ and, at the same time, are also benefitting from support of several other agencies. The choice of the locations has been made at the beginning of the intervention a decade ago¹⁵ and has not been subject of particular discussions at the planning of the current phase. At the same time it must be noted that preliminary results of a forthcoming study commissioned by UNICEF suggest that the Roma communities in the northern Albania require much more attention than they received thus far. Consequently, support may (have to) shift away from municipalities located in central Albania. However, much will depend on the final results of the study that are not yet available at the time of writing this report. The range of activities that the implementing partner offers follows good practice; the activities are applied in many countries facing similar challenges as regards the inclusion of Roma. CEFA's approach recognises that the problems that the Roma community faces are multidimensional and thus need to be tackled from different angles: education, employment, empowerment, awareness raising, financial support. An EU and OSI funded research paper features the CEFA project as a regional best practice example;¹⁶ the Deputy Minister of Education qualifies the CEFA approach as a “show case” project due to the “multidimensional approach”, “economic support activities”, and “close cooperation with and involvement of the Roma community”.

Only the modality of delivering CEFA classes exclusively for Roma and Egyptian children causes concerns, as voiced by several interviewees. Some of them argue that this modality would perpetuate the segregation and alienation of the Roma. In the same manner criticism was voiced regarding the annual youth summer camps that are open for CEFA beneficiaries (i.e. Roma and Egyptian youth) only. The evaluators share the concerns and remedial action needs to be undertaken as far as the summer camps are concerned. Regarding the classes matters are not as clear. It may well be justified to place children with special needs (e.g. children who never have been to school, children who dropped-out of school) into classes where they receive more

¹⁴ There has been continuous discussion about the actual size of the Roma and Egyptian communities in Albania. Estimates of the Roma population vary between 50.000 and 120.000, whereas the population of Egyptians is estimated at around 200.000. The national census, which commenced in October 2011, as well as a forthcoming research funded by UNICEF should shed some light onto this matter. Reliable census and demographic data is instrumental for more effective policy design and monitoring the results of social inclusion interventions.

¹⁵ The activities in Tirana, however, only started in September 2010.

¹⁶ *Advancing Participation and Representation of Ethnic Minority Groups in Education*, Kosovo Education Centre, date unknown; <http://www.apreme.net/>

more attention and support. There is certainly no purposeful segregation. Quite to the contrary the project seeks to enhance the chances of the beneficiaries to obtain quality education and mechanisms are in place to ensure that a child enters “as quickly as possible” the mainstream classes.

Summing up, we conclude that the project continues to be highly relevant and its Components and activities are aligned to relevant (national) strategies and commitments.

The Swiss contribution to the social sector is complemented with other support and contributions, including support to the work of Terre des Hommes, Save the Children in Albania, or Swiss Interchurch Aid (HEKS). Finally, Switzerland also provides substantial funds for the Roma Education Fund, which was established in the context of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015

3.2. Effectiveness

Effectiveness measures the extent to which the programme attained the planned outputs, results or specific objectives that are important elements of any project or programme strategy.

3.2.1. Achievement of Project Objectives

This section provides an assessment of the extent to which the project achieved its purposes and delivered its outputs through the implementation of different activities. Our approach to this assessment is that we discuss the activities and achievements in the four project Components. Given the broad scope of the activities as regards content, we are unable to deliver an in-depth assessment of *all* the activities and achievements. We will therefore undertake to make plausible the extent of output and purpose achievement of NPF’s main activities.

Considering that the project is still ongoing, a conclusive analysis of the actual achievement of all target indicators at result level would have to follow at the end of the implementation of the project.

This sub-chapter is complemented with Annex 2, which provides an overview of the performance targets as per the logical framework in the Yearly Plan of Operations. Given that NPF and SDC-A referred to the latter during implementation the evaluators decided to assess the project against the performance indicators formulated therein.¹⁷

The evidence that we collected during the desk research, the interviews and our visits in Tirana, Korça and Berat suggests that the programme enjoys first and foremost (very) good recognition

¹⁷ In this context it should be noted that the formulation of several objectives, outcomes and outputs differs, though not significantly, in the ProDoc, the Credit Proposal and the Yearly Plan of Operations.

at the local level, i.e. in the municipalities where activities of CEFA are implemented. Representatives of local government (e.g. social services department, child protection unit), school principles and teachers, children and parents, as well as Roma NGO representatives stressed that the project is providing valuable support. They also share the view that the project managed to achieve impressive results as far as child enrolment rates, propensity to remain in school, change of attitudes etc. are concerned.

Examples of project activities and achievements that were repeatedly mentioned to the evaluation team are referred to in the following qualitative assessment of the project's effectiveness.

Component 1: Education Component

Background

The CEFA classes – also referred to as “catch-up classes” – are the key intervention under this Component. The project supports two classes in each of the two schools in the project municipalities (except Elbasan where the project works in two schools with one class each). The first class hosts children in grades I and III, the second class children in grades II and IV. The classes, in which the official curriculum is delivered, are fully integrated into Albania's formal nine-year education system and all children are registered in the official school registry. CEFA classes are specifically offered for children who have not received any school until the age of nine; the target group is aged 9-16. With a few odd exceptions all children in the CEFA classes belong to the Roma or Egyptian communities. In addition to the CEFA classes the project provides support to children in the mainstream classes at primary schools and in secondary schools to achieve their full integration and to avoid renewed drop-out. The following table provides an overview of selected data of pupils in CEFA classes. The data stem from the first and second technical report.

Table 1: Key data of Component 1 beneficiaries¹⁸

Reporting Period	Boys	Girls	Total	Passing	Attendance	Parent Participation	Ratio Girls
May 2009-June 2010	184	121	305	88.84%	90.00%	92.00%	39.67%
CEFA classes 1 and 2	125	79	204	93.63%			38.73%
Mainstream school	55	41	96	97.90%			42.71%
High School	4	1	5	75.00%			20.00%
July 2010-June 2011	190	124	314	93.99%	90.50%	91.00%	39.49%
CEFA classes 1 and 2	132	80	212	98.08%			37.74%
Mainstream school	51	42	93	90.90%			45.16%
High School	7	2	9	93.00%			22.22%

¹⁸ Averages calculated on the basis of data reported in the technical reports submitted by NPF.

Benchmark

The project did not establish a baseline or control group against which the performance in the CEFA classes could be compared and analysed. In the absence of such benchmarks we refer to a study of UNICEF and Save the Children (2007), which reports a national average participation rate of Roma children aged six to sixteen of 46.5 % for boys and 44.4 % for girls compared to over 99 % for the general population. Against this background the mere average passing, attendance and parents' participation rates appear impressive and a distinct success of the project.¹⁹ It is noteworthy that the passing, attendance and parents' participation rates are similar in all project locations in both reporting periods.

Assessment of economic support

Another prominent feature of this Component is the economic support that is provided to the families of children in CEFA classes, namely in the form of grants and conditional in-kind support.

- More than 110 parents / family members, some 70 % are female, received small-scale non-refundable grants with an average amount of approximately CHF 420 in the first and CHF 460 in the second project year. The grants shall enable the beneficiaries to commence business activities such as dealing with second-hand items or rearing and selling of turkeys. It emerges from the interviews that several of the beneficiaries of this programme were able to generate regular income for their families. The technical reports use the cautious formulation “*...slight improvement of the economic situation....*” However, in order to truly assess the effects and impact of these grants more research would have to be carried out (questions that arise include: what is the average monthly income after the economic support; how sustainable are the economic activities; what are the effects regarding school attendance of children; has there been crowding out of other small businesses).
- A conditional in-kind support (also referred to as “food basket support”) was provided to support poverty stricken families to send their children to school rather than having them work to contribute to the family income. The budget for the food basket support amounts to close to CHF 295.000 over the three years project period for 327 beneficiary families, or 13 % of the entire project budget. The food basket was provided on a monthly basis contingent upon the child’s regular attendance at school. As envisaged in the ProDoc, the value of the food basket was gradually reduced from CHF 35 in the first to CHF 15 in the third year – a fact which was very transparently communicated to the beneficiaries. With only few exceptions the latter have accepted the decreasing

¹⁹ It is a mere benchmarking *attempt* and we are *fully aware* that it is methodologically flawed to compare the data sets with each other.

value without problems. It is particularly noteworthy that the decrease was not associated with an increase of school-drop out. In other words, the correlation “less in-kind support equals higher drop-out” could not be observed. Quite to the contrary it emanates from the technical reports and the interviews that a change of mindset took place and families continued to send their children to school despite the decreasing support.²⁰ Not only for this but for several other reasons more than half of the interviewees opined that the in-kind support should cease, including: continued dependency of the beneficiary families; it only provides momentary relief but does, as opposed to VET or self-employment support, not alter the prospects of regular income in the mid- to long-run; it inhibits parents to understand the value of education; some parents delayed entry into school of their children until they were eligible for CEFA support, some sent them to schools with CEFA classes rather than schools in the vicinity of their residence. The evaluators principally concur with SDC’s decision to phase out this support scheme but invoke that research would have to be carried out to analyse e.g. “dead weight effects” or to answer the questions *whether* at all and/or for *how long* the in-kind support is an effective “incentive” for parents to send their children to school.²¹

Other support that the project provides is related to i) the identification of children who have not been to school yet; ii) support to children and parents to register and obtain necessary documents, habitually in close collaboration with other non-governmental and governmental services; iii) homework support to newly identified children and children with learning difficulties; iv) supplementary Roma language course for more than 80 children in all four project locations; the courses are delivered by qualified Roma language instructors, who have been identified and trained with support of the CEFA project; v) facilitating and fostering the relations between schools, parents and pupils through bi-weekly parents’ meetings; psycho-social support to families and awareness on issues such as hygiene, family planning etc.; vi) extra-curricular activities such as participation in various commemoration days, excursions, sport events; summer camps for 60 beneficiary children in each project location; vii) capacity building and training of CEFA staff, teachers and social workers on topics such as Roma minority rights, human trafficking and child abuse, environmental education, standards of social service for children; CEFA social workers and VET Advisors participate in a thirteen-module training on the “Counselling cycle

²⁰ In a recent survey carried out among Roma parents (n=270) respondents were i) asked to state to what extent the receipt of food support at school for their child would influence their decision to send their child to school and ii) choose out of three actions the one that would most influence their decision to send their child to school. In both questions the respondents gave food support only little priority. Source: FOSA, report forthcoming.

²¹ For further reading on related conditional transfers (cash payments) see e.g.: Assessing Conditional Cash Transfers as a Tool for Reducing the Gap in Educational Outcomes Between Roma and Non-Roma, E. Friedman et. al., REF Working Paper 4, December 2009.

on the “Counselling cycle approach” that is provided by the SDC-funded AlbVET project (cf. 2.2).

Issues of concern

Notwithstanding of these results two interlocutors voiced concern that the project falls short of monitoring the actual *education outcomes* of the children in the CEFA classes. They argue that the mere passing rate is itself not a viable indicator, even more so since CEFA teachers have an interest to let Roma children pass despite low(er) level of education. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to assess the education outcomes but the evaluators concur that research should be done in this regard.

The inclusion of girls and women into the project has been a steady concern of the CEFA project team. Close to 40 % of the beneficiary children are girls, which is below parity with boys, yet within the target range of the project. However, in all four project locations there are more boys than girls in the CEFA classes and the girls’ participation rates across the age ranges is uneven with a very apparent and sharp drop off between the mainstream school and the high school; similar data were reported in the above-mentioned UNICEF and Save the Children study.²² These figures suggest that more efforts need to be undertaken to target girls’ retention at school.

Despite the efforts invested by CEFA, drop-out remains one of the key challenges to the project. The number of CEFA beneficiaries reported to have abandoned school during project implementation continues to be disturbing since only a fraction of the drop-outs have abandoned schools for “understandable” reasons such as employment or attainment of legal age.

²² One of the main reasons for Roma girls to drop out is the very young age at which many are being married.

Table 2: Dynamics of entry into / exit from CEFA classes (Technical Report 2010-2011)

Municipality	Number of children in CEFA classes ¹	1. Entry by 09/2010 2. Exit by 09/2010	Number of children in CEFA classes during reporting year
Korça	57	+33	84
		-27	
Elbasan	54	+25	69
		-15	
Berat	46	+34	80
		-34	
Tirana	55	+27	72
		-17	

¹ Data as per Technical Report July 2010-June 2011

The table above shows the fluctuation of children in the CEFA classes during the second year of the project. In Korça, for instance, 33 children were newly integrated in the course of the year whereas 27 children left, abandoned or dropped out of school for different reasons.

As mentioned further above, there is also a continuous challenge to dispel concerns that the CEFA approach “segregates Roma children” from their majority peers. The same concerns were voiced regarding the summer camps which are designed specifically for CEFA beneficiaries in each of the schools in which CEFA classes are held. The evaluators suggest that special attention be paid to strengthen the inclusiveness of the approach by e.g. designing extra-curricular activities with peers and preparing ground for having inclusive CEFA classes in the mid- to long-run; it would make sense to integrate such activities with existing or newly launched initiatives of the municipal services.

Summary

Component Objective	Assessment of the Component
The number of Roma beneficiary children who attend education in public schools is increased.	<p>At this stage the evaluators' assessment of this Component is generally positive and the activities reach the respective performance targets as per the logical framework.</p> <p>Challenges remain regarding the actual education outcomes (in other words: have CEFA beneficiaries similar levels of knowledge than children in mainstream classes?) and the fact that particularly the CEFA classes are by default not “inclusive”.</p>

Component 2: Vocational Education and Training

Background

Access to vocational education and training and access to the labour market are key features of CEFA's multilevel and multidimensional approach to tackle the integration challenges that Roma and Egyptians are faced with. Until June 2011 the project facilitated that 113 Roma and Egyptian youth in the age range of 16-39 years received certified VET in public and private VET training centres. The following table provides more detailed information of the structure of the VET training beneficiaries. Particularly encouraging is the high number of women who benefit from VET training, a result of CEFA's incessant awareness work among the local Roma communities / families.

Table 3: VET training beneficiaries

Reporting Period	Female	Male	Roma	Egyptian	Total
May 2009 - June 2010	32	30	26	36	62
July 2010 - June 2011	31	20	36	15	51
Total	63	50	62	51	113

Activities

The project accompanies the youth throughout the entire process, i.e. from identifying and selecting suitable candidates²³, coaching the candidates to choose the training course that best fits to their interests, skills and capacities, to supporting the youth during the training programme and beyond. Starting the second year of the project the social workers and VET Advisors were able to apply the “Counselling cycle approach” as per the training they received from the SDC-funded AlbVET project. In this tailor-made counselling programme the trainees are supported to acquire methodological, social and individual competences (“soft skills” that are particularly instrumental in the labour market). The effects of the CEFA-AlbVET collaboration are threefold: it i) increases the technical capacity of CEFA staff, ii) improves the service quality they can deliver to their clients, and iii) enhances the employment possibilities of VET trainees.

Each successful trainee is provided with a so-called “professional kit” to support them to e.g. start their own business operation or to find employment. Thus far, more than 60 trainees benefitted from such support.

²³ The selection of the candidates is done jointly by a social worker and a VET advisor on the basis of specific selection criteria such as age, gender, education level, and economic status. The candidates themselves must meet certain pre-conditions to become eligible for VET support, including self-motivation, commitment and compliance with the programme requirements.

NPF identified VET providers and entered into collaboration with six²⁴ such providers, private and public alike. By diversifying the VET providers over time, CEFA was able to offer a broader range of training to the beneficiaries (hairdresser, cook, tailor, plumber, mechanic, barber etc.). This way, CEFA was able to respond to recommendations contained in the past review to offer different jobs for the target group.

CEFA's social workers and VET advisors have undertaken additional activities with a view to enhance the chances of the VET trainees to access the labour market: they registered VET trainees in the public employment offices; liaised with the private sector to identify employment opportunities for the trainees; and supported specifically those VET beneficiaries, who received a professional kit from the project and who started a small business.

Issues of concern

While the evaluators acknowledge the many “success stories” in the technical reports of youth who benefitted from CEFA support and the positive feedback that the project receives from the few youth we were able to interview during the field mission, we note that there has been no systematic *analysis* of the actual effects of the VET training. It would be of considerable interest to find answers to questions related, *inter alia*, to the professional pathways of the VET beneficiaries (employment or self-employment; official or unofficial work; average duration of employment during a given period; the range of income after the VET training; other positive or negative effects on the Roma community). These questions become particularly apparent considering that many trainees in the same municipality receive the same training. Example: During both the first and the second project year 13 women benefitted from professional training. However, all of them were trained to become hairdressers. Whether these trainees will be able to find employment or be successfully self-employed will greatly depend on the actual demand / the market for this type of profession. On the basis of the data collected by the project and in light of the resources at the evaluators' disposal it is, however, not feasible to respond to these questions in this review.

As stated by NPF and CEFA staff, AlbVET provided support in enhancing the service quality of CEFA in terms of vocational education and training. The social inclusion component of the AlbVET project, under which CEFA's VET advisors were trained in applying the “Counselling cycle approach”, is phasing out by mid-June 2012; as matters stand at present AlbVET will then no longer be able to further assist CEFA. How NPF will thereafter ensure that the service quality continues to be improved – in the absence of external support (such as from AlbVET) – remains uncertain at this stage.

²⁴ Tirana: 2 agreements with two public VET centres; Berat: 1 agreement with a private VET centre; Elbasan: 2 agreements, with each a public and a private VET centre; Korça: 1 agreement with a public VET centre.

Summary

Component Objective	Assessment of the Component
<p>The number of Roma and Egyptian community members who benefit from vocational training has increased and the opportunities to choose a profession for vocational training expanded.</p>	<p>Against the lack of a relevant benchmark we can neither determine with sufficient certainty whether the amount of Roma and Egyptian community members increased, nor whether and to what extent their opportunities to find employment expanded. However, more than 110 Roma have participated in VET and have obtained a recognised certification in diverse professions.</p> <p>Close cooperation is established with the AlbVET project particularly as regards training of CEFA social workers and VET advisors. The cooperation brings about a threefold effect: it i) increases the technical capacity of CEFA staff, ii) improves the service quality they can deliver to their clients, and iii) enhances the employment possibilities of VET trainees.</p> <p>Still, more needs to be done in a forthcoming project phase to document, analyse and understand the actual effects of the VET training and self-employment support.</p>

Component 3: Empowerment of the Roma Community

Background

CEFA's project slogan is “*nothing for Roma without Roma*”, which is mirrored in the third Component of the project. The project seeks to strengthen Roma communities with a variety of economic and social / cultural activities as well as Roma inclusion in the decision making and consultative bodies of the project.

Activities

The project supported, facilitated and/or organised activities for e.g. the Roma International Days and organised seminars (on women's rights; gender mainstreaming; child behaviour; advocacy and lobbying; project management), meetings (monthly meetings with families on issues such as education, family hygiene, health and nutrition) and other events (exhibition) that raise awareness of Roma issues. Several of these activities got attention by non-Roma and local

media. The most noteworthy event organised by NPF was the National Roma Conference in March 2011, which many of the interviewees qualified as successful. It is the only event that produced a tangible contribution to policy dialogue, namely a set of lessons learned and recommendations.

The project made a leap forward in the inclusion of Roma in the implementation of the project. First and foremost, local Roma advisory boards²⁵ were established and they play a central, yet not necessarily prominent, role. Furthermore, NPF / CEFA achieved Roma involvement in the Board of Directors, the Steering Committee and in the project roll-out.

As regards the economic support activities of the project we refer to our deliberations above under Component 1.

Issues of concern

Whilst it is acknowledged that Roma are involved in the project (Roma language teachers, summer camp coordinators, one VET advisor etc.), more should be done to involve Roma community members in the actual *service delivery* of the project, which at the same time would contribute to individual and community development. This could take the form of, for instance, training of qualified Roma/Egyptian individuals in social work to enable the latter to respond to community issues as well as to liaise with local authorities and non-governmental organisations on behalf of the project. In light of the current reform discussion of the social protection / services delivery at local government level (“community care plans”) there will be a growing need for community-driven activities.

Summary

Component Objective	Assessment of the Component
<p>Roma community is strengthened through cooperation, participation in decision-making, and capacity development.</p>	<p>The involvement of Roma in the implementation of the CEFA project has significantly improved in comparison with the previous project phases. Yet, more should be done to gradually ensure involvement of Roma in the actual service delivery of the project – e.g. as social workers, VET advisors, teachers or project coordinators. Also, more focus should be put on empowering the Roma community economically and politically, i.e. by</p>

²⁵ They are composed of 3-4 Roma prominent individuals (e.g. community leaders, Roma NGO representatives) who are invited in each project location to discuss issues related to CEFA project implementation, to provide advice, help, mediate, and assist in referrals etc. in various project implementation issues. Meetings with the boards were organised frequently and regularly documented.

assisting the Roma community to articulate and advocate vis-à-vis public authorities.

3.2.2. Organisational Performance Assessment²⁶

Component 4: NPF Institutional and Organisational Development

Background

NPF, which currently operates with three permanent staff, 25 project staff (CEFA and EU projects) and 16 part-time project staff (CEFA and EU projects), exists to provide a wide range of services to the Roma community in Tirana, Elbasan, Korça, Pogradeci, Fier and Berat. This requires having an effective and efficient organisation that is capable of providing relevant and quality services. The fourth Component focuses on institutional and organisational development and aims at the empowerment of NPF to implement activities / render services and to ensure the sustainability of the organisation. Its main results include the establishment and re-registration of NPF's headquarter office in Tirana as well as the development of documents reinforcing NPF's structure and the image of the organisation. At the same time, however, NPF needs to further improve and advance the tools and systems already established.

Institutional and organisational assessment

The aim of this section is twofold: highlight the achievements of the institutional and organisational development process and display the areas of non-achievement and remaining challenges in five critical dimensions: i) organisational design, ii) programme management, iii) resource management; iv) organisational processes and systems; v) effective programmes and services.

i) Organisational design

Organisational architecture: The project has supported NPF to build up a new structure, to better allocate its staff and other resources with a view to improving NPF's responsiveness to priorities and accomplishment of its mission. Major changes in the organisational structure include: transfer of NPF's headquarters from Korça to Tirana, clarification of ambiguity between CEFA as a project and NPF as organisation, and development of a Manual of Policies and Procedures. The organisational design is mirrored in the Strategic Plan 2010-2015, which was developed in 2009-2010 with support of the project. The change process was managed professionally and the new organisational structure enjoys broad support.

²⁶ This part of the report and the corresponding recommendations in Chapter 5 were developed by the local evaluator, Ms Mirela Muça.

Management and decision-making: The project also contributed to shape the organisational profile of NPF. The current management and decision making is based on the Manual of Policies and Procedures, approved in June 2010. The Manual provides the framework for the broad definition of roles of NPF's headquarters, board of directors / steering committee, and NPF staff. The Manual defines systems, processes, tools and provides guidance in support of NPF management. Previously fractionised among three local coordinators, the day-to-day management is now performed by one Executive Director, who is supervised and supported by a nine-member Board of Directors. Compared to before, the new management structure allows NPF to operate more efficiently. As a drawback the evaluators opine that the centralisation of NPF seems to have affected the business development involvement of senior staff in the project / field offices. It emanates from the interviews that the senior staff in the field offices scaled back their business development efforts since this is now a function of NPF's headquarters – while previously there were projects that were acquired in the project offices (e.g. in Berat).

ii) Programme management

This part of the assessment focuses on the formulation of the vision, goals and strategy of NPF, which are fundamental for NPF's ongoing programme management. The Yearly Plan of Operations notes the need for a mid term strategic perspective firmly rooted in a set of organisational goals, to ensure that all NPF projects and activities reflect agreed priorities and policies, thereby achieving the maximum impact.

In the Organisation and Development plan, part of the Yearly Plan of Operations 2011-2012, two aspects of management were defined: (a) Strategic Plan 2010-2015, and (b) Manual of Policies and Procedures

(a) The Strategic Plan is NPF's five year strategic framework. It was developed in a participatory process, which encompassed working groups, data collection and analysis, and planning workshops. The strategic planning process began with a situation analysis that enabled participants to assess NPF's capacities, review its main priorities, review its mission and define its managerial goals and objectives for five years.

(b) The Manual of Policies and Procedures is NPF's framework document to ensure organisational consistency, efficiency and logic. Despite the fact that it is considered to be a good tool for NPF management, it lacks a range of important elements such as *standards of NPF services* and *monitoring and evaluation*.

iii) Resource management

The evaluation was designed to assess policies and procedures as well as actions that were undertaken to ensure the development of NPF staff and human resources. The evaluator found that human resource (HR) policies, procedures and systems were consistent with the Strategic Plan (Strategic Goal 2.2) and adequate to ensure that NPF has a competent and motivated workforce.

User-friendly and efficient policies for staffing, compensation and performance management are in place. However, more attention needs to be placed on training of staff to equip the latter to better perform their duties.

iv) Organisational process and systems

Organisational processes and systems were introduced and are gradually being applied throughout the organisation. Still, the Strategic Plan and the Manual foresee periodic reviews and updates in order to refine existing processes and systems and to respond to new challenges. Areas that require improvements include: *Information and data collection* systems are in place (for instance: the project keeps detailed information of each direct beneficiary and her/his family). However, much information is kept on paper, manually and it is thus neither easy to process this data nor to share the data – data protection permitting – with other stakeholders. *CEFA's financial management* is operated in the project office in Korça. The physical distance and absence of an appropriate IT solution (e.g. intranet; remote access) make it difficult for the executive director to approve or disapprove of financial operations before their execution. Likewise, it is unclear whether the project finances should continue to be managed by project staff in Korça, given that NPF is officially registered in Tirana and that the authorities in Tirana are responsible for e.g. tax issues. The evaluator also observed an incongruity in the *Manual* as regards the position of the offices in Berat, Elbasan and Korça (CEFA project offices vs. NPF branch office; cf. Annex 1 and Annex 2 in the Manual). Generally speaking, enhancing NPF's technological infrastructure and taking full advantage of modern IT solutions is a key component of institutional and organisational development.

Financial viability

The ability of NPF to generate and manage adequately its resources with a view to ensure its sustainability has been a key concern of this project. SDC supported NPF with annual core funding in the amount of CHF 201.000. Furthermore, a budget line in the amount of CHF 50.400 was specifically earmarked for organisational development purposes²⁷. Against this background NPF is required to “raise corresponding funding” to fill the gap of Swiss core support that peters out.

The following table provides an overview of the projects NPF was able to secure since May 2009.

²⁷ The budget was spent, *inter alia*, to cover trainings delivered to CEFA staff, external advice of the consultancy ANNTARC for the development of the Strategic Plan and the Manual of Policies and Procedures as well as for translations and report writing.

Table 4: Successful project acquisition May 2009 – June 2011

Date / Bidding	Donor(s)	Project Implementation	Budget (in CHF)*
February 2011**	ILO	Feb 2009 – Nov 2009	68'000.00
March 2010	USAID	Mar 2010 - Feb 2011	41'400.00
May 2010	EU	Jan 2011 – Aug 2012	200'000.00
August 2010	Arsis	August 2010	3'600.00
January 2011	AusAid	Mar 2011 - Jun 2011	3'700.00
February 2011	FOSA, UNDP, SDC	March 2011	20'900.00
		Total	269'600.00

* Currency conversion on 20 October 2011.

** Project was acquired before CEFA VI start and implemented until November 2009; not included in the total.

Since May 2009 NPF has been submitting eleven tenders / project proposals, excluding the CEFA project, of which five were successful. Five project applications were unsuccessful, including applications to UNICEF, the US National Endowment for Democracy and the Roma Education Fund. The cumulative amount NPF was able to contract amounts to some CHF 270.000.

Applying a 10 % management fee to this budget the associated margin mounts to CHF 27.000; this in turn is too low to make up for the lost revenue from SDC's gradually decreased NPF core funding. Admittedly, this core funding also covers the operational costs that are required to deliver CEFA in Tirana. If this cost is estimated with CHF 100.000 there is still a funding gap of some CHF 73.000. In theory, however, not all donors accept to pay such a management fee, exacerbating NPF's challenge to secure funding. According to information received from NPF, the organisation requires approximately CHF 60.000 to cover its annual operational costs. Summing up, it becomes apparent that NPF has, as of yet, not been able to cover the funding gap. While NPF has the elements critical to secure business, it must prop up its business development efforts. This is particularly warranted since NPF needs to compete for donor funds against both national as well as international organisations.

Summary

Component Objective	Assessment of the Component
The NPF sustainability is increased in order to better fulfil the target community needs through organisational development.	NPF made a leap forward in terms of organisational development. It was able to successfully apply for donor funds in the amount of more than a 250.000 Swiss francs. However, at this stage it is not possible to fully assess NPF's sustainability, the assessment is ambiguous: while staff capacities have increased and internal processes improved, financial sustainability – without SDC core funding – could not yet be achieved

to sufficient extent.

3.3. Efficiency

In general efficiency measures the outputs and results of a project in relation to the inputs that were invested. It assesses the extent to which the least costly resources possible were used in order to achieve the planned results.

The evaluators suggest assessing efficiency by identifying processes and actions that illustrate the extent to which NPF undertook to achieve the desired results at minimised costs and the least costly resources possible; SDC-A accepted this approach. The assessment of the efficiency is therefore largely based on the document review and information that was obtained from the interview partners.²⁸

The following processes and actions could be identified:

- *Local contractor and local experts provide services:* The project is implemented by an Albanian organisation and local staff members. Specific international expertise was sought only for the selection and training of 12 Roma language teachers. There is widespread agreement amongst the project stakeholders that the service provision by the local partners is a key factor of the project's efficiency. At the same time the evaluators note – based on comparisons with similar organisations and interview feedback – that the staff costs of the project are above the market rate in Albania.
- *Quality, timeliness and transparency:* The quality of the services rendered by the project is considered to be high compared to local standards and several interlocutors mentioned the diligence and transparency of NPF / CEFA staff in terms of resource utilisation, which is also proven by the fact that several budget lines remain largely unspent at the end of the second project year. Procedures are in place to ensure that best value-for-money goods and services are procured. The project did not experience significant delays that would have had ramifications on the performance of the project.
- *Decreasing core funding of NPF and tempered conditional in-kind support (“food basket”) contribute to project efficiency:* Despite NPF's gradually decreasing core funding and the phasing out of the “food basket” support the performance targets of the CEFA project remained unaltered. Consequently, it can be argued that the project's input-output ratio improved with every year of the project (“same value for less money”) and thus increased relative efficiency of the project.

²⁸ The correctness and appropriateness of the use of funds was subject of external audits and is thus not part of this evaluation assignment.

- *Compared to CEFA IV the project now delivers more activities for the same amount of budget (excluding organisational development budget):* While it is indeed difficult to compare both the quantity and the quality of the services rendered in two different project phases, the evaluators have the impression that the current phase delivers more services for the same budget.

At the same time there is room for increasing efficiency by other measures, which we outline in the following:

- *Several interlocutors suggest that NPF is not sharing its best practices / experiences compared to other NGOs (“possessive”):* While the document review confirms increasing visibility efforts of NPF (e.g. website, promotion and information material, National Conference), the interviews suggest that NPF is not *perceived* as having sought to widely distribute / share its outputs, experiences, knowledge and expertise – thereby scaling up the project’s efficiency. Such “scaling up” does not contravene NPF’s organisational interests²⁹ and could take the form of e.g. presenting the “CEFA approach” in other municipalities, performing small scale research to understand the impact of project activities, analysing the reasons and mechanism that make a project intervention work etc. and making respective research outcomes available to interested parties. It may be, however, that the current means of communication are inadequate to reach relevant stakeholders.

With a view to increase efficiency NPF should collaborate with other organisations to work together in order to address their mutual interest. For instance: UNDP is working in the same area in Tirana providing VET and employment services for the same target group.

- *Increased analysis of the impact of project activities can contribute to increased efficiency:* As mentioned elsewhere the project should do more to analyse in more detail the effects and impact of its activities – both qualitatively and quantitatively. The results of such analysis could provide the basis to reallocate available resources to activities that yield more return / are more efficient.

In this context, although not necessarily a question of input vs. output, it is opportune to make reference to the specific target group of CEFA beneficiaries (9-16 years) and the considerations that would speak in favour of interventions for younger children: International research suggests that there is strong evidence that early education of young(er) children results in improvements in school attainment and decreases the likelihood of school-drop out. Against this background

²⁹ Like other non-governmental organisations NPF is competing for donor support / project funding. The “CEFA model” is one of NPF’s core products with which it can compete in the market. It is therefore understandable, from an organisational perspective, that NPF keeps the product for its own organisational purposes.

background the actual target group of the CEFA project – children aged nine to sixteen – has been subject of much debate during the interviews and discussion with the project stakeholders. (Questions that arose: *Is it efficient to focus on this target group? Should the funds better be invested in early childhood development?*). There are indeed good arguments to focus on the target group as defined by the CEFA, most importantly that they might otherwise be neglected, but with only few exceptions the interviewees were of the opinion that the project interventions should target much younger children so as to address causes of drop out rather than “curing symptoms”. Furthermore it was argued that the Governments “Second Chance programme” would already cater for this group, albeit not with the same intensity than the “catch-up classes” under CEFA.

In light of the above proxy indicators the evaluators conclude that the resources – funds, human resources, time and expertise – were generally utilised strategically with a view to achieve the expected results and outputs.

3.4. Impact

Impact measures the success of a programme in realising its overall objective, i.e. whether and to what extent a project has brought about overall long-term changes. Although it is common to ask for impact assessments in external reviews, one cannot expect impact to become perceptible until much later, at which time it might be measured with an *ex post* evaluation.

This is also true in the areas of CEFA VI, namely educational reform, social inclusion, human and minority rights. Change and reform in these fields require time to be achieved and a long-term perspective to implementation.

At the beginning of the project a set of impact hypothesis was defined that is contained in the project’s Credit Proposal. The hypothesis – recognition of CEFA’s approach and NPF as an expert implementing agency; diversification and sustainability of NPF’s funding sources; enhancement of Roma self-esteem and Roma empowerment – are largely realised, though to varying degree and extent. Most impact the evaluators believe was achieved in terms of NPF’s reputation, the diversification of its funders and the recognition of the CEFA approach. For a more detailed discussion and assessment of the impact hypothesis the evaluators refer to Annex 3.

While it is not possible to make a conclusive impact assessment, the evaluators highlight additionally selected issues that are likely to contribute to the impact prospects:

- More than 500 vulnerable children and/or their families have benefitted from education and other support services rendered by CEFA VI, enhancing their potential prospects to escape from the poverty trap. The attendance and passing rates are

impressive and likely – though not measured against a valid baseline – well beyond the general average.

- The project stakeholders repeatedly stated that the perceptions of and attitudes towards Roma in the project schools and communities changed to the better and many parents have become motivated to send their children to school and proud of their successes. The high parents' participation rates across the four municipalities would point in this regard.
- Several Roma – women who received grants for small-scale businesses, VET graduates or families whose children are taken care of in a kindergarten – have commenced and/or retained their jobs and businesses and thereby gain and/or contribute to family income, reducing the dependency on aid.
- A pool of qualified teachers, social workers, VET advisors and project managers has been built up and equipped with the skills and expertise to render quality services as well as a civil society organisation that has the potential to work on behalf of state authorities in the future.

Even though the impact of these successes cannot be measured – qualitatively and quantitatively – at this stage, they have the potential to bring about change in the mid- and long-term.

It is opportune to make reference to what the evaluators qualify as unintended impacts, which warrant consideration in a forthcoming project.

- *CEFA has (partially) taken over public service functions:* In several instances municipal representatives, school teachers and parents stated that they would often resort to CEFA first when issues arise, prior to contacting state institutions. The interviews with Roma community members also suggest that there are elements of the perception that “*local authorities will not help unless CEFA intervenes*” thereby undermining the credibility of the state institutions.
- *NPF's project acquisition capacity might have been weakened by the “centralisation” process of the organisation:* Contrary to the previous set-up of field offices which enjoyed equal roles, responsibilities and prerogatives and had similar motivation – including as regards project acquisition – this function is now centralised at NPF. Despite the overall positive effects of this change, it has become more difficult for project acquisition to benefit from the knowledge and networks of senior CEFA staff.
- (The validity of this unintended impact cannot be assessed; however, they were mentioned in the context of the interviews: *Food basket support appears to have prevented parents from sending children to school at schooling age so as to benefit*

from CEFA support at a later stage; and to send their children to a CEFA school, rather than the school in their respective neighbourhood.)

3.5. Sustainability

Sustainability looks at the longer-term effects of the project. It assesses the extent to which the effects continue over time after the end of donor support for the project.

Despite the financial contribution of the MoES and the MoLSAEO respectively to the CEFA project, which the MoES is expressly willing to continue and eventually expand in a forthcoming project phase, there are no signs that the CEFA activities in their entirety would be continued at the same service quality level if SDC stops financing the project. The project stakeholders hold the view that the human and financial resources required to implement the project are beyond the budget possibilities of the ministries, let alone the municipalities.

Different than in the review of 2008, however, the sustainability of NPF as an organisation has been enhanced (though lack of sufficient funding continues to be the critical element).

As implied in the sub-chapter above, there are several factors that suggest that the project has brought about change. With regard to sustainability the evaluators believe that the following factors are relevant:

- The project has undertaken to invest into interventions that should yield return in the longer-term, including: supporting adult job training and self-employment support which has multiple benefits such as raising household incomes, giving Roma the chance to access the labour market more easily, remedy concerns and misperceptions of the majority population – to name but a few. Furthermore, the project has focused on increasing the involvement of girls and women into the project, who exhibit a higher probability to benefit from such job / labour market support.
- Sustainability depends to a large extent on Albania's priorities and ownership in relation to the objectives of the project; other than during past phases, the Government of Albania started several reform efforts that are (also) driven by its bid for EU accession. These reform efforts include i) government reform, ii) social protection reform, iii) legislative reform, and iv) fiscal decentralisation and better use of funds.
- Participation and support of stakeholders at the local level has been assured; all participating municipalities or schools the evaluators visited are committed to contribute to the programme's success. Good practices will, to the extent they can be financed, likely be continued (e.g. referring a child at risk to the CPU social worker as opposed to a CEFA social worker).

- Municipalities have the possibilities to co-fund service delivery by NGOs under the current legislation; secondary legislation is currently being developed by the MoLSAEO that shall enable local governments to outsource social protection services to non-governmental organisations.
- The approach of the “catch-up classes”, concretely the element of creating an exclusive space for Roma and Egyptian children within the respective schools, might be overtaken by the trend to build up / foster more integrated and inclusive forms of schooling. It should be recalled here that SDC’s Concept Note on Social Inclusion states that “... *exclusive targeting [of Roma] may lead to separate services – inadvertently causing segregation and reinforcing exclusion.*” This idea is also captured in the “explicit but not exclusive targeting” and “aiming for the mainstream” principles on Roma inclusion of the European Union.³⁰ Also, given the increased attention that Roma education receives in Albania, it might reduce the “supply” (sic!) of children without any schooling at the CEFA’s target age (9-16)” in the mid-term.
- The project has continuously improved the involvement of Roma in the project delivery but still more needs to be done to empower Roma to develop their services and projects. Also, any future project needs to gradually hand-over responsibility to state institutions at the appropriate level such as Child Protection Units.

In addition to the above, achieving sustainability will generally depend on several interrelated conditions, including a suitable mechanism for follow-up support, the availability of continued financial resources, and a long-term approach to project implementation.

4. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

The evaluation team considers that the project achieved remarkable results, particularly in the first and fourth Component, whereas it is difficult to gauge the actual impact of the interventions in the fields of vocational education and training and Roma community empowerment. In the course of this external review the evaluators formulate the following, general, lessons learned:

- Projects that aim at improving social inclusion of Roma and generally their access to human and minority rights need to address the multiple deprivations that Roma face; they thus require multisectoral interventions. Furthermore, change and reform in these

³⁰ The 10 Common Basic Principles on Roma Inclusion, European Union, June 2009. Source: <http://ec.europa.eu/roma>

fields require time to be achieved and a long-term perspective to project implementation.

- In order to achieve changes at the system / policy level projects need to i) clearly formulate the objectives that are envisaged to be achieved and ii) potent actors who can credibly and with authority engage in a policy dialogue with Governments, ministries and other public institutions.
- For the time being, Albania continues to be reliant on donor support, including in cost intensive areas such as education and social protection that are addressed by the CEFA project. At the same time more cost efficient interventions, which typically are often community based, need to be supported.

5. Recommendations

The following recommendations, most of which come as a result of our intense dialogue with project stakeholders, suggest action that the evaluators believe should be taken into consideration in the forthcoming project phase to address the challenges in the field of social inclusion, specifically of vulnerable children of the Roma and the Egyptian community.

Some of the recommendations include a summary of selected feedback received from the interviewees; they may thus not directly stem from / relate to the body of the report in the above chapters.

In line with the Terms of Reference for this evaluation assignment as well as briefing discussions with SDC senior staff, we focus on recommendations regarding the programming of a next CEFA phase.

Overall recommendation:

- *Extend the project for an additional duration of two to three years:* The evaluators are of the opinion that the project, i.e. one that is implemented at beneficiary level, should be continued. Our view is based on the following considerations: i) the project is delivering quality and much required services to beneficiaries which, in the immediate future, have little prospect of being provided by the respective authorities in Albania; ii) the sustainability of the implementing partner NPF has not been secured yet to sufficient extent and exiting the project at this stage will likely lead to a reduction of the current staff capacities; iii) the focus of the Government of Albania on Roma education has become manifest only in the last two-three years offering now a “window of opportunity” for changes at policy and system level. The vast majority of our interview partners concur with this view; this is also exemplified, for instance, by

the most recent REF report on Albania, which notes that “... *sustained efforts to reform the education system in Albania began only in 2008 ...*”. iv) Albania continues to be reliant on external support to master its social inclusion reform agenda. The continuation of the project fits with the lessons learned that are contained in the Concept Note for sub-domain Social Inclusion (June 2011) that “*donors should go for supporting a combination of interventions at system/policy level with those at the beneficiary/direct assistance level.*”

Specific recommendations:

The overall recommendation comes along with the requirement that a forthcoming project phase needs to work more – explicitly – at system/policy levels. Generally speaking, the ProDoc, Credit Proposal and Logical Framework need to formulate clearly what the project shall achieve – including objectives and associated indicators – in terms of system and policy change.

- *Design and implement activities that have an impact at system / policy level and that embed the “CEFA approach” in actions at central / regional / municipal level, thereby contributing to “institutionalisation”:* Regions and/or municipalities should be supported i) in breaking down e.g. the Roma Decade National Action Plan to the respective level and define which and how their actions best support the realisation of the national strategic goals and objectives; ii) in delineating responsibilities and tasks among different actors at local level, including governmental and non-governmental organisations, specifically Roma NGOs and Roma representatives, to put actions at local level into practice and to determine the respective costing and source of funding for these actions. Such activities are likely to support the recently started reform efforts of social protection and social services that foresee: formulation of objectives and outcomes at central level; policy and planning at regional level; service delivery at local level (“community care planning”; see also the social reform efforts supported by UNICEF). The project could play a facilitation role in setting-up and managing working groups that develop what may be called “local plans of actions”.

In this context it is necessary to capitalise on SDC’s experience in the decentralisation projects in terms of improved service quality of local governments, increased citizens’ participation and mutual accountability.

- *Negotiate with the MoES to continue making available funding required for teaching personnel and in-kind support for the “catch-up classes”:* Senior staff of the MoES stated the readiness of the Ministry to make available even more funds in a forthcoming phase compared to the current one. The evaluators thus recommend that a renewed commitment on behalf of the Ministry is negotiated. Ideally, however, there

there is no particular “cap” of this commitment; the MoES should provide full funding for whatever personnel resources are required in the project locations to cater for education in “catch-up classes” of *all* Roma and Egyptian children who are eligible under the project.³¹

- *Negotiate with municipalities to co-fund selected project services, particularly the community development services, thereby contributing to “institutionalisation”:* It has been stated above that the project enjoys good anchorage and reputation at the local levels in particular. The work of e.g. the social workers extends far beyond the immediate needs of the project and it benefits the community in its entirety. Despite this, the municipalities are not financially contributing to the project at all. The evaluators thus recommend that the municipalities be invited to contribute to the overall costs of the services, perhaps by funding some or all of the costs of the classroom / social workers, especially as they have other community development tasks as well. (The actual funding of project services may also be stipulated in a “local plan of action”.) Several municipal representatives stated that they have – albeit small – funds at their disposal to co-fund project activities and respective legislation that allows such co-funding is in place. Furthermore, in light of the planned reforms in the service delivery of social protection such a co-funding mechanism would prepare the ground for future “outsourcing” of public tasks to non-governmental organisations. Ideally, any such municipal contribution would increase gradually over the lifetime of the project (in order to allow municipalities to plan the increasing contributions in their budget planning processes).³²
- *Define issues / topics to which the project could contribute with (small scale) research and analysis of project impact:* We encourage SDC to develop tools that help monitoring the long-term impact of their programme activities. Such research will increase the knowledge base in Albania and support the design of evidence based policies and actions.

³¹ Describing the payment of the teacher salaries and the in-kind support to host the classes as “contribution” by the MoES to the project is misleading. With the payment of the teachers’ salaries – required to provide education services to beneficiaries who are in fact entitled to such services – the MoES is merely living up to its commitments based on national and international legislation.

³² A senior staff of SDC voiced the interesting idea to “tender” to project locations and to eventually implement the project in those municipalities that offer to contribute most to the project implementation.

Recommendations regarding the organisational set-up:

- *Consider collaboration between the implementing partner with a / other strategic partner(s) for specific components or activities:* The design and the institutional set-up of the project have hampered achieving more profound system / policy changes at ministry level. First, the project documents did not clearly spell out the project's objectives in this regard. Second, despite NPF's occasional advisory role with the MoLSAEO, it would have been / it is difficult for a local NGO to engage in a credible policy dialogue with the Government. The evaluators therefore recommend that the implementing partner is supported as regards policy dialogue and system/policy change with a potent, technically versatile and reputed partner such as UNICEF. The Children's Fund roles could be manifold including fostering policy dialogue and policy development vis-à-vis the Government of Albania; quality control, quality enhancement and diversification of the services rendered in the project; capacity development of the implementing partner.

It emerged from the interviews that UNICEF would be interested in engaging into a closer dialogue with SDC in this regard and several options of collaboration and contractual relations appear to be feasible.

Closely related to this are the following recommendations:

- *Engage in a comprehensive project design process:* The evaluators recommend that there be a careful participatory project design / planning process; it should be ensured that Roma representatives are actively involved. The planning process should ideally be one element within the planning process of the entire social inclusion sub-domain. It would allow the planners to, *inter alia*, devise i) which actions to implement, ii) in which locations, iii) at which level of government, and iv) by which organisation(s). This approach should ensure that all interventions within the sub-domain are “cast from the same mould”.
- *Consider UNICEF to assume a backstopping role of the entire social inclusion domain:* The Concept Note on Social Inclusion makes reference to planned liaison and alignment with UNICEF, e.g. as far as research and monitoring are concerned, and SDC's Country Strategy calls for joint programming and multi-partner interventions. Rather than considering only a “project-by-project” collaboration, the evaluators recommend that SDC considers entering into a “strategic partnership” with UNICEF to advance SDC's social inclusion efforts.
- *Consider that project management remains with a local organisation:* To the extent possible, the evaluators recommend that NPF continues to be responsible for project management. The organisation has proven its ability to implement

implement quality projects and it has become a trusted partner of SDC. Having a local organisation manage the project should also temper project management / overhead costs.

At the same time the evaluators do not recommend that the project is managed in form of a project implementation unit (PIU) in either of the key ministries (education or social affairs). It has also been stated by several interviewees that the ministries' capacities and competences continue to be inadequate to manage a technical assistance project.

Recommendations as regards the content of the project:

- *Education Component:*
 - *Consider forms of mitigating the risk of segregation in schools:* This could take two forms:
 - iii) Developing and implementing more extracurricular activities that are open for Roma / Egyptian as well as non-Roma children and exchange between classes (i.e. children in CEFA classes attend part-time their respective mainstream class). It also means to open activities such as “summer camps” to all children, notwithstanding their ethnic background.
 - iv) Integrating children into the mainstream classes that correspond to their age and provide “social / teaching assistance” to these children. This might require entering into dialogue with the MoES, the RED and school principles as regards engagement of more personnel/teachers, in-kind support such as additional class rooms etc. If a full change towards an integrative education cannot be achieved, a “pilot” in one or two schools might be feasible. This would allow to eventually comparing the performance of children in such a “pilot” classes with those in CEFA “catch-up” classes.
 - Timing: Actions in this regard can already be planned and introduced in the remaining months of the current project phase.
 - iv) Integrating children into the mainstream classes that correspond to their age and provide “social / teaching assistance” to these children. This might require entering into dialogue with the MoES, the RED and school principles as regards engagement of more personnel/teachers, in-kind support such as additional class rooms etc. If a full change towards an integrative education cannot be achieved, a “pilot” in one or two schools might be feasible. This would allow to eventually comparing the performance of children in such a “pilot” classes with those in CEFA “catch-up” classes.
 - Timing: Given the preparation that is required such a change is feasible only in a forthcoming project phase.
 - *Consider shifting the focus to children at school entry stage:* We recommend that the project – gradually – shifts its support services to children in the age group of 6-10 and assists these children and their families to have a good start

into the school but also to retain in school. Considering that children in this age group are entering schools in mainstream classes, the focus of the project work would shift away from education (“CEFA classes”) towards assisting parents and family members to build up an environment that contributes to child’s success in school. (This would result in scaling down the education component, in which NPF has most capacity, in terms of content and finances to the benefit of the other components.)

Timing: Given the preparation that is required such a change is feasible only in a forthcoming project phase.

- In the long-run the possibilities to shift focus to children that require pre-school education should also be fathomed, given the experience NPF is building up in its ongoing EU project.

Timing: This is a long-term recommendation and feasible at the very earliest in a forthcoming project phase. It will require having a thorough understanding of the Government’s plans in this regard, an analysis how a project could contribute to such plans and building up capacity within NPF

- ***Vocational Education and Training Component:***

- On a general note: *Ensure alignment with the IPA Component IV (HR Development) and forthcoming projects such as YEPA:* The Government of Albania is in the process of developing an HR Development Operational Programme that will govern the reform efforts in this field. It is suggested to contribute to this document in terms of its content regarding training, coaching and employment of vulnerable and marginalised people. Also, complementarities and synergies need to be explored with the forthcoming YEPA project.
- *Invest into measuring the effects and impact of VET training and small-business support:* see below.
- For both components – particularly the VET Component: *Invest into research of the effects and impact of the project activities:* The project has proven to have the tools and staff in place that ensure quality data collection. The project should undertake efforts, possibly with support of external research institutes or experts, to move towards data analysis and interpretation rather than mere reporting. Even small scale research in four municipalities can provide useful insights that can be presented in briefing notes or policy papers. Such research products would: i) add to the knowledge base in Albania, ii) sharpen the organisational profile and visibility of both

the implementing agencies and the donor, iii) support the advocacy and policy dialogue, and iv) improve quality and validity of the project in its entirety.

▪ *Roma Empowerment Component:*

- *Assess feasibility and define opportunities to link the planned Roma community empowerment component under the social inclusion Concept Note:* The evaluators recommend that a future project closely collaborates with / is aligned to SDC's forthcoming intervention as planned in the Concept Note (collaboration could be sought in the context of the development of “local Decade action plans”).

Recommendations to the contracting agency:

The following recommendations are addressed to the contracting agency and relate to contract and project management as well as promotion and visibility:

- *Consider extending the contract with the current implementing partner:* The stakeholders repeatedly commended the performance of the NPF team. The commitment and established personal relations of the local coordinators and the social workers in particular were mentioned as critical factors of the project's success. We thus recommend that the contract with the current implementing partner be extended so that the same team could be deployed again. The probable gains of contracting a new contractor/team (new ideas, lower staff costs, build up of capacity of another Albanian organisation) can in our view not outweigh the associated risks (for instance: losing the project's institutional memory, time to build up relationships with project stakeholders). Not tendering the project does not foreclose re-negotiating the terms of collaboration (see below) and re-designing the organisational set-up (see above). To the extent it is allowed by SDC's procurement rules the evaluators recommend that SDC abstains from opening a public tender for a forthcoming project, unless no agreement can be reached with NPF.
- *Substitute core funding payment with a management fee according to NPF procedures and re-negotiate terms of collaboration:* In the current project phase NPF benefitted from direct core funding amounting to a total of CHF 201.000 to cover management and overhead costs of the organisation (and the administrative costs of the CEFA project in Tirana). In the forthcoming phase such costs should be covered by a management fee of 6-10 % (negotiable, according to NPF Strategy Document) to be applied to the project implementation costs (i.e. total budget less staff costs). In the same light any support in terms of organisational development should be limited, given the advances the organisation made in the recent past.

- *Improve the collaboration with key partners and the sharing information and good practices:* The coordination mechanisms within government structures are reportedly far from being optimal. Also, coordination among donors only recently started to improve. A platform for sharing information and good practices should contribute to policy development and replication of positive experience across Albania and at different government levels. Even though not directly related: this also includes making the resources of SDC's platform for employment and income practitioners³³ known more widely.
- *Cease expenditure for “humanitarian” action and for items that are the responsibility of the public authorities:* The evaluators suggest that the budget be reviewed in terms of “humanitarian” action such as expenditure for clothes; there are several humanitarian agencies that offer such assistance to persons in need. Also, the project should not cover the costs for items that are covered by the Government (e.g. for school books).
- *Ensure that the key project documents – ProDoc, Credit Proposal, and Logical Framework – are consistent:* The evaluators observed, albeit small, inconsistencies and differences at objective level in e.g. the logical framework that was part of the Credit Proposal on the one hand and the one annexed to the Yearly Plan of Operations on the other hand. SDC should ensure consistency of these documents, which benefits implementation, monitoring and performance review.
- *Ensure that the project budget and the financial reports are updated and consistent with the project content / services:* The evaluators observed that there are, albeit minor, inconsistencies in the project budget. For instance: the budget indicates part-time (80 %) instead of full-time employment of the CEFA project coordinators; some budget lines use confusing terminology (e.g. field social teacher). It is thus recommended to ensure that the budgets are fully consistent with the project content.
- *Formulate a project name and abbreviation that makes reference to the social inclusion focus:* The future project should ensure that it becomes clear for third parties that the project addresses issues of social inclusion; the future social inclusion portfolio should have a strong “brand” to make Swiss engagement in this domain visible.

Recommendations to NPF:³⁴

³³ <http://www.sdc-employment-income.ch/>

³⁴ These recommendations were developed by the local evaluator, Ms Mirela Muça.

The long-standing experience of NPF, the presence of the organisation in several municipalities in Albania and the human resources it has at its disposal – all these are factors that contribute to NPF's positive performance as the implementing agency of CEFA. While ownership of CEFA has proven to be advantageous for NPF (in terms of finances, visibility, reputation, capacity building etc.) it has also been an obstacle for the organisation to be committed in other projects.

Hence, the evaluator recommends that NPF continues its efforts in terms of institutional and organisational development, including in particular related to:

- *Organisation sustainability:*
 - Develop appropriate partnerships and service agreements with potential donors: NPF can benefit from appropriate partnerships and alliances to secure requisite institutional, financial, and local support.
 - Develop and institutionalise partnerships with local government: NPF should undertake efforts to position NPF as a (future) service provider at community level.
 - NPF should use its human resources (social workers, VET advisers) to diversify its products, projects and services.
- *Transparency:* NPF should continue to improve its reporting towards more transparency and analysis of achieved results. It is recommended that NPF compiles an annual report that records NPF's activities and performance for a given financial year. It is also recommended that such a report be published on NPF's website for purposes of transparency, visibility and marketing.
- *Increase human resource capacities:*
 - Despite the fact that a Roma community member is in the Board of Directors, none is involved at NPF's management level. The evaluators recommend their participation in senior level roles and the application of effective instruments foreseen in the Manual of Policies and Procedures that guarantee their roles – to the extent and when the financial resources of NPF allow for an increase of staff on its payroll.
 - Set up close relationship with Roma organisations and Roma individuals that are successful in education, entrepreneurship, etc. These individuals should act as agents to encourage change within the Roma communities and to point out the positive aspects of implementation of NPF and its projects.
 - It is important that all technical staff (teachers, social workers, VET advisers, finance expert) be continuously trained in their areas of expertise. NPF should develop a training plan tailor-made to the respective staff profiles to ensure that

the team has appropriate skills and knowledge relevant for specific services. More efforts need to be made to enhance team spirit within the organisation with particular focus on learning and teambuilding.

- *Communication and visibility:* Public relations, communication and visibility are instrumental for the organisations sustainability. In this view the evaluator recommends:
 - NPF management needs to develop and improve knowledge and methods of conducting effective strategic internal and external communication.
 - NPF's website requires continuous update and improvement. Intranet would contribute to facilitate access of the organisation's headquarters to the project (field) offices and vice versa.
- *Improvement of management tools of NPF:* The evaluator identified deficiencies with regard to the completion, approval and submission/declaration of financial documents (especially those related to social insurance and income taxation), as a result of the fact that CEFA's project accounting is managed in the office in Korça rather than in Tirana where NPF is registered. It is recommended that NPF seeks qualified external advice to review the organisations financial reporting system so as to assert full compliance with Albanian legislation.

Recommendations of actions in the current phase of the project:

In the time that is left until the end of the project (June 2011) the evaluators recommend actions that the project and/or implementing partners should undertake to prepare the ground for the recommended follow up. The evaluators generally recommend that SDC and NPF concentrate on administrative issues for a future support as opposed to introducing changes to the approach / content in the education or VET components during the ongoing school year.

- *Commence discussions with public authorities regarding a forthcoming phase:* SDC and NPF should start discussions with key project stakeholders – the MoES and the MoLSAEO as well as local authorities – regarding i) the potential scope of services to be rendered and ii) their eventual financial contribution to continue the project activities;
- *Commence discussions with UNICEF about an eventual backstopping mandate of the social inclusion domain:* SDC should build up on existing plans to collaborate with UNICEF in the context of SDC's future work in the field of social inclusion and sound the options for a closer collaboration. Such collaboration could take the form of a project-by-project collaboration to a comprehensive backstopping support. SDC

should particularly define which policy and system changes it wishes to contribute to and determine the best means and approach to achieve the latter.

- *Examine the possibilities to utilise existing data for research purposes:* NPF should examine possibilities to undertake a small-scale study / research (e.g. on the impact of the VET component) based on existing data and access to beneficiaries. This will require to collaborate with or to commission a specialised research institute with a view to ensure research quality.

In the event that SDC decides to end funding for a new CEFA phase and/or to scale the latter back in terms of size or scope, we recommend that NPF undertakes the following action:

- *Ensure that all children in the CEFA classes can either stay in the classes – possibly only with support of the teacher – or are transferred into mainstream classes:* this will require intense dialogue with the MoES, the REDs, the school principals, and municipal authorities;
- *Ensure that particularly the CPUs, where they exist, receive full information about the children who are most at risk to “drop-out” in the event of a CEFA phase out;*
- *Organise meetings with relevant ministries, regional and local authorities and potential donors or organise a “road show” or “mini-donor-conference” to discuss whether and what type of funding could be secured in the short-term to sustain project activities;*
- *Compile and make available a complete set of outputs and material produced by the project and hand the latter over to the relevant authorities – contingent upon approval / acceptance of SDC;*

Annex 1: Terms of Reference



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
 Confédération suisse
 Confederazione Svizzera
 Confederaziun Svizra

Swiss Cooperation Office Albania

7F- 00094.06.04- CEFA Project

FINAL

Terms of Reference

for the Review
 of

**Alternated Education and Vocational Training Project-Phase VI
 (CEFA VI)**
1 May 2009-30 June 2012

Time Frame of Mandate: September – October 2011

1. Background:

1.1 Situation of Roma in Albania

In Albania, the Roma community constitutes the most vulnerable minority group, facing widespread poverty, socioeconomic marginalisation and frequent discrimination, particularly regarding access to education, social protection, health, employment and adequate housing¹. The Roma population in Albania is estimated to vary from 80,000 to 150,000, but there are though no official/reliable data on the Roma population in the country (the official number of Roma people in Albania as in many other countries varies depending on the reporter). Geographically the largest part of Roma lives in the districts of Tirana, Fier, Korca, Elbasan, Durres and Berat.

A national strategy to improve Roma living conditions (2003-2015) was adopted in 2003 under the lead of the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities (MOLSAEO). Albania joined the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 in 2008 and adopted a national action plan focusing on education, employment and social protection, housing and infrastructure, health, social inclusion and equal opportunities, and cultural heritage. The implementation of the national strategy and action plan remains slow, due to insufficient human and financial resources, inadequate coordination of all institutions involved at local and central level², and deficiencies in the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

¹ In this document, the word "Roma" stands for the Aromian and Roma community (status of ethno-linguistic minority), but also for the Egyptian community (seeking status on ethno-cultural minority).

² The structures dealing with Roma are the Technical Secretariat at MOLSAEO; the Committee for Minorities at Council Ministers and the one at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Ministry of Justice, Education, Health, Interior and Finance as well as the local government structures do have assigned responsibilities, which overall aim at upgrading the Roma status.

With regard to education: even though steps have been taken to favour the inclusion of Roma in the school system (access *legally* guaranteed), the school enrolment of Roma remains insufficient and drop out rates high. The language barriers and the social obstacles (i.e. reluctance of parents to send children to school for economic reasons, early marriage for girls etc.) are some of the causes for a high school drop-out rates among Roma children. The low school enrolment makes the Roma children particularly vulnerable to further social marginalisation and exclusion and puts them further at risk of trafficking.

Overall, a legal framework on human rights and respect for the protection of minorities is largely in place and broadly corresponds to European standards. However, its implementation remains insufficient in a number of cases.³

1.2 Swiss support to upgrade the Roma status in Albania.

Responding to both development and political concerns, Switzerland has continuously supported projects targeting the Roma community over the last decade both in priority countries and regionally in the Western Balkan. The Swiss involvement and experience focuses mainly on the educational and social sectors.

In Albania, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation – SDC, through its Swiss Cooperation Office in Albania, has supported since 1998 the social inclusion of Roma population in Albania with specific qualitative interventions, through the *Alternated Education and Vocational Training Project- CEFA*. The main outcome of the Swiss contribution has been the improvement of the integration of Roma children and families in need through a comprehensive integration model encompassing formal/vocational education with protection and social inclusion activities in 4 key regions (Tirana, Elbasan, Korca and Berat). The main implementing partner for this intervention is "Ndihme per Femijet" Foundation (NPF)⁴, an NGO originally set with the support of Terre des homes and which benefits, in the framework of SDC mandate, from an organisational development support. The "integration model" developed by the CEFA Project is recognized by the GoT as one of the key approach that successfully allows and ensures, on the long-run, the enrolment of neglected and Roma children in the educational system.

Regionally, among other activities, SDC supports the *Roma Education Fund (REF)* founded in 2005 under the Decade of Roma Inclusion by the World Bank and the Open Society Institute. Its overall goal is to contribute to close the gap in education, including the desegregation of educational systems. This initiative is highly relevant for Albania but further support/capacity-building to applicants is needed so as to access funds.

Under its *Program contribution*, the SDC is (core) funding Terre des hommes for its activities in the western Balkan region; in Albania, Tdh implements a *Child Protection Safety Net Project* (2009- 2012), aiming at protecting children – through the development and institutionalisation of a referral mechanism at decentralised level – from (risks of) trafficking and other forms of abuse, violence, exploitation or neglect. HEKS is also benefiting from the Program contribution of SDC: through local partners (Diakonia Agapes, Useful to Albanian Women), it supports also Roma communities in needs through (psycho-) social assistance (Elbasan and Shkodra regions).

In Spring 2011, in line with its Cooperation Strategy (2009-2013), the SDC management has decided to strengthen its involvement towards social inclusion with a targeted focus on Roma. In this context, a programmatic approach has been sketched, with a new intervention plan, encompassing the following elements⁵:

- to commission a research in order to have clear data and analysis as a basis for future interventions
- to strengthen the implementation and monitoring mechanisms and capacities of the Decade Action Plan at the regional and local levels

³ European Commission, 2010 Commission Opinion on Albania's application for membership of the EU.

⁴ For more information please refer to: www.npf.al

⁵ Cf Concept Note for sub-domain „Social Inclusion”, 11.04.2011

- to empower the Roma community through better mobilisation, information and participation in decision-making processes

In a programmatic approach, synergies will be sought between this new intervention, the CEFA project and more broadly with other SDC supported projects (i.e. decentralisation sub-domain). The due capitalisation of the CEFA experience will be of great importance for the design of the new initiative and the "shaping" of the SDC social inclusion program. A possible further development (exit) phase of the CEFA is to be seen in - and part of - this broader programmatic perspective (dissemination of knowledge/expertise, existing network etc.).

1.3 Project background

The CEFA project in its current phase, and in line with the recommendations made by the former evaluation (March 2008) is guided around four main components, corresponding to its four strategic objectives/outputs (cf logical framework): *i) education, ii) vocational education, iii) increasing the capacities and empowerment of Roma associations and of Roma community in general and iv) NPF sustainability.*

- Under the *education* component, the main priority is the integration of CEFA catch up students of fifth grade into normal mainstream classes as well as the education of Roma girls. Moreover, the Project is encouraging the participation of students to the standard Roma language courses as part of their tradition and culture. Another issue particularly tackled is the registration of Roma girls who are not registered at the civil registry yet. The gender perspective is at the heart of this priority as bringing Roma girls to school remains still a huge challenge, although the project has managed so far to have a balanced gender representation in class each year. The Project provides also trainings on human rights for school teachers (including the Roma language instructors and the Roma teachers). Thus beside targeting Roma students, the model targets equally the (Roma and non-Roma) parents and the school staff. Under this component, the salaries and basic training of the CEFA classes' teachers are covered by the Government of Albania while specific training and accompanying measures are provided by the Project.
- Under the *vocational education* component, the main priority is the vocational training offered from the public centers to Roma youngsters. Likewise, the increased number of opportunities and choices for a variety of professional trainings is also at the focus of the project at this stage. Gender mainstreaming is planned to be also very much reflected in this component in terms of a balanced representation of Roma women and men participating in the training courses, but also in benefiting from other potentials for small income generating activities. In addition, in the focus of the project is also to increase the contacts and negotiate new employment opportunities with businesses in Tirana, Elbasan, Korça and Berat for Roma who have participated in VET training courses and have shown a potential to further succeed. Under this component, the Project works, in principle and whenever possible, with the state vocational training centers and the National Employment Services (Tirana, Elbasan and Korca); the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs should facilitate the access to these vocational courses free of charge.
- Under the third component (increasing the capacities and empowerment of Roma associations/ community), the main focus of the Project is the delivery of capacity-building training (i.e. gender equality mainstreaming, family planning, project cycle management, project development). In this line of action, NPF aims at further strengthening the capacities of Roma community and NGOs, in contributing to enable them to come up with concrete self-initiatives, to articulate their own ideas and initiatives, increasing thus their self esteem and encouraging them to promote their social and cultural values. In addition, Roma community representatives are already and will further be active participants in the decision-making and executive structures of the CEFA project. CEFA's activities are driven by the motto "*Everything for Roma with Roma*" translating and responding thus differently and in a positive way to the Decade's motto "*Nothing for Roma without Roma*". In this perspective, the approach given to activities are progressively changed from a humanitarian aid logic to a development one (i.e. replacement of the basket fund/economic aid by an income generation scheme/economic activities). Under this component, the inputs come mainly from the Project and the involvement of other actors varies from one region to another.

- **NPF organizational development and sustainability:** The NPF main office is established in Tirana and many new documents reinforcing the structure and the image of the organization are in place (i.e. NPF strategic plan 2010 – 2015, the internal manual of procedures, NPF website, and promotional features). The Project is subject to a tripartite Project Agreement between SDC, MoES and MoLSAEO, where a Steering Committee is institutionalized. In addition, continuous efforts are done so as to enlarge the funding basis and network with other important donors like USAID, UNDP, Soros foundation, IOM and EU. NPF is exploring new fields of cooperation by enlarging its scope of cooperation and activities in the Western Balkan region.

2. Objectives of the Review and key questions:

The main objectives of the external evaluation are:

- To review CEFA results – building on the recommendations of the former evaluation, the hypothesis of impact and the logframe set in 2009 - and to draw out the key findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations with regard to the effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the "integration model" developed.
- The review should pay a particular attention and give a clear analysis of the current sustainability of the interventions (what takes place independently and/or still thanks to the Project's inputs/facilitation) and analyse what steps should/could be undertaken so as to allow both an (SDC) exit and the possible replication of the model to other regions (with or without SDC support).
- In view of the planned programmatic approach of SDC under the social inclusion sub-domain, the review will provide with recommendations on the way the CEFA's experience could feed into a broader program and what could be the role of NPF in this endeavour.

Specific questions:

a) Outcomes/impact

- To which extent the Phase VI of the CEFA Project is achieving its intended outputs and outcome/purpose? To which extent does the Project contribute to the *"social inclusion of Roma minority through education, thereby empowering the community and promoting the Roma minority rights?"*
- Are the hypotheses of impacts (of Credit Proposal) realised? How successful are the efforts made to empower the Roma community? Please illustrate. Are they still valid for the future? Please consider each of them and give your analysis and conclusions.

b) Project's effectiveness and sustainability

- Compared to the former evaluation, can the results be considered sustainable *beyond* the beneficiary level? Did the project choose the right approach and strategy, so as to ensure the sustainability of the interventions (incl. gender mainstreaming)? Is there a systemic approach applied by the CEFA team (institutionalisation of processes vs substitution of the public services)? If not or partly, what have been the attempts of the Project to foster sustainability? Which factors do foster – or hamper sustainability?
- Under components 1-2-3, what is the current support/involvement of the Albanian Government/local authorities and structures? Is it enough to ensure the sustainability of the interventions/ integration model? If not, what are the readiness and capacities at national and local levels to improve the situation? What are the latest/announced developments?
- To which extent is the Roma community involved in the Project? What are the effects (both negative and positive) brought by this involvement, for the Project and for the Roma community? Does this involvement have a positive effect on the sustainability of the Project's interventions?

c) *NPF's sustainability (institutional)*

- What is the current project's implementing set up in terms of effectiveness and costs efficiency? Is the split between CEFA and NPF clear – both in terms of funding and staff responsibilities?
- Did NPF implement the recommendations of the CEFA V external evaluation report? How is NPF currently known and perceived by other donors and the Albanian Government, at the different levels? How is NPF currently positioned and networked? What is its current stand of fund raising and funding? To which extent is NPF structure still depending on SDC funds?

Recommendations:

On the basis of your findings (above), recommendations will be given with regard to:

- The further development of the current phase (content and organisational aspects). What should be taken into consideration for the last months of the phase VI implementation/consolidation?
- The suggested developments beyond the current phase: What follow-up do you recommend, in which scope and with which focus? A further of the Project in its current form or other/new modalities of support (bearing in mind the intended exit strategy by SDC already in 2009)? (suggested content, focus, approach and set-up)
- The potential synergies and contribution of the CEFA Project to the upcoming broader SDC involvement/program for the social inclusion of the Roma community. How could a coordinated and institutionalised model/scheme of integration be further developed and fostered in the targeted regions and beyond? What could be the role of CEFA Project/NPF in this perspective? What is the current replicability/chances of replication of the CEFA model/experience?
- What lessons can be learnt to improve/feed into the future SDC interventions?

3. Responsibilities

The project review mission will be conducted by a team composed by one international consultant accompanied by a local one. The overall responsibility will be with the international consultant who will be the team-leader. Both consultants will have their own contract with SDC. Also an interpreter (English-Albanian-English) will be hired to facilitate the communication during this mission. The SCO Albania will be responsible for the overall organisation of the review, though supported by the Project for the organisation of the Review Program.

4. Methodology

The consultants are expected to:

- a) Review the project documentation, including yearly and half-yearly reports, NPF strategic planning, Project Agreement as well as additional context information (when important to the subject).
- b) Having a briefing session with SCO-A in Tirana (possibly also at SDC HQ in Berne).
- c) Conduct interviews with NPF Executive Director and CEFA Director as well key staff in charge of CEFA.
- d) Conduct individual and/or group discussions with the key partners including Roma local advisory boards of each project component.
- e) Conduct individual/group discussions with beneficiaries (focus group visit will be integrate part of the mission program).
- f) Conduct field visits at least to three regions where CEFA operates (Tirana, Elbasan, Berat and Korça).
- f) To gain information on the different initiatives/experiences ongoing in the area of Roma social inclusion, SCO-A suggests organising a workshop (half day) gathering the main stakeholders and projects. (Half day workshop with max 15 participants, probably best during the first 3-4 days of the

experts field mission). *Additional inputs (methodology, discussion structure etc) from the consultants will be provided for this workshop.*

- g) Conduct one workshop (at least one day) with NPF and CEFA staff on CEFA project achievements and results with a special focus on the sustainability of the intervention. *Additional inputs (methodology, discussion structure etc) from the consultants will be provided for this workshop.*
- h) Have a look at the work of the NPF (beyond CEFA), its organisational developments, fund raising initiatives; synergies established with other donors as well as state and non state stakeholders.
- i) Have a debriefing session in Tirana, possibly also in Berne: present the preliminary findings, **lessons learnt** and recommendations.

The review methodology aims at fostering a participatory approach so as to nurture a reflection from the Project team. The program will be elaborated in collaboration with the consultants.

5. Reporting

The consultants will provide with a presentation of the first findings for the debriefing.

A draft report will be provided one week following the end of the mission. Based on the feedback of SCO-A on the draft report the evaluators will deliver a final report. The document will not exceed 20 pages (plus annexes), and will include an executive summary.

The consultants shall not disclose to third parties the information made known to him/her under this project without an explicit authorisation of the SDC. It is not in the responsibility of the consultant to promise any kind of future activities with financial consequences for SDC.

6. Documentation to be provided

The consultant shall receive the following document in electronic form:

- Terms of Reference of the Project Review;
- CEFA VI Project Document and budget;
- CEFA V External Evaluation Report;
- The annual reports of CEFA VI and its planning documents, including YPO 2010, YPO 2011
- Steering Committees Minutes;
- The NPF strategic plan 2010 – 2015, as well as the internal manual of procedures;
- Swiss Cooperation Strategy with Albania (2010-2014);
- National Strategy for Development and Integration (2007-2013); Sectorial Strategies: National Strategy for Improving Roma Living Condition (2003-2015); National Strategy for Social Inclusion (2007-2013); National Education Strategy (2004-2015); Strategy on Gender Equality and Eradication of Domestic Violence (2007-2010).
- The Decade of Roma Inclusion (2005-2015);
- Concept Note for sub-domain „Social Inclusion“, 11.04.2011
- Other documents upon request.

7. Work Time schedule

The mission is planned to take place during the second half of 2011 (week 39-40) and the mandate last until November 5th, latest. The contractual assignment will encompass:

	International Consultant (Time Frame)	Local Consultant (Time Frame)
Preparation, review program, documentation, possibly briefing in Berne (int. consultant); desk study (local consultant); Week 37/38	6	3
Mission to Albania, including the travel time and briefing/debriefing in SCO-Tirana; Week 39/40	10	8
Preliminary report; Week 41	5	4

Final Report, incl debriefing in Bern; Week 44	3	3
Total	24 Days	18 Days

Tirana/31.08.2011

SDC, Western Balkans Division

The consultant

Silvana Mjeda
National Program Officer
SCO-A
Tirana-Albania

Harald Meier
B,S,S. Basel

Annex 2: Performance Indicators

In the following we summarise the current level of achievement of the performance indicators in the local framework that is annexed to the Yearly Plan of Operations. As mentioned in the body of the text (cf. 3.2.1) the logical framework in the Credit Proposal is not entirely congruent. In agreement with SDC we follow the YPO logical framework and assess the indicator achievement at objective level only. We will highlight differences of the indicators between the YPO and the Credit Proposal in parenthesis.

Component 1: Education

Output 1: Number of Roma beneficiary children who attend education in public schools is increased. (Credit Proposal: “*... is maintained and GoA assumes its commitment.*”)

OV Indicators envisaged	Level of indicator attainment															
The number of beneficiaries that attend education in public schools is at least 327 (Credit Proposal: “ <i>... at the time.</i> ”)	<p>The average number of beneficiaries since May 2009 falls slightly short of the target. The annual technical reports contain the following data:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="983 826 1648 890"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="983 826 1253 850">Number of students in CEFA classes</th><th data-bbox="1253 826 1320 850">Boys</th><th data-bbox="1320 826 1388 850">Girls</th><th data-bbox="1388 826 1455 850">Total</th><th data-bbox="1455 826 1648 850">Ratio Girls</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="983 850 1253 874">May 2009-June 2010</td><td data-bbox="1253 850 1320 874">184</td><td data-bbox="1320 850 1388 874">121</td><td data-bbox="1388 850 1455 874">305</td><td data-bbox="1455 850 1648 874">39.67%</td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="983 874 1253 890">July 2010-June 2011</td><td data-bbox="1253 874 1320 890">190</td><td data-bbox="1320 874 1388 890">124</td><td data-bbox="1388 874 1455 890">314</td><td data-bbox="1455 874 1648 890">39.49%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The data are calculated on a rolling basis, i.e. children who are newly integrated into the project and children to cease to be beneficiaries of the project in a given period are added to/subtracted from the total number of beneficiaries. The number of beneficiaries during a given school year is thus likely higher than the target 327.</p> <p>Attendance and retention rates stand – on average – slightly above 90 % and correspondingly above target. In all cities there are more boys than girls in CEFA classes.</p>	Number of students in CEFA classes	Boys	Girls	Total	Ratio Girls	May 2009-June 2010	184	121	305	39.67%	July 2010-June 2011	190	124	314	39.49%
Number of students in CEFA classes	Boys	Girls	Total	Ratio Girls												
May 2009-June 2010	184	121	305	39.67%												
July 2010-June 2011	190	124	314	39.49%												
MoES continues to cover salaries for formal teachers working with CEFA classes.	The contract between the contracting parties SDC and the Council of Ministers was signed with a one year delay in May 2010; it entered into force with retroactive effect starting 1 May 2009. The MoES covered the salaries in the amount of CHF 50.000 annually. The RED in Tirana ceased to															

	<p>cover the “supplementary classes”.</p> <p><i>Note:</i> Senior staff of the MoES stated that there are and have neither been any plans to increase nor decrease the number of teachers paid by the MoES despite the positive results that CEFA achieved. However, in a forthcoming project phase the MoES would be ready to fund more salaries if required for purposes of the project.</p>
<p>MoES ensures well functioning of CEFA classes within public schools.</p> <p>(Credit Proposal: “... <i>provides the necessary facilities for CEFA classes within public schools.</i>”)</p>	<p>The contract between the contracting parties SDC and the Council of Ministers was signed with a one year delay in May 2010; it entered into force with retroactive effect starting 1 May 2009.</p> <p>According to the technical reports and interviews with school principals and the RED the MoES has been covering the running costs of the CEFA classes; furthermore, schools made other facilities available for e.g. homework support classes. CEFA teachers have been included into the annual training programme for teachers.</p> <p>Supplementary hours were paid for six teachers (two in each of the following municipalities: Korça, Berat, Elbasan); in Tirana, the RED was unable to finance supplementary hours for lack of funds.</p>
<p><i>Note:</i></p>	<p>The commitments of the MoLSAEO, including the provision of access to VET courses free of charge or the accreditation of NPF, have not been included in either of the logical frameworks.</p>

Component 2: Vocational Education and Training

Output 2: Number of Roma community members who benefit from certified vocational education training is increased and their possibilities in the selection of professions for training are extended.

OV Indicators envisaged	Level of indicator attainment
160 beneficiaries attend vocational education	The most recent technical report (July 2010 – June 2011) contains the following data: 51

<p>and training (VET) in all project locations <i>(Note: YPO only indicates annual targets; hence reference is made to the logical framework of the Credit Proposal.)</i></p>	<p>Roma and Egyptians youth (31 of which are female) have completed their VET. In the preceding year (May 2009 – June 2010) there were 62 beneficiaries; 32 of them women. It is probable that the indicator will be fully achieved by the end of the project in June 2012.</p> <p>VET is provided in some ten different professions. In Berat, for instance, out of 29 VET trainees 13 received training in hairdressing and/or aesthetics. Whether the (job) market in Berat can absorb the trainees would require additional research that goes beyond this evaluation assignment.</p>
<p>30 beneficiaries that attain good or very good results in VET courses receive professional kits, where 15 are women <i>(Credit proposal: “30 beneficiaries trained and equipped with professional kits are employed and/or self employed every year”</i></p>	<p>Until June 2011 CEFA provided 69 professional kits to successful VET trainees. The technical report confirms <i>“that many of the beneficiaries, who got a professional kit, have started an activity and continue to work”</i>, which includes home-based jobs or mobile businesses.</p> <p>However, data of the <i>impact</i> (e.g. average duration of employment during a given year; average income/revenue) of the support that was provided is lacking. Whether and how many beneficiaries were able to find a job through the Regional Employment Offices, to which CEFA sent the files of the selected beneficiaries, cannot be established.</p>
<p>10 beneficiaries trained and equipped with professional kits are explored employment and/or self employment potentials, 6 are women</p>	<p>This indicator could not be assessed.</p>

Component 3: Empowerment of the Roma Community

Objective 3: Roma community is strengthened through cooperation, participation in decision making, and capacity development (Credit Proposal: “... *through participation and self-action in economic, cultural, social activities and decision making within the project.*”)

OV Indicators envisaged	Level of indicator attainment
Roma community participates in at least 12 social and cultural activities organised for and/or from the Roma community, per city per year	This indicator will be achieved by the end of the project.
Roma representatives are part of CEFA consultative and decision-making structures (Roma Advisory Boards per each city 13 Roma representatives, where 6 are women; CEFA Steering Committee, NPF board of directors 10 persons, where 4 are women)	<p>The Steering Committee (SC) is composed of six members, two of which are Roma NPO representatives. The two representatives were present at the SC meetings in July 2010 and July 2011 respectively.</p> <p>Furthermore, the project set-up so-called local Roma advisory boards (LRABs) in each project location discuss issues related to project implementation (advice, help, mediation, referral, and negotiations). The LRABs are composed of 3-4 prominent Roma representatives (community leaders, Roma NGO representatives etc) and convene on a needs basis.</p>
Roma community participates in different awareness/capacity building activities organised by CEFA project	Roma have regularly participated in awareness/capacity building activities such as the Roma and Children's day celebrations, the Roma breakfast, the Roma National conference, the local Roma advisory boards, the summer camps and selected training.
Participation of Roma community in other activities organised by local/national government, NGOs or other institutions	The evaluators have no information regarding achievement of this indicator; it can thus not be assessed.
At least 30% of the CEFA staff is Roma	NPF/CEFA currently operates with 25+16 staff members. Ten are members of the Roma community.

	Based on the document review – particularly the Steering Committee Notes – and feedback received during the interviews the conclusions of the evaluators are twofold: on the one hand there is Roma participation in the CEFA project and – depending on who is considered in the calculation of the indicator – the respective indicator is achieved; on the other hand the Roma representatives do not appear to be particularly vocal and the roles of at least five of them are only part-time.
--	---

Component 4: Organisational Development

Objective 4: Organisational development of NPF for fulfilling community needs through CEFA project as well as other projects.

(Credit Proposal: *Sustainability of NPF in order to better fulfil the needs of the target community is increased through organisational development and NPF's cooperation with GoA and other donors and organisations.*)

OV Indicators envisaged	Level of indicator attainment
(Credit Proposal: “ <i>NPF organisational development documents are approved by May 2009</i> ”.)	
NPF implements its activity based on its approved strategy; the general implementation plan (2009-2012) and YPOs. (Credit Proposal: “ <i>... are approved by the steering committee.</i> ”)	<p>NPF's Strategic Plan 2010-2015 and the Manual of Policies and Procedures were developed through a participatory process and with external support of the Albanian NGO ANNTARC.</p> <p>Based on the interviews and spot checks the evaluators have the impression that the organisation / the team members are largely working along the lines of both documents.</p> <p>The YPO is updated on a regular basis and provides for the framework and guidance for the project's implementation.</p>

NPF staff knowledge and skills are improved as a result of their participation in trainings.	<p>E.g. CEFA social workers and VET Advisors benefited from the modular training on the “Counselling cycle approach” that was offered by AlbVET.</p>
Fund raising from other projects (outside CEFA) is increased.	<p>The Project Acquisition Officer participated in a training organised by the EU Delegation in Albania in July 2010 on IPA fund grant procedures.</p> <p>The actual learning outcomes of the training cannot be assessed in more detail.</p>
NPF visibility is improved.	<p>NPF submitted ten applications since May 2009 of which five were successful; their cumulative budget amounts to approximately CHF 270.000 to be invoiced until August 2012. USAID, AusAid, Soros Foundation, Arsis and European Commission are the five donors.</p> <p>Applying a 10 % management fee the associated margin mounts to CHF 27.000; this in turn is too low to make up for the lost revenue from SDC’s gradually decreased NPF core funding that amounts to CHF 201.000 for a period of three years. Admittedly, this core funding also covers the operational costs that are required to deliver CEFA in Tirana. If this cost is estimated with CHF 100.000 there is still a funding gap of some CHF 73.000. According information from NPF, the organisation requires approximately CHF 60.000 to cover its annual operational costs.</p> <p>A qualified Project Acquisition Officer (PAO) has been supporting NPF’s business development efforts since October 2009. The PAO participated in a training organised by the EU Delegation in Albania in July 2010 on IPA fund grant procedures.</p>

that NPF organised contributed to the organisation's visibility.

Interview feedback suggests that NPF is a well known non-governmental actor in Albania and appreciated for its quality services. At the same time it emanates from the interviews in Berat and Korça that the quality assessment is much influenced by the personal commitment of the local coordinators, rather than NPF as an organisation. Also, project stakeholders regularly confound NPF with CEFA and vice-versa.

Annex 3: Specific Evaluation Questions

In the following the evaluators wish to respond to several of the specific questions, which were contained in the assignment Terms of Reference. We refer to the body of the text and or Annexes where the specific questions are expressly addressed.

To which extent the Phase VI of the CEFA Project is achieving its intended outputs and outcome/purpose?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Please see the overview in Annex 2.
To which extent does the Project contribute to the “ <i>social inclusion of Roma minority through education, thereby empowering the community and promoting the Roma minority rights</i> ”?	
Are the hypotheses of impacts (of Credit Proposal) realised?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ <i>Recognition of CEFA’s approach by the MoLSAEO and the MoES:</i> Both ministries stated that the CEFA approach is a “show case” for a successful multi-dimensional intervention to support children. CEFA is complementary to Albania’s efforts in the context of the MoES’ <i>Education for All</i> programme and the “Zero-Drop-Out Initiative”. Multisectoral approaches have become a standard in projects that focus on vulnerable and marginalised groups.■ <i>Recognition of NPF as an expert implementing agency by the MoLSAEO and the MoES:</i> NPF takes part in ministry-led working and advisory groups (e.g. in the context of the “Zero-Drop-Out Initiative”) and is called-in to provide information and expert advice. This, however, never translated into a formal consulting assignment for NPF.

How successful are the efforts made to empower the Roma	<p>The MoES qualified NPF as very professional and dedicated local non-governmental organisation.</p> <p>Furthermore, NPF was accredited by the National Licensing Centre in November 2010 and is thus a certified service provider in the domain of “Social Care Services”, subcategory “community care services”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ <i>Diversification of NPF’s funding and support in a sustainable way:</i> NPF has applied for ten projects since May 2009, five of which were successful. While this is in principle a positive sign, the actual budgets NPF was able to secure are too small to cover its annual costs of operations that are estimated at CHF 60.000.■ <i>Roma self-esteem allow them to assume work in various areas:</i> It is difficult to gauge to what extent Roma self-esteem was improved through interventions of the project. There are several selected “success stories” of e.g. VET graduates, small scale family businesses, and mothers who have become the breadwinners of their families. Also, local Roma advisory boards, Steering Committee members and other Roma play active roles within NPF and/or the CEFA project. More should be done to involve Roma in the service delivery of the project and to empower Roma to articulate and advocate for their interests and rights vis-à-vis public authorities. <p>In general, with a view to go beyond such anecdotal evidence, much more analysis would be required to respond to the question; a respective recommendation has been put forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ <i>Roma communities are active members of NPF, up to 30 % of the whole</i>
---	--

community? Please illustrate.	<p><i>NPF staff, and they make pressure for their rights:</i> Two members of the Board of Directors belong to the Roma community. Strictly speaking, none of the NPF staff is Roma. There are, however, Roma involved in the implementation of the CEFA project, namely in the roles of members of the local Roma advisory boards (13); members of the Steering Committee (2); Roma language teachers (4); VET advisor (1); and summer camp facilitators (5).</p>
Are they still valid for the future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Overall, the evaluators of the opinion that little has been achieved in terms of Roma community empowerment.
Compared to the former evaluation, can the results be considered sustainable <i>beyond</i> the beneficiary level?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Please see Chapter 5.
Did the project choose the right approach and strategy, so as to ensure the sustainability of the interventions (incl. gender mainstreaming)?	
Is there a systemic approach applied by the CEFA team (institutionalisation of processes vs. substitution of the public services)?	
If not or partly, what have been the attempts of the Project to foster sustainability?	
Which factors do foster – or hamper sustainability?	
Under components 1-2-3, what is the current support/involvement of the Albanian Government/local authorities and structures?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The Government of Albania lives up to its commitments – if not to say obligations under national and international legislation – as per the Agreements: salaries are paid, in-kind support is provided, teachers

Is it enough to ensure the sustainability of the interventions/integration model?

If not, what are the readiness and capacities at national and local levels to improve the situation?

participate in the annual training plan etc. NPF reports that in Tirana the RED ceased funding the “supplementary classes”. Local authorities are fully cooperating with CEFA and acknowledging the value of the project; Korça, for instance, replicated the children summer camp. NPF is a regular member of e.g. CPU coordination meetings. However, none of the municipalities is co-funding any of the services rendered by CEFA.

The evaluators conclude on the basis of the interviews that the project is highly recognised and appreciated by the relevant public authorities at local level (certainly in the municipalities that the evaluators had the chance to visit) and at the level of the Ministry of Education.

- The support / involvement as defined above is, in the eyes of the evaluators, insufficient to ensure the intervention *per se*; in other words, if donor funding ceases many project activities will likely be reduced in scope or quality – if not stopped entirely; selected activities / processes may be continued (such as the CEFA classes, yet without a social teacher). The integration model is acknowledged as being successful. CPUs are operating in the same philosophy.
- With regard to a future project phase: The MoES stated to be ready to cover additional personnel costs and in-kind contributions for additional “catch-up classes”. It appears that in Berat funds are at the disposal of the local governments to co-finance selected project activities with the payment of additional However, based on the limited number of interviews with Government representatives any response to this question has to be interpreted with caution.

What are the latest/announced developments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Relevant developments include: ongoing legislative work that would allow public authorities to procure from / contract e.g. non-governmental organisations to provide services in the social protection services; this might open up opportunities for qualified NGOs in the mid-term future; furthermore, UNICEF is supporting the MoLSAEO in revamping social protection services at regional and municipal levels.
To which extent is the Roma community involved in the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ See above the response to the impact hypothesis.
What are the effects (both negative and positive) brought by this involvement, for the Project and for the Roma community?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ n/a
Does this involvement have a positive effect on the sustainability of the project's interventions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ There are good prospects of sustainability at beneficiary level, e.g. for successful VET graduates. Whether the Roma involvement has a particular positive effect on the sustainability cannot be assessed.
What is the current project's implementing set up in terms of effectiveness and costs efficiency?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Please see Chapter 3.3.
Is the split between CEFA and NPF clear – both in terms of funding and staff responsibilities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The set-up of NPF as organisation and CEFA as (one) of its projects has been accomplished, certainly as far as legal matters are concerned. Procedures are in place that prevent “cross-financing” between different projects implemented by NPF. However, many of the interviewees continue to confound CEFA with NPF and vice versa.
Did NPF implement the recommendations of the CEFA V external evaluation report?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The Final Review Report (2008) contains specific recommendations on the CEFA model (point 11.5.) on a number of which we will take a closer

closer look at in the following:

1. *Organise more curricular/extra-curricular activities of the CEFA classes in the schools:* This area requires more attention by CEFA; the recommendation has not been followed to sufficient extent. The evaluators also propose to undertake efforts to achieve better interaction / integration of pupils in CEFA classes with their peers.
2. *Get external support for the market research for VET / small business beneficiaries:* Benefitting from technical inputs of AlbVET CEFA started to apply the Counselling Cycle Approach in its work with VET / small business beneficiaries. Doubts remain as to the chances of VET graduates / small business beneficiaries regarding their entry into and stay in the labour / market. CEFA's beneficiaries under the Employment Component are beyond the age of 16.
3. *Pay more attention to the involvement of beneficiaries and their communities in the decisions concerning the project and the implementation of activities:* Roma are now better involved in consultative and operational roles than before; still, Roma participation can be further improved, e.g. by empowering Roma representatives to provide / render services (e.g. as social workers, social mediators, community mediators etc.). NPF has Roma representatives in its supervisory board, two Roma are members of the CEFA Steering Committee. *Other related recommendations:* Roma language training is now been offered – as suggested in the evaluation report – to more than 80 children.
4. *Close collaboration and alignment with GoA, which needs to be*

How is NPF currently known and perceived by other donors and the Albanian Government, at the different levels?

How is NPF currently positioned and networked?

What is its current stand of fund raising and funding?

To which extent is NPF structure still depending on SDC funds?

committed from the beginning of the project: The evaluators conclude that there is a close collaboration with the GoA at all levels of government. Concerns remain regarding i) the strong position of CEFA in the municipalities as services providers / first points of contact, ii) the segregation of CEFA pupils from other children. The GoA lives up to its commitments to a very large extent.

Generally, NPF / CEFA studied the evaluation report of 2008 in depth and seriously considered all recommendations and suggestions, a vast majority of which is being implemented / put into practice by NPF.

- NPF is acknowledged at all levels of government *in the municipalities / regions it operates.* The organisation is generally perceived as professional, knowledgeable and committed. NPF is regularly invited to working groups / consultative bodies at central levels (e.g. at MoES) and local level (e.g. Child Protection Units).
- NPF continues to be at infant stage given its short existence. It benefits from the work / results of the CEFA project in particular. NPF is in contact with the key players – both governmental as well as non-governmental services and international organisations – and e.g. member of the BKTF coalition of non-governmental institutions.
- Please see chapter 3.2.2.
- Please see chapter 3.2.2.

Annex 4: Organisational Performance Assessment – Methodology and Tool

Nr	Issue	Tools Questions Check list	Description
1.	Who is NPF	NPF/ Executive Director & Manager	<p style="text-align: center;">Give general information about your organisation</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Reference: web page of organisation (if it is in place)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yearly report</p>
1.1	Mission	Do you have a written mission of NPF?	Express the Organisation's reason for existence that reflects its values and purpose.
1.2	Vision	Is there any specific understanding of what organisation aspires to become?	Explain what organisation aspires to become or achieve.
1.3	Goals	Is your vision translated into set of concrete goals?	Explain if there are a set of goals that NPF aims to achieve, with specific time frames and concrete measures for each goal; if the goals are universally known within organisation and consistently used to direct actions and set priorities.
1.4	Strategy	Is there any midterm or long term development strategy, in place? Is the strategy known by organisation' stakeholders (how?) Does it help drive day-to-day actions at all levels of the organisation (how)?	Explain if there is a clear, coherent medium- or long-term strategy that is both achievable and linked to overall mission, vision, and overarching goals.
1.5	Board composition and commitment	How it is composed? How does it function?	Explain the membership of the NPF board, the fields of practice and expertise. Explain if there are regular, purposeful and well-planned meetings.

1.6	Executive Director	<p>What can you say about her experience and standing?</p> <p>Is she able to cope with complexity and ambiguity?</p> <p>Does she have difficulties taking financial decisions or understanding financial issues?</p>	Explain how does she build trust and rapport with others both within and outside the NPF; manages projects; shares her experiences with others; develops coaching tool; delivers consistent, positive (negative), and reinforcing messages to motivate people finds or creates special opportunities to promote people's development etc.
2	Management capacities	Focus group discussion (FGD) with staff	Background and experience of the staff with regard to performance
2.1	Senior management team	<p>What is the background of the 3 project managers of NPF?</p> <p>Do they bring a broad range of outstanding capabilities; outstanding track record of learning and personal development; contagiously energetic and committed?</p>	Explain if there is an extensive and varied experience of the management team of the NPF drawn from extraordinarily diverse backgrounds and experiences.
2.2	Staff	<p>Is their background and experience in accordance with project activities?</p> <p>Are they capable in multiply roles?</p>	Explain who is doing what, how many persons are involved in the project?
2.3	Shared references & practices	<p>Do you share references and practices between each other?</p> <p>How is this being done? (internships, periodically meetings ...)</p>	Explain if common set of references and practices exists, and whether and how it is shared and adopted by all members of NPF.
2.4	Goals, Performance	What about targets of your project?	Explain whether there are realistic (or unrealistic) yet demand-

	Targets	<p>Do they exist?</p> <p>Are they realistic?</p> <p>Are they linked with the organisation strategy?</p> <p>Do staff utilise targets and work to achieve them?</p>	ing targets in all areas; whether targets are tightly linked to overarching goals and strategy, quantifiable, outcome-focused, have annual milestones, and are long-term in nature.
2.5	Funding model	<p>Do you think that organisation has a strong dependence on donators?</p> <p>How do you think that organisation can manage to diversify the funding?</p> <p>Do you have developed sustainable revenue-generating activities?</p> <p>Have you / has the organisation organised fundraising activities?</p>	Potential donors.
2.6	Financial planning / budgeting	Do you have financial plans continuously updated? Is the budget integrated into all operations?	
2.7	Financial operations management	<p>Do you have strong governance and control systems of all financial operations?</p> <p>Where? How do they look like?</p>	
2.8	Operational Planning	Does the organisation have a detailed operational plan?	Explain whether there is a concrete, realistic and detailed operational plan developed and regularly refined; critical mass of internal expertise in operational planning, or efficient use of external, sustainable, highly qualified resources; operational planning exercise carried out regularly; operational plan tightly linked to strategic planning activities and systematically used to

			direct operations.
2.9	Human resources planning	How does the organisation and/or address HR needs? Are there job descriptions?	
2.10	Recruiting, development, & retention of management	Does the organisation have recruitment procedures for all promising staff members? Is there staff promotion?	
3	Operational capacity	Managers (project coordinators in Tirana, Elbasan, Korça, and Berat) FGD with staff	
3.1	Staffing levels	Are all positions of the organisation (project) adequately and appropriately staffed?	
3.2	Skills, abilities, & commitment of volunteers	Are the recruited staff of the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ well educated? ■ skilled? ■ culturally competent? ■ reliable? ■ loyal? ■ highly committed to organisation's success and to "making things happen"? 	
3.3	Communications and outreach	What are the marketing materials consistently used by the organisation? Which are the most used actions for the client outreach? Please provide examples.	
3.4	Telephone & fax	Which facilities, services infrastructure is	

	computers, applica- tions, network, & email, website	at the disposal of staff?	
3.5	Management of legal & liability matters	Are you licensed by MoLSAEO? By court decision?	Please explain if there is an effective, and efficient internal legal infrastructure for day-to-day legal work.

Annex 5: NPF strategic documents, monitoring and reporting system samples

NPF strategic documents and samples / templates of reporting tools used by NPF in the context of the CEFA VI project:

NPF Strategic Plan 2010-2015	 Adobe Acrobat Document
NPF Manual of Rules and Procedures	 Adobe Acrobat Document
NPF License issued by Tirana District Court	 Microsoft Word-Dokument
NPF Licence issued by National Licensing Centre	 Microsoft Word-Dokument
CEFA-VET Training Centre – cooperation agreement	 Microsoft Word-Dokument
CEFA Component 1 (education) beneficiary – case file template	 Microsoft Word-Dokument
CEFA Component 2 (VET) beneficiary – case file template	 Microsoft Word-Dokument

Annex 6: Workshops

Workshop 1 Agenda

Agenda
Workshop / Critical Review of CEFA Project
September 29, 2011
Hotel Grand, Korça, 13:00 – 17:00

Time	Topics	Responsible person
13:00–14:00	I. Welcome and opening II. Introduction 1. Workshop Agenda 2. Objectives and organisation of the Workshop 3. Workshop topics 4. Discussion on workshop topics, 5. Questions	Robert Stratobërdha (RS) Mirela Muca (MM)
14:00-15:30 Coffee break in between	Topics to be covered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficiaries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ direct and indirect ◦ age group ◦ success stories ◦ participation • Cooperation and Partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ sustainable cooperation ◦ tentative partners for the future ◦ good examples ◦ models to be “copied” • Activities (CEFA Classes; training of teachers, summer camps.....) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ difficulties faced ◦ positive impact ◦ the strengths and limitations • Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ the most visible results of the project ◦ immediate and long term ◦ indicators for measurement • Lessons learned <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ effective strategies • New strategies of intervention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Early Intervention and Preschool Services 	Working group 1 Moderator: RS Working group 2 Moderator: MM Working group 3 Moderator: MM
15:30- 16:00	Reporting from each group Reporter 1 10 min Reporter 2 10 min Reporter 3 10 min	
16:00- 16:30	Discussions	MM
16:30 – 17:00	Conclusions	MM

Workshop 1 Summary

Workshop 1

September 29, 2011

Hotel Grand, Korça, 13:00 – 17:00

Memo / Notes³⁵

Participants:

Note: 14 participants took part in the workshop 1; please see the list of participants at the end of the document.

The workshop was organised in the format of working groups, short presentations from each group, followed by discussions. The CEFA Project Coordinator, Robert Stratoberdha, opened the workshop by welcoming the participants. The workshop proceeded with the facilitator, Ms Mirela Muça and with an introduction of the agenda items and an agreement of all participants on the topics to discuss.

The CEFA Project Coordinator briefed participants on the activities and delivery progress of CEFA VI. He reiterated that the workshop should also be utilised to bring out the challenges and difficulties that NPF staff faced during CEFA implementation as well as the “potential changes of the CEFA project” in the future.

The second session of the workshop proceeded with working groups. The participants were divided into three groups, which worked for one hour independently from each other. Then a member of each group reported on the issues pointed out by the group. Each presentation was followed by discussions on the main topics. The workshop was concluded with a summary of the findings of all group presentations and the ensuing discussions.

(I) Direct and indirect beneficiaries of the CEFA project

Direct:

- Roma children of families who live in very bad social/economic situation
- Roma children who dropped out of school or are at risk to drop out (10-16 years old)

³⁵ Prepared by Mirela Muça, local evaluator, who also facilitated the workshop.

- Roma children 1-6 years unregistered and complex cases
- Youngsters who want to carry out a VET
- Roma families
- Roma community based organisations (CBO)

Indirect

- CEFA schools/classes
- CEFA Teachers
- Institutions (RED, municipality, SSS)
- (Roma) Community

Question related the topic, raised to be discussed:

1. Should CEFA extend/enlarge the group of beneficiaries or change it?

- Preschool children
- Youngsters

(II) Collaboration with main stakeholders in the future

- Beneficiaries, Roma families
- Donors
- MoES, MoLSAEO, RED, School
- MASH MPCSSH
- DAR

Question related to the topics:

1. Which of the central/local institutions CEFA could rely on in the future?

- Municipality (child protection unit)
- “Regional council” child rights unit
- Observatory of child rights
- National agency for child rights
- Project will maintain the network with community by providing them with relevant information in the area of education, training and employment opportunities

2. Which are the best practices CEFA should replicate in the future?

- Pre-school classes (of NPF) and summer camps
- Collaboration with referral body CPU-NPF-RED, to ensure a multidisciplinary service for children classified as very difficult cases
- Collaboration with Egyptian associates/associations

(III) Challenges faced during CEFA implementation:

- Facilitating employment of trained individuals and ensure their integration into the labour market
- Parents of working (street) children
- Insufficient services provided by local government

(IV) Next steps:

- Ensure financial sustainability of CEFA through better collaboration with local governments
- Promotion of CEFA values and best practices
- New strategies for interventions (work with parents on domestic violence issue)
- Redefine the priorities of Roma community in Korça
- Prepare the exit strategy

Workshop participants:

No.	Name Surname	Institution
1.	Robert Stratoberdha	Project Coordinator CEFA 6 Korça
2.	Mukades Koromani	Teacher CEFA classes Naim Frasher School Korça
3.	Oli Mile	RED Inspector Korça
4.	Eriketa Bejleri	Teacher CEFA classes Naim Frasher School Korça
5.	Mariana Jorgji	Child Protection Unite Korça Municipality
6.	Miranda Fejzo	NPF
7.	Alketa Zallani	Korça Municipality
8.	Fatime Xhambazi	Roma CBO
9.	Arlien Kosturi	Teacher of Roma language
10.	Artur Lamove	Roma CBO
11.	Rudina Lako	Social worker NPF
12.	Mirela Kapedani	Social worker NPF
13.	Irena Bozdo	State Social Services Regional Office Korça
14.	Entela Fejzo	Social worker NPF
	Mirela Muça	Evaluator / facilitator
	Harald Meier	Evaluator

Workshop 2 Agenda

Agenda
Workshop / CEFA Outlook
October 6, 2011
Tirana, 10:00 – 17:00

Time	Topics	Responsible person
10:00–10:30	I. Welcome and opening II. Introduction 1. Workshop Agenda 2. Objectives of the Workshop 3. Main findings 4. Questions	Shpresa Spahiu Mirela Muca
10:30-11:00	Plenary session Main topics to be discuss in the workshop 3 scenarios	Mirela Muca
11:00-11:45	Working group discussion (3 groups designed according the cities) Discussion on topics 1,2,3,4 Reporting Questions/ Answers	
5 minutes	Break	
10:50- 11.15	Working group discussion (2 mixed groups) Discussion on topics 5,6,7 Reporting Questions/ Answers	
5 minutes	Break	
11.20-14.10	Working group discussion (3 mixed groups) Discussion on scenario 1,2,3 (30 minutes each) Reporting Questions/ Answers	
	Minutes 5 break in between	
	Reporting from each group Reporter 1 10 min Reporter 2 10 min Reporter 3 10 min	
	Discussions	
16:30 – 17:00	Conclusions	Mirela

Workshop 2 Summary

Workshop 2

October 6, 2011

Tirana 10:00 – 17:00

Memo / Notes³⁶

Participants:

- Coordinators 4
- Teachers 2 (Tirana 1, Elbasan 1)
- Social workers 4 (Elbasan 1, Korça 1 Berat 1 Tirana 1)
- VET adviser 3 (Tirana 2, Elbasan 1)

Note: 13 participants took part in the workshop 2.

General Topics on CEFA component outcome

Q1. What are the factors that prevent children to go to school for each school context / municipality? Are there marked differences?

Regular factors for 4 cities

- **The Roma parents simply do not send their children to school.** Most of the Roma parents are illiterate or very poor educated; they simply think that the school is worthless and useless.
- **Social and economic conditions of Roma community.** High percentage of Roma community lives in extreme poverty. Parents are not able to pay for school supplies and other cost of the education.
- **Homeless families.** Homeless Roma families are forced to move from place to place. In these conditions the children loose their associations with the school.
- **Birth registration.** Roma children do not start attending primary school when they reach the compulsory age because either they are not registered at birth, or they live in another place of residence than where registered.
- **The quality of education services in school is poor.** In such cities like Tirana and Elbasan schools tend to be overcrowded with over 50-60 students per class. In these conditions the most discriminated students are Roma students, they usually stay in the last line, teachers do not pay attention to them, and students lose the interest for the school.

³⁶ Prepared by Mirela Muça, local evaluator, who also facilitated the Workshop.

- **Teachers are not trained to teach in multi cultural groups.** They have negative and punitive attitudes toward Roma children.
- **Distance from school and lack of transport.** Roma children drop out of school because they live in significant distance from school and lack transport to school.
- **Marriages in yearly ages** of girls.
- **Working children**, Roma children, boys and girls, work for money or to help at home their parents to take care on younger brothers.

Are there marked differences? Specifics in the municipalities:

Tirana:

- Extreme poverty of Roma community. The selected community to implement CEFA in Tirana is the poorest and the most isolated community among Roma communities in the city.
- Lack of adequate programs that support Roma children to enrol school.
- Children without parental care and supervision. There are many Roma children whose parents live abroad and children are under supervision of their grandfathers.
- Street children.

Korça

- Migration/ Emigration. High rate of drop out school by Roma children due to seasonal emigration of their families in Greece.
- Lack of preschool education.
- Low level of parenting.
- No adequate policies at local level to enrol Roma in school as well as identifying, registering, and monitoring them.

Berat

- A big number of single-parents.
- Roma community in Barat are geographically and socially isolated.
- Poor knowledge of Albanian Language.
- Increase of number of Roma families that move abroad due to liberalisation of the visa regime.
- Roma drop out is not consider a serious issue by local government

Elbasan

- Lack of services for early childhood.
- Parents can not manage to send children to school every day.
- Teachers are unable or unwilling to accept Roma children in their classes.
- Negative peer influence.

Q2. Did CEFA adapt its approach/activities depending on the specifics of the communities?

Tirana:

- CEFA teachers/social workers monitor not only enrolment, but also daily attendance. Social workers get every day the problematic children at school, such as children without parental care (those that are living with their grandparents).

- CEFA staff works closely with schools. CEFA use its specific power in enforcing school. Knowing very well Roma families, CEFA provides school with accurate information about Roma children (at risk) who will reach school age by the start of the next school year.

Korça + Elbasan

- CEFA teachers help to create a friendly atmosphere in school, and try to encourage out of school activities for Roma (Roma day).
- CEFA staff has intervened at Korça municipality for housing of homeless Roma .
- Provide support for Roma children in their living.

Berat

- CEFA staff provided counselling to Roma families for receiving immunisation or health services.
- Support to / working with Roma children exploited and maltreated by their parents.

Q3. What are the achievements (passing rate) of CEFA classes? How do we measure the education outcome of a child participating at CEFA class? (100 % passing does not mean 100% writing and reading)

- Statistics collected by CEFA are reliable. They are equivalent with official statistics collected by the school.
- CEFA students read and write when they finished the first class.
- CEFA students' performance is measured in the same way as normal students. The performance indicators are the same for CEFA and non CEFA.

Q 4. Can we assume that changes in behaviour within the Roma community towards education have occurred because of CEFA project? How can we measure it?

- Increased enrolment of Roma students in the school.
- Roma parents are more focused on the quality of classes (learning outcomes and learning achievements).
- Increased participation of parents in the school activities.
- On average, increased the number of years of schooling completed by Roma children.
- Increased the interest for VET.

Q 5. How do we measure the impact of the VET component? (just to receive a profession or an opportunity to start a business, are they employed or self employed , earning more than before VET, is there steady income)

- The number of persons employed (or self employed) compared to the number of persons who received VET.
- The number of youngsters who require a VET course in a year.
- The number of persons who manage to have steady income.

Q 6. Statistics doesn't show the impacts of the CEFA. What can we do? Can NPF do it or is necessary to have an external support?

- Develop a specific register for CEFA classes defining the kinds of information and the ways it should be gathered.
- Improve the data-gathering systems at CEFA schools, developing criteria that would not be susceptible to various interpretations.

Q 7. If we have statistics how we can use them/outcomes?

- Study the causes of various phenomena and their impact on the process of education. Based on the results, develop recommendations for improving work in CEFA classes.
- Define precisely the groups of potential families in risk, which need special support and assistance, in order to prevent school drop out by younger children and facilitate their normal enrolment.
- Develop and, with state support, implement in-service training programs for school administrations and teachers to assist them in improving work with truants, students repeating the grade, and other children at risk within schools.

Note: Q 1+Q2+Q3+Q4: Working group according to cities; Q5 +Q6 +Q7: Working groups of six participants

Topics according to 3 scenarios

Scenario 1: CEFA ends in June 2012

What CEFA needs to do next coming months until the end of the project? (to keep CEFA alive)

- Till end of project (June 2012) NPF should invest its energies and resources in writing project proposals, lobbying for potential donators.
- CEFA staff should further develop the tools and strategies it has exercised through the CEFA project in order to capitalise on the CEFA experience and advertise or put it for the market.
- CEFA staff should strive to develop more innovative and effective ways to improve services, as well as to refine the use of social workers and VET advisers to better address the problems of Roma community. These services may include e.g. health (sexually transmitted diseases) and services for the Roma and non Roma families with social problems (children with disabilities, single parenting mothers, young people), and day care services.
- NPF should use its influence in the respective DARs to ensure that competent staff involved with the CEFA project remain engaged, despite its end, thus ensuring the continuity of CEFA philosophy in schools where dropping out is a problem of both majority and Roma.
- NPF should amplify the efforts to find potential donors for CEFA as well as for other similar activities in education, VET, and social services at home/community.

Q.2 How NPF can be adapted in the new situation? (need for donor support, consultancy, exit strategy...)

- NPF will continue to respond to the urgent needs of Roma community through similar projects as CEFA. As far as the support of NPF for Roma is concerned, NPF will continue to require further support from donors, including particularly SDC.
- Based on a deep organisational analysis, NPF should define new areas of interventions in accordance with its mission and organisation profile.
- It should also refine the management structure, resource arrangements, and staffing.

Q.3 What risks are associated with the end of the CEFA project? (related to beneficiaries Roma, schools, parents, donor, education system...)

- June 2012 is an unrealistic end date because CEFA project deliverables are supposed to continue beyond 2012. In this situation CEFA should ensure the gradual integration of CEFA student in the normal classes (students above 10 years old, who are in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th). So, first of all the end of the project risks direct beneficiaries, Roma students currently in CEFA classes.
- End of CEFA risks CEFA model and approach. DARs in four cities are not able to host all the components of the CEFA classes to ensure the continuity of CEFA activities, because of insufficient finances and staff.
- End of CEFA risks that all human capacities built thanks to CEFA are lost.
- Thanks to CEFA approaches, Roma community participation and involvement in the schools problems as ameliorated. End of CEFA will interrupt relations created thanks to CEFA mechanisms (social workers, VET advisers or economic incentives).
- End of CEFA is associated with the risk that all records and statistics created through years are lost.
- The local government will loose a good partner for referring social cases.

Scenario 2: CEFA will continue with a reduced budget

Q.1: Which elements of the project can be reduced in the future, why (activities with less impact...) and in which way?

- Community development

Scenario 3: CEFA will continue with the same budget

Q.1: How can NPF work with central government organisation? How do you see NPF role? (monitoring organisation, watch dog organisation, consultant role)

- NPF can play both, watch dog and technical consultant role for the specific services that NPF used to exercise successfully through CEFA. Whatever the case, NPF could easily work with central and local government institution based on a consultancy contract.

Q.2: What are the potential benefits in case of a collaboration of NPF with an international organisation?

- The primary purpose of collaborations (consortiums / partnerships) is to bring different expertise, experience, capacity and competencies together. In this perspective, NPF could bring expertise and experience gained during 12 CEFA years and the international organisation could bring the effectiveness to influence the national policies and programs (in particular budgeting of national strategies and action plans).
- NPF could be part of a multi-disciplinary team that fulfils a project implementer/agent role. For example, international partner could take responsibility for all the systematic institutional development components within a programme or project. NPF can be sub-contracted as an implementing agency to fulfil specific roles, for example technical planning, promotion, facilitating institutional arrangements, etc. NPF could also play a useful role within a collaboration or consortium in terms of making recommendations as to the most appropriate approach (models) to implementing different types of education projects that address drop out.

Q.3: What preparation should be done in this case?

- NPF should capitalise on its experience gained during 12 years implementing CEFA project.
- Preparatory phase to support in service training for teachers, facilitating the improvement of knowledge and skills in working with students on the verge of dropping out and their families.

Q.4: In case of a new CEFA phase, what will be done differently in each of the cities?

Tirana

- Extend the CEFA project involving Roma and non Roma communities, to ensure integration of Roma students.
- Re-design CEFA including preschool classes.
- Design modules on multiculturalism for teachers and students. Modules can be used in extra classes.
- In collaboration with RED, NPF can design and deliver training on multiculturalism for the teachers of all schools in Tirana.

Berat

- CEFA activities should be more focus on education and VET.
- The component of family empowerment should be substitute with community empowerment.

Korça

- Build up stronger relations with municipality.
- Collaborate with other NGOs (such as Kennedy foundation), exchanging experience and identifying best practices to build relation with municipality.

Elbasan

- Work closely with RED to open pre-school classes in CEFA schools.
- Seek opportunities to improve cooperation with families, emphasising the development of parenting knowledge and skills, as well as providing economic support through social assistance scheme.

Workshop participants:

Nr.	Name surname	Institution	Responsibility
1.	Entela Fejzo	CEFA Korça	Social worker
2.	Robert Stratoberdha	CEFA Korça	Coordinator
3.	Miranda Fejzo	CEFA Korça	VET advisor
4.	File Kolndreu	CEFA Elbasan	Teacher
5.	Merenxa Beqiri	CEFA Elbasan	Social worker
6.	Ornela Zhuka	CEFA Elbasan	Teacher
7.	Mihail	CEFA Elbasan	Coordinator
8.	Palla	CEFA Berat	Coordinator
9.	Elvira Tarizi	CEFA Tirana	Social worker
10.	Ilir Kolla	CEFA Tirana	VET advisor
11.	Eleni Hysi	CEFA Berat	Social worker
12.	Edmond Disho	CEFA Elbasan	VET advisor
13.	Shpresa Spahiu	NPF	Executive director
	Mirela Muça	External Consultant	Evaluator / facilitator

Annex 7: Interview Guidelines

Basel, 22 September 2011

Interview Guidelines: External Review of the Alternated Education and Vocational Training Project – Phase VI (CEFA VI)

Dear Madam or Sir,

The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) commissioned us to perform an external review of the Alternated Education and Vocational Training (CEFA), Phase VI project.

The project, implemented by the non-governmental organisation *Ndihmë për fëmijët* (NPF), aims to support social inclusion of Roma with a set of interventions in the field of education and vocational education and training. The current phase started in May 2009 and was designed for a period of three years. The project's activities are implemented in selected municipalities in Albania, namely Tirana, Berat, Elbasan and Korça.

The purpose of the review is to assess and appraise to what extent the CEFA VI reached its planned objectives, purposes and results to date. Moreover, the review shall provide recommendations for the future strategic and/or operational direction of an eventual forthcoming project phase. Lastly, we seek to appraise the organisational development and performance of the implementing partner, NPF.

The review is based on an examination of project documents as well as information and data that will be collected through a series of semi-structured interviews. The interviews will include a set of pre-formulated questions but also new questions will be brought up during the interview as a result of your responses.

The interviews will look at different evaluation themes, key points of which are mentioned below:

- *Effectiveness:* We will seek to measure the extent to which the activities in the project attained their intended objectives. We furthermore seek to answer what were the key factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives. Also, whether the project management arrangements are clear and whether they support institutional strengthening and local ownership.

- *Efficiency*: Our evaluation will look at the qualitative and quantitative outputs in relation to the inputs that were invested. We will seek to assess NPF's performance, whether the newly designed project organisation enhanced efficiency and whether there are alternative ways to provide the various CEFA VI services at lower cost.
- *Impact*: The overall aim is to evaluate whether CEFA VI's project work produced positive (or negative) changes, directly or indirectly, planned or unplanned. Questions: What has happened as a result of the project; what difference did the project or its activities make for the beneficiaries?
- *Sustainability*: Sustainability shall measure whether the benefits of the CEFA VI or the processes it instituted are likely to continue after an eventual completion of the project.

We have approximately 45 to 60 minutes at our disposal for the interview; we will undertake best efforts to maximise the use of the (limited) time.

We do appreciate receiving written documents e.g. a bullet point listing of your thoughts on the CEFA VI and its performance, including your ideas and pertinent recommendations for a forthcoming phase; also presentations of the activities and outputs are very welcome.

Finally, we confirm that all data, information and/or (critical) comments we receive from you will only be used for the purposes of this evaluation and will not be shared with third parties.

We thank you already at this stage for your readiness to participate in the interviews. Looking forward to meeting and to discussing your opinion and ideas with you we remain,

With best regards,

Harald Meier and Mirela Muça

Basel, 22 Shtator 2011

Udhëzues për proçesin e intervistimit: Rishikimi dhe vleresimi i jashtëm i Projektit Arësimi Alternativ dhe Formimi Profesional-Faza VI

I/e nderuae zonjë/zoteri

Agjencia Zvicerane për Zhvilim dhe Bashkëpunim (SDC) na ka ngarkuar të kryejmë një vlerësim të jashtëm të projektit CEFA, për fazën VI.

Projekti i implementuar nga një OJF *Ndihmë për fëmijët* (NPF), ka për qëllim të mbështesë përfshirjen sociale të Romëve me disa ndërhyrje në fushën e edukimit dhe formimit profesional. Faza të cilën do të vlerësojmë ka filluar të vihet në zbatim në Maj 2009 dhe është menduar të zgjase 3 vjet. Aktivitetet e projektit janë zhvilluar në bashkitë e Tiranës, Beratit, Elbasanit dhe Korçës.

Qëllimi i rishikimit të projektit është të vleresoje se deri në çfare mase CEFA VI ka arritur objektivat, synimet dhe aktivitetet e planifikuara. Ajo çfarë është me e rëndësishme është se ky vleresim do të ofroje rekomandime që lidhen me drejtimin e zhvillimit operacional dhe strategjik per fazën e ardhshme të projektit. Së fundi, ne synojme të vlerësojmë zhvillimin edhe performancën organizative të NPF si partner implementues i projektit. Vleresimi është bazuar në ekzaminimin e dokumentave të projektit si dhe ne informacionin dhe të dhënat që do te mblidhen nëpermjet intervistave gjysëm të strukturuara. Intervistat do të perfshijnë një numër pyetjesh të parapergatitura, por edhe pyetje të tjera te cilat do të lindin si rezultat i përgjigjeve të marra gjatë intervistikës.

Gjate vleresimit, intervistuesit do te perqendrohen ne disa tema kryesore, çështjet kyçë të të cilave do të jenë si më poshtë:

- *Efektiviteti:* Nëpërmjet këtij vleresimi ne do të mundohemi të gjejmë se deri në çfarë mase aktivitetet e zhvilluara kanë arritur objektivat e vendosura në projekt. Gjithashtu ne do të identifikojmë faktorët që kanë ndikuar në arritjen ose mos arritjen e ketyre objektivave, si dhe do të vlerësojmë nëse sistemi i menaxhimit i projektit është i qarte dhe funksional, dhe nese ky sistem ndihmon ne fuqizimin institucional dhe nese eshte i përshtatshëm për kushtet e organizatave vendore.
- *Eficiencia:* Vleresimi jone synon te hedhe një veshtrim mbi rezultatet cilesore dhe sasiore të perfittuar nga projekt, krasuar me inputet e investuara në të. Ne do të synojmë të vlerësojmë rezultatet e arritura nga NFP për të kuptuar se sa organizimi i ri i projektit, ka arritur të përmirësojë eficiencën dhe nëse egzistojnë mënyra alternative për ofrimin e shërbimeve të ndryshme të CEFA me një kosto më të ulët.

- *Ndikimi:* Qëllimi i përgjithshëm është të vlersohet nëse projekti CEFA VI, në mënyrë të drejtpërdrejtë ose jo të drejtpërdrejtë, ka prodhuar ndryshime positive (ose negative), qofshin këto të planifikuara ose të paplanifikuara të ndodhnin. Pyetje: Çfarë dukurish të reja janë vënë re si rezultat i projektit, çfarë ndryshimi ka sjellë projekt i ose aktivitetet e tij përfituesit.
- *Qëndrueshmëri:* Qëndrueshmërija do të matet me atë se sa efektet positive të prodhuara nga CEFA VI ose proceset të cilave ajo ju dha jetë kanë të ngjarë të vazhdojnë edhe pasi projekt i ketë përfunduar.

Ne kemi afërsisht 45 deri 60 minuta në dispozicion për intervistën; ne duhet të përpinqemi të shfrytëzojmë kohën e kufizuar sa më mire.

Do të vlersonim shumë nëse do mund të merrnim prej jush një dokument me çështjet dhe mendimet e renditura lidhur me CEFA VI dhe rezultatet e arritura prej saj, përfshirë idetë dhe rekomandimet tuaja në lidhje me fazën e ardhëshme; po kështu me vlerë do të ishin dhe prezantimi i aktiviteteve dhe arritjeve të projektit.

Së fundi, ne ju sigurojmë se të gjithë të dhënat, informacioni, dhe/ose komentet (qoftë dhe ato kritike) që do të marrim prej jush do të përdoren vetëm për procesin e vlerësimit dhe nuk do të bëhen të njoitura palëve të treta.

Ne ju falenderojmë për gadishmërinë për të marrë pjesë në intervistat. Presim me padurim të diskutojmë me ju mendimet dhe idetë tuaja në lidhje me sa më sipër.

Ju faleminderit,

Harald Meier dhe Mirela Muça

Annex 8: Interview Partners

Name	Position	Organisation / Institution
Nathalie Barbancho	Programme Manager	Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (via email)
Anne Savary	Deputy Country Director	Swiss Cooperation Office Albania
Silvana Mjeda	National Programme Officer	Swiss Cooperation Office Albania
H.E. Yvana Enzler	Ambassador	Swiss Embassy
Shpresa Spahiu	Executive Manager	Foundation Ndihmë për fëmijët
Robert Stratobërdha	CEFA Coordinator	Foundation Ndihmë për fëmijët
Llazar Palla	CEFA Coordinator	Foundation Ndihmë për fëmijët
Enkelejda Sula	Project Acquisition Manager	Foundation Ndihmë për fëmijët (via email)
Nora Malaj	Deputy Minister	Ministry of Education and Science
Gramoz Bregu	Roma Focal Point	Ministry of Education and Science
Entela Lako	Programme Analyst (Social Inclusion)	United Nations Development Programme
Bujar Taho	National Project Manager	United Nations Development Programme
Blerina Zoto Tepelena	Head of the Roma Technical Secretariat	Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunity
Detlef Palm	Representative in Albania	United Nations Children's Fund
Mirlinda Bushati	Project Officer	United Nations Children's Fund
Astrid Wein	Head of Office	Austrian Development Agency
Florence Qosja	Deputy Head of Office	Austrian Development Agency
Dritan Nelaj	Roma & Education Program Coordinator	Fond for an Open Society Albania
Marsela Taho	Country facilitator Albania and Kosovo	Roma Education Fund
Eben Friedmann	Country facilitator Albania and Kosovo	Roma Education Fund
Peter Evans	Consultant	United Nations Children's Fund
Sendrine Constant	Country Representative	Terre des Hommes Albania
Stefano Calabretta	Programme Manager	Delegation of the European Union to Albania

Andrea Chalupova	Human Rights Officer	Delegation of the European Union to Albania
Irene Bozda	Social Services Department	Regional Directorate, State Social Service, Berat Office
Julinda Vokopola	Child Protection Unit	Berat Municipality
Mariana Jorgji	Child Protection Unit	Korça Municipality
Alketa Zallami	Social Service Office	Korça Municipality
Vilma Petro	Social Service Office	Korça Municipality
Ilir Gedeshi	Researcher	
Albina Nuredina	School Director	26 Nentori School in Tirana
Klodjan Seferaj	Council of Ministers	Coordinator, Department of Strategy and Donor Coordination

Note: The list does not contain all direct beneficiaries (children, parents, trainees), teachers, NGO representatives and CEFA social workers etc. we met and interviewed during the field mission, including at the schools 26 Nentori Tirana, Naim Frasheri Korça and Shyqyri Laka in Berat.

Annex 9: Field Mission Plan



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
 Confédération suisse
 Confederazione Svizzera
 Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Cooperation Office Albania

Programme for External Review of CEFA project – Albania Harald Meier and Mirela Muça 26 September-06 October 2011
--

Final

Date	Time	What	Where	Who	Status
26.09.2011 Mon	23:50	Arrival Austrian (Basel-Vienna-Tirana)	Rinas	HM, Taxi	confirmed
	00:45	Check-in at Hotel Theranda		HM	confirmed
27.09.2011 Tue	08:15-08:40	Meeting of the evaluators	Theranda Hotel	HM, MM	confirmed
	09:00-10:30	Briefing	SCO-A	SAV, MJESI	confirmed
	11:00-13:00	Meeting with NPF (Executive Director and CEFA manager)	NPF'HO	Shpresa Spahiu (NPF ED), Robert Stratoberdha (CEFA Manager)	confirmed
	13:30-14:30	Meeting at UNDP	ABA building	Entela Lako Cluster Manager Bujar Taho Manager for Roma Project	confirmed
	15:00 –16:00	Meeting at Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities	MoLSAEO	Blerina Tepelena, Head of Technical Secretariat	confirmed
	16:30 -17:30	Meeting at TdH	TdH	Sendrine Constant, Country Delegate for Albania	confirmed
28.09.2011 Wed	08:30-09:30	Meeting with Roma Education Fund (REF)	SCO-A	Marsela Taho, REF Country Facilitator for Albania	confirmed
	09:30-11:15	Meeting with SDC-A and among evaluators	SCO-A	MJESI	ad hoc; as response to changed schedule
	11:30-14:00	Visit of CEFA Project at 26 Nentori School in Tirana (meeting with the Director, the CEFA teachers, Roma kids, beneficiary families living in the neighbourhood next to the school).	26 Nentori school	Albina Nuredini Director	confirmed
	14:00-18:00	Workshop 1 preparation	SCO-A	MJESI	confirmed
	19:45-20:30	Meeting at Ministry of Education and Sciences (Deputy Minister who co-chairs the CEFA'SC)	SCO-A	Nora Malaj, Deputy Minister	confirmed
29.09.2011	07:30-12:00	Travel to Korca		Driver, BE	confirmed

	13:00-17:00	Workshop 1 in Korca (with state and non state stakeholders operating in Korca including Roma representatives from the advisory board)	NPF Office	HM, MM, 12+ participants	confirmed
30.09.2011 Fri	08:00-09:00	Meeting at Municipality with Child Protection Unit	Municipality	Driver, BE	confirmed
	09:30-10:30	Meeting at Prefecture (Social Services Department)	Prefecture		confirmed
	11:00-13:30	Visit of CEFA Project at Naim Frasher School in Korca (meeting with the Director, the CEFA teachers, Roma kids, beneficiary families living in the neighbourhood next to the school)	Naim Frasher School		confirmed
	13:45-14:30	Visit of CEFA Project Office	CEFA Project Office	CEFA Coordinator, Administrator	confirmed
	14:30-18:45	Travel back to Tirana		Driver	confirmed
	20:30-22:00	Meeting with Peter Evans, Consultant to UNICEF on Social Service/Protection Delivery Reform	Hotel Mondial, Tirana		confirmed
03.10.2011 Mon	06:00-08:30	Travel to Berat		Driver, BE	confirmed
	09:00-10:00	Meeting at Regional Education Department with the Director	RED	Director	confirmed
	10:30-11:30	Meeting at Municipality (Social Services Department)	Municipality		confirmed
	12:00-14:30	Visit of CEFA Project at Shyqyri Laka School in Berat (meeting with the Director, the CEFA teachers, Roma kids, beneficiary families living in the neighbourhood next to the school)	Shyqyri Laka School		confirmed
	14:00-15:00	Visit of CEFA Project Office	CEFA Project Office	CEFA Coordinator, Social Workers	confirmed
	15:00-18:00	Travel back to Tirana		Driver	
04.10.2011 Tue	09:30-10:15	Meeting at Swiss Embassy in Albania	Swiss Embassy	H.E. Ms. Yvana Enzler Swiss Ambassador	confirmed
	10:30-11:30	Meeting at Soros Foundation	Soros	Dritan Nelaj Project officer	confirmed
	13:00-14:00	Meeting at Department of Strategy and Donor Coordination (DSDC)	Council of Ministers	Klodian Seferaj Coordinator	confirmed
	14:30-15:30	Meeting at EU Delegation	ABA building	Andrea Chalupova Human Rights Officer Stefano Calabretta Program Manager	confirmed

	15:00-17:00	Meeting at UNICEF	UNICEF	Linda Bushati, Project Officer Roma Focal Point Detlef Palm, Representative	confirmed
	17:15-18:00	Meeting with Roma Focal Point at Ministry of Education	SCO-A	Gramoz Bregu, MoE Roma Focal Point	confirmed
	18:00-19:00	Preparation for workshop 2	SCO-A	MJESI	confirmed
05.10.2011 Wed	08:00-09:00	Meeting with a researcher, local evaluator for CEFA IV	SCO-A	Ilir Gedeshi	confirmed
	09:30-12:30	Preparation for workshop 2	SCO-A	MJESI	confirmed
	13:00-17:00	Preparation for debriefing	SCO-A		confirmed
	17:30-19:30	Debriefing	SCO-A	SAV, MJESI	confirmed
06.10.2011 Thu	10:00-18:00	Workshop 2 (with NPF and CEFA team)	NPF	MM, 12+ participants	confirmed
06.10.2011 Thu	04:25	Departure Austrian (Tirana-Vienna-Basel)	Rinas	HM, Taxi	confirmed

Important telephone numbers (check also "Security Guidelines Albania"):

- SCO-A: 00355 4 224 01 02
- PER / Isabel Perich 00355 68 20 80 791
- SAV / Anne Savary 00355 68 20 29 645
- MJESI / Silvana Mjeda 00355 68 60 33 123
- LIKDI / Diana Lika 00355 68 20 57 177
- MM/Mirela Muca 00355 69 20 86 815
- HM/Harald Meier 00355 67 33 83 578
- BE/Ergys Bezhani (translator) 00355 68 20 27 068

Annex 10: Literature (selected)

CEFA VI Project Document (including Annexes and revised Annexes): Alternated Education and Vocational Training (CEFA), Phase VI, April 2009

CEFA VI Technical Report (May 2009-June 2010), (July 2010-June 2011); CEFA VI Narrative Report (July-December 2010); NPF Yearly Plan of Operations (YPO) 2010 and 2011

Final Report External Review CEFA, Amriswil, March 2008

CEFA VI Agreements and Contracts, financial reports, Steering Committee Statute and Minutes, and selected technical outputs, visibility material; laws related to education system in Albania

NPF Strategic Plan 2010 – 2015 and Manual of Policies and Procedures

SDC Concept Note for sub-domain „Social Inclusion“, 11.04.2011

Swiss Cooperation Strategy with Albania (2010-2014)

National Strategy for Development and Integration (2007-2013)

National Strategy for Improving Roma Living Condition (2003-2015)

National Strategy for Social Inclusion (2007-2013)

National Education Strategy (2004-2015)

Strategy on Gender Equality and Eradication of Domestic Violence (2007-2010)

Decade of Roma Inclusion (2005-2015)

Albania 2011 Progress Report, European Commission, SEC(2011) 1205, Brussels, 12.10.2011

Report on the National Conference: Roma Empowerment: An Approach for Inclusive Development, NPF, Tirana, 31 March 2011

Country Assessment Albania, Roma Education Fund, 2011 (forthcoming)

At Risk: Social Vulnerability of Roma in Albania, UNDP, 2006

Educational situation of Roma children in Albania, Study Report, UNICEF / Save the Children, Tirana, 2007

Discussion Paper: Preventing Social Inclusion through the Europe 2020 Strategy. Early Childhood Development and the Inclusion of Roma Families, UNICEF, European Social Observatory, Belgian Federal Planning Service (Ministry) for Social Integration, 2010

Towards Roma Inclusion. A Review of Roma Education Initiatives in Central and South-Eastern Europe, UNICEF, February 2010

Education of Roma children in Europe, Final Report Expert Meeting, UNESCO and Council of Europe, September 2007

The 10 Common Basic Principles on Roma Inclusion, European Union, June 2009

Websites (selected):

<http://www.npf.al>

<http://www.swiss-cooperation.admin.ch/albania/>

<http://ec.europa.eu/roma>

<http://ec.europa.eu/roma>

<http://www.ref.org>