

## Review of the life skills education programme: Maldives



December 2015

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS – Revise the pages numbers**

Acknowledgements	p. 2
Acronyms	p. 3
<b>1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>p. 1</b>
<b>2. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>p. 3</b>
2.1 Country context	p. 4
2.2 Education in the Maldives	p. 4
2.3 Life Skills Education (LSE)	p. 5
2.4 The LSE program in the Maldives	p. 5
<b>3. EVALUATION DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>p. 9</b>
3.1 Evaluation purpose, objective and scope	p. 9
3.2 Evaluation criteria and questions	p. 10
3.3 Evaluation methodology	p. 10
<b>4. FINDINGS</b>	<b>p. 14</b>
4.1 Relevance	p. 14
4.2 Coverage	p. 16
4.3 Efficiency	p. 20
4.4 Effectiveness	p. 23
4.5 Sustainability	p. 25
4.6 UNICEF added value	p. 26
4.7 Good practices and lessons learned	p. 27
<b>5. CASE STUDIES</b>	<b>p. 28</b>
<b>6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>p. 31</b>
6.1 Summary of findings	p. 31
6.2 Conclusion	p. 32
6.3 Recommendations	p. 33
<b>ANNEXES</b>	<b>p. 36</b>
Annex 1 – Field mission schedule	
Annex 2 – Analytical framework	
Annex 3 – List of documents reviewed	
Annex 4 – List of project stakeholders interviewed	
Annex 5 – School grades and sex of students who participated to FGDs	
Annex 6 – Inception report and data collection tools	
Annex 7 – Terms of Reference for the LSE review	
Annex 8 – Content of LSE program manuals	

Special thanks go to all the students, parents and school personnel who took time to participate in an interview or to a focus group discussion and share their experiences and views on the LSE program.

The review was conducted by Mr Tamo Wagener, an external consultant selected by UNICEF Maldives and the Ministry of Education (MoE), with the daily support of Ms Nasira Sadiq (Education Development Officer at the MoE).

Ms Fathimath Azza and Mr Hussain Rasheed from the MoE facilitated and supervised the review process. This work could not have taken place without their support.

## Acronyms

ASRH	Adolescents Sexual and Reproductive Health
CFBS	Child Friendly Baraabaru Schools
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CHSE	Center for Higher Secondary Education
ESQID	Educational Supervision and Quality Improvement Division
FCPD	Family and Child Protection Department (in the Maldives Police Service)
FCSC	Family and Children Service Centre
GoM	Government of Maldives
HPA	Health Protection Authority
JJU	Juvenile Justice Unit (at the Ministry of Home Affairs)
LSE	Life Skills Education
MoE	Ministry of Education
NDA	National Drug Agency
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIE	National Institute for Education
PTA	Parents and Teachers Association
SHE	Society for Health Education
SMT	Senior Management Team
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Maldivian Ministry of Education (MoE) has initiated an extra-curricular Life Skills Education (LSE) Program for secondary schools students and out of school children in 2004. This program was developed with the support of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and focused on aspects related to Adolescents Sexual and Reproductive Health. From 2011 to 2015, UNICEF Maldives supported the Ministry of Education to develop and implement Life skills education to:

- 1) Boost students' knowledge and skills to enhance their personal and social competence to resist risky situations that impact on their well-being such as drugs, HIV/AIDS, sexual health and others.
- 2) To strengthen institutional capacity at the Ministry of Education and schools to roll out the school-based Life Skills Education (LSE) programme for students in secondary schools across the country.

The purpose of this review is to:

1. Review the progress achieved so far
2. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the programme, challenges encountered and propose recommendation to addressing them.
3. Review the national curriculum and curriculum materials to identify how LSE is integrated and to make recommendations to strengthen delivery through the curriculum.

The review specifically assessed issues of relevance, coverage, efficiency of delivery, effectiveness, sustainability of the LSE programme and UNICEF additionally. Key findings of the review identified several strengths in the design and implementation of the programme. It was found that:

- The concept of LSE is well understood and valued by policy makers as well as by the different stakeholders at school level (students, teachers and parents). For instance, teachers have very high perception of benefits of LSE on the behaviour of children, students think they should receive more LSE and parents interviewed think children should receive more LSE, particularly generic skills.
- There is very high level commitment to institutionalize LSE in schools. The programme is fully aligned with the Child-friendly Schools framework and the School Improvement, Quality Assessment and Accountability Framework (SIQAAF).
- A broad set of Life Skills starting from pre-school are integrated in the new National Education Curriculum which is being rolled out since 2015. This is a good strategy for mainstreaming LSE, and further sustaining it in schools.
- The LSE program design is appropriate (as per 2011 operational framework). The content, methodology and materials are age appropriate and adapted to the needs and situations of students.
- The quality of training provided to LSE facilitators was high and had a good coverage.

In addition to the strengths, a number of weaknesses in the implementation of the LSE programme were also highlighted in the review. Key findings revealed that:

- Although, issues of drug use by adolescents and exploitation of adolescents in the drug trade are key challenges facing adolescents in Maldives, skills on handling these issues have not been integrated into LSE materials. Further, issues of child abuse which are also on the increase in Maldives, are addressed in a limited manner (in one single module between Grade 6 and Grade 11). Although the MoE, in addressing these issues, developed a separate manual in 2011 for facilitators giving greater attention to drug and child abuse issues, the review did not find indications that this manual had actually been used LSE sessions with students. The review also finds that web related issues facing Maldivian children are not addressed in the Life Skills packs.
- There are no clear operational guidelines or standards used in implementation of the LSE program. Ufaa, the implementing department within the Ministry of Education, has however drafted guidelines for LSE facilitators in 2015, and though not yet finalized, they are providing some level of guidance to the facilitators.
- There was limited monitoring / assessments of LSE program despite, the *Scheme for the Monitoring and Evaluation of Life Skills Programmes* presenting possible monitoring and evaluation systems. No data providing information on the implementation of the LSE program appears to be recorded and collated.
- Program is overall not getting high results for its inputs. LSE education to students in secondary school is happening in a limited and non-consistent fashion, outside of the established standards.
- Although this trainings were designed as the starting point of larger capacity building effort, the LSE facilitators have not received any further support or guidance on LSE.

Based on the weaknesses and key challenges identified, the following recommendations are proposed.

- MoE to ensure that LSE components part of the new National Education Curriculum are effectively implemented
- MoE to reinforce extra-curricular LSE program to complement curriculum based LSE and to reach children out of school.
- MoE to participate to the reinforcement of the national and atoll based child protection systems.
- UNICEF to support MoE to roll out the new National Education Curriculum effectively.
- UNICEF to support MoE to design a capacity building system (building upon the existing TRC scheme) for schools to benefit from practical support and hands on capacity building.
- UNICEF should support MoE to gradually transform the LSE activity of Ufaa, from being a “core” service provider to becoming a more specialized service provider that would be fillings gaps in the curriculum based LSE and providing services to out of school children and youth.

.....

## 2. INTRODUCTION

### 2.1 Country context

The development of the Maldives is in many aspects a success story. In the early 1980s, the country was one of the world's 20 poorest countries, with a population of 156,000. Today, with a population of 402,071, it is a middle-income country with a per capita income of over \$6,300<sup>1</sup>.

Male', the capital city of the Maldives, is one of the world's most densely populated cities. Traffic is fierce; there is very little open space, and a lot of concrete. Children spend a lot of their free time indoors and more and more online. Life in the atolls is very different, and in many respects far more child friendly. For children in the atolls, the beach or the sports fields tends to be where they spend their free time.

Maldives tops the internet usage in South Asia with 49 percent of the population using internet in 2014, according to the latest internet usage data published by the World Bank. Although no statistics are available it is obvious that the large majority of adolescents access internet on their personal devices (smart phones mostly) and that although the proportion might be lower in the islands, the Maldivian children overall have a high access to internet.

It is interesting to note that “the overall trend of decrease in poverty incidence over the period 2002/03 to 2009/10 consists of two components: decrease of poverty in the atolls and increase of poverty in the capital. Statistics itself cannot explain this pattern. It needs further analysis to understand its causes. One possible cause behind the rising poverty in Male' could be the increasing influx of poor people from other islands; such assumption needs however to be verified.”<sup>2</sup>

The International Labor Organisation (ILO) also points that the Maldives have experienced a sharp increase in unemployment and discouragement in recent years, especially among youth and women, even while nearly half of the total employed workforce is foreign. While there are insufficient numbers of Maldivians with the necessary skills to secure the top-end jobs, lower skilled or unskilled Maldivians appear to be unwilling or unable to be employed at the lower end of the scale<sup>3</sup>.

As established by UNICEF in the ToR of the present review ( attached in the Annex), evidence suggest adolescents face deprivations and vulnerabilities in their homes, communities and schools that predispose them to dropping out of school and/or migrate to other islands in search of schooling and a protective environment. Adolescents are also at risk of abuse, exploitation and are increasingly engaging in criminal behaviour including drug abuse.

Nationwide, one in seven children (15%) attending secondary school gave an affirmative answer to the question “did an adult ever touch you or hurt you in a sexual way when you did not want it”. Analysed by gender, girls have been double as often abused as boys (20% vs. 10%, respectively). At the age of 17, 28% of girls attending secondary school reported to have been **sexually abused** on at least one occasion.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/maldives/overview> - as consulted on 04/12/2015

<sup>2</sup> Situation of the children in the Republic of the Maldives – UNICEF 2013 – p9

<sup>3</sup> Employment challenges in the Maldives – International Labour Organization, 2013

<sup>4</sup> National Study on Violence Against Children in the Maldives – Ministry of Gender and Family / UNICEF – 2009 - p.51



The case records at the Maldives Police Services shows an increase of 32.5% of juvenile crimes from the cases reported in 2013. 40% of the cases were related to **drugs** while another 18% were related to violent assault. The Juvenile Justice statistics shows that 61% of children in conflict with the law are school drop outs (16% from grade 7 at 13 years; 37% from grade 8 at 14 years; and 20% from grade 9 at 15 years.) The data also indicate that 31% of these children in conflict with the law are from broken families. Furthermore, the National Drug Use Survey shows 47.6% of drug users in Male' were aged between 15-19 years. Evidence suggests that children and adolescents experience high level of violence against them at home, in school and in the community.

Maldives is particularly vulnerable to projected adverse consequences of climate change, including sea-level rise, increases in sea surface temperature, ocean acidification, and frequency/intensity of droughts and storms. These are likely to be accentuating the urbanization process over the next decades.

## 2. 2 Education in the Maldives

Over the last decades, the Maldives has achieved remarkable success in ensuring access to primary education for all, but the quality of education is now a major policy challenge facing the Maldives. "The country achieved the first generation objective of providing universal access to basic education through rapid expansion of enrolment. As is frequently the case, the second-generation challenge is to provide education of adequate quality. Evidence from a variety of sources shows that education quality in the Maldives is weak, and needs urgent improvement".<sup>5</sup> The challenge faced by the educational system are mostly due to the inconsistencies in education standards and practice across the country.<sup>6</sup>

School based management is an important policy initiative for the Maldives. Schools received a budget to improve the quality of education and teachers are paid directly from this budget. Except for the payment of salaries, schools are free to decide how to use this budget. Such a policy makes sense in a multi-island nation but requires strong guidelines, monitoring and support systems to ensure education provided is of quality and consistent with policies.

UNICEF Maldives mentions in the Term of References of the present LSE Review, that while attendance in primary education is near universal, net attendance rate for lower secondary is 66.3%, with girls having a higher attendance rate (74.3%) compared to boys (58.7%) (DHS, 2009). Drop-out rates for lower secondary level (for Grade 7) is higher for boys than for girls. Students in the remote islands drop out of school at Grade 7 more often than children in Male'.

The quality of education is in general lower in the atolls than in Male' and even in Male' there are inequalities between schools, where the community schools (or ward schools) are of a weaker quality. Those children academically less able are more likely to drop out of school and to contribute to the already large (but unmeasured) group of adolescents over 15 years old who are out of education, do not have any vocational training opportunities and are too young to apply for jobs.

<sup>5</sup> Human Capital for a Modern Society – General Education in the Maldives  
/ World Bank / 2012 / p.E4

<sup>6</sup> Improving education in the Maldives: Stakeholders perspectives on the Maldivian Education Sector – Maldives Research, 2012 – p. 4



The Maldives however has an overall very low student teacher ratio (ratio of 12:1 in 2011), with Male' presenting a very different picture: over 40% of the countries students are learning in Male', in 6% of the country's schools.

Teachers perceive discipline management as a worsening problem and the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that Maldives find ways and methods to discipline children with other means than excluding them from school<sup>7</sup>.

The new National Education Curriculum, which is being rolled out between 2015 and 2017, has been under construction for several years and has been piloted in a number of schools since 2012.

### 2.3 Life Skills Education (LSE)

**Life skills** are defined by the World Health Organization as “abilities for adaptive and positive behaviour that enable individuals to deal effectively with the demands and challenges of everyday life”<sup>8</sup>. This is the conceptual basis for the work undertaken by the UN organisations.

This definition allows for inclusion of large number of skills under the term “life skills”. WHO suggests there are a core set of skills that are at the heart of skills based initiatives for the promotion of the health and wellbeing of children and adolescents: decision making, problem solving, creative thinking, critical thinking, effective communication, interpersonal relationship skills, self-awareness, empathy, coping with emotions and coping with stress. Those skills are often grouped into three broad categories of skills: cognitive skills for analysing and using information, personal skills for developing personal agency and managing oneself, and inter-personal skills for communicating and interacting effectively with others.

**Life Skills Education** is a structured programme of needs- and outcomes-based participatory learning that aims to increase positive and adaptive behaviour by assisting individuals to develop and practise psycho-social skills that minimize risk factors and maximize protective factors. Life Skills Education appears in a wide variety of educational programs, including prevention of substance use, of adolescent pregnancy, AIDS, other STIs or bullying.<sup>9</sup>

### 2.4 The LSE program in the Maldives

In the Maldives, the LSE program that is being reviewed under the present exercise aims at adolescents, both in and out of school. It was established in 2004 with the objectives of:

- empowering children and young people to make informed and healthy decisions in the face of often confusing and conflicting information and life styles, and ,
- encouraging the development of the skills and attitudes to cope with general aspects of one's life in the family, the school and the community in general<sup>10</sup>.

**The Life Skills program is established under the form of manuals entitled “Life Skills Packs”.** Each Life Skills pack includes a number of different sessions (15 on average – see

<sup>7</sup> UN Committee on the Rights of the Child consideration of 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> periodic reports submitted by the Republic of Maldives – September 2012, points 214 - 216

<sup>8</sup> Life Skills Education in Schools – World Health Organisation - 1997

<sup>9</sup> [http://www.unicef.org/lifeskills/index\\_7308.html](http://www.unicef.org/lifeskills/index_7308.html) - as consulted on 15 December 2015

<sup>10</sup> Education for All Mid-Decade Assessment – Ministry of Education, 2007 – p63

details in [Annex 8](#)) that focus on a specific skill or topic. Each pack provides core generic life skills (assertiveness, self-esteem, communication etc.) as well as topic specific life skills (Child Abuse, Gender and Sex, HIV AIDS etc.). Each session contains a major goal, achievable objectives and activities to be undertaken by the LSE facilitators with participants. Each session lasts approximately 60 minutes.

Life Skills packs are designed to be used by “Life Skills facilitators” who can be any adults who engage with children as part of their professional duties (teachers, social workers, counsellors, activity facilitators etc.) and who have undergone a specific training. The Life Skills packs are not designed to be used as part of peer education programming.

A first set of three “Life Skills Packs” (manuals for LSE facilitators) was published by the Ministry of Education (MoE) in 2004, in collaboration with UNFPA and with a focus on Adolescents Sexual and Reproductive Health. A pack aiming at providing LSE to out of school youth was created with the input of the Ministry of Youth. Those manuals were reviewed at 3 occasions and are the backbone of the extra-curricular LSE program.

Since 2011, the institutionalization of the LSE program, by integrating LSE in the new National Education Curriculum, was seen as a critical way to ensure all children in the Maldives receive knowledge and skills to enhance their personal, interpersonal and social competences. The Ministry of Education (MoE) has started rolling out the new National Education Curriculum in 2015. It is composed of eight key learning areas which include different subjects (Islam, literacy, mathematics, biology etc.) that vary depending on the concerned classes. A number of subjects include cross cutting LSE components. The MoE plans for the entire new National education Curriculum to be rolled out in 2017, from the foundational to the higher secondary levels.

According to the ToR of the current Review, UNICEF Maldives support aimed at:

- 1- Boosting students’ knowledge and skills to enhance their personal and social competence to resist risky situations that impact on their well-being such as drugs, HIV/AIDS, sexual health and others.
- 2- Strengthening institutional capacity at the Ministry of Education and schools to roll out the school-based Life Skills Education (LSE) programme for students in secondary schools across the country.

UNICEF has supported the MoE to implement the extra-curricular LSE program in schools between 2011 and 2015, providing financial and technical support to:

- Review and update the content of the LSE packs (including the integration of the drugs and child abuse topics),
- Build the capacity of LSE facilitators,
- Support to advocate for the LSE program to school managers, and
- Develop awareness among parents.

The main expected result from the support UNICEF provided to MoE for the development of the LSE program was that students participate in LSE programs and have appropriate knowledge and skills to protect themselves from abuse and exploitation and prevent them from engaging in risky behaviour including substance abuse.

In the present document, the “LSE program” refers to the efforts undertaken by the Ministry of Education to ensure that Maldivian children access quality and age appropriate Life Skills Education in school, using extra-curricular materials which are the “Life Skills packs” described above.

Since UNICEF initiated support to the MoE in 2011, the main stakeholders of the LSE program have been:

- ESQID, the MoE’s quality insurance department which implemented the program from 2011 until April 2015,
- Ufaa, a new project created by the MoE in 2015, which took over the implementation of the LSE program in April 2015,
- UNICEF through providing financial support and technical advice to the MoE for the implementation of the LSE program – also implemented two monitoring visits in 2015 (without directly monitoring field implementation of program),
- UNFPA has been associated to the program as it worked with MoE (through the NIE) on the integration of Life Skills in the new National Education Curriculum, while UNICEF focused on the extra-curricular Life Skills curriculum,
- UNODC did collaborate with UNICEF in 2011-2012 for the integration of the prevention of substance use in the Life Skills program **but the exact role played by UNODC could not be identified.**

The present exercise has been initiated as UNICEF and the MoE wished to conduct a review of the LSE program in 2015.

---

*No **Theory of Change (ToC)** or outcome framework were developed for the LSE program. Based on documentation available the consultant reconstructed the following Theory of Change and used it throughout the present evaluation exercise.*

*The Ministry of Education developed a Life Skills Education Program with the objective to ensure all children in the Maldives gain the skills necessary to face reproductive health issues in a safe and positive manner and to ensure their overall well-being in a rapidly changing environment.*

*The Ministry of Education planned to achieve this objective by:*

- *Building the capacity and motivation of teachers and other school based facilitators to use the learner centred participatory methodologies required for LSE.*
- *Creating awareness among teachers, students and parents and orientating them in LSE, as there is reluctance in the Maldivian public in general to acknowledge adolescents’ sexuality, child abuse or substance use.*
- *Revising the content of the LSE manuals to ensure they are relevant to the needs of students and society. The LSE program initially focused on Adolescents Sexual and Reproductive Health (ASRH). The MoE and UNICEF consider ASRH to remain a central and essential topic but acknowledge it should be completed with other essential protection issues faced by children and young people - in particular Violence against Children and substance abuse.*

- *Integrate LSE in the National Education Curriculum: while the LSE program was developed as a stand-alone program, the institutionalization of the program through integration of LSE components in the National Education Curriculum was seen as a critical way to ensure sustainability, ownership and replication in all schools across the country. (Note: this last outcome is not part of the support provided by UNICEF to the MoE – it was developed over the last years by the MoE with support from UNFPA.)*

### **3. EVALUATION DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION**

#### **3.1 Evaluation purpose, objective and scope**

UNICEF has supported the Ministry of Education (MoE) to develop and implement the Life Skills Education (LSE) program since 2011. The expected result was that *“students participate in LSE programs and have appropriate knowledge and skills to protect themselves from abuse and exploitation and prevent them from engaging in risky behavior including substance abuse.”*

UNICEF Maldives and the MoE wished to conduct a review of the relevance, coverage, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of the LSE program in 2015. As defined in its ToR (Annex 7), this exercise will primarily:

1. Review the progress achieved so far
2. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the programme, challenges encountered and means of addressing the challenges.
3. Review the new national curriculum and curriculum materials to identify how LSE is integrated and to make recommendations to strengthen delivery through the curriculum.
4. Undertake a cost analysis of the Programme to strengthen the results based management of the programme and make recommendations for efficient delivery of the Programme – going forward.
5. Identify students’ knowledge of life skills, students’ perceptions on the importance of LSE, and their perceived benefits in their day-to-day life and how students think LSE can be improved.

In consultation with UNICEF, it was decided that the cost analysis of the programme (point 4 above) could not be taking place because of the limited timeframe of the assignment.

The consultant travelled to Male’ from November 8 to 19<sup>th</sup> and was allocated another 6 days to conduct the desk review and report writing from home.

In the Maldives the review geographically covered the capital city Male’ and 2 islands, Maafushi and Mahibadhoo. The ToR mentioned that the consultant would conduct interviews and FGDs in four schools (two in Male’ and two in the islands). Given the time allocated to the review (total 21 days) and time required for transportation in the Maldives, it would not have been possible to include any additional sites in the review. Islands and schools included in the review were selected by UNICEF and the MoE based on convenience; mostly based on their accessibility but also based on the willingness of school principles to participate in the exercise as the review was conducted during the end of year school exams.

The evaluation started on November 6<sup>th</sup> with the preparation of the inception report. Interviews with project stakeholders started on November 9<sup>th</sup>. Field visits took place between November 12<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> and initial findings were presented on November 19<sup>th</sup>.

UNICEF Maldives, the Ministry of Education and the National Institute of Education will use the findings of this review to improve the life skills education content, delivery and to strengthen institutional mechanisms needed for effective delivery of life skills to students.

### 3.2 Evaluation criteria and questions

UNICEF has defined in the ToR that the review would be based upon 4 OECD-CAD (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability,) as well as two additional criteria: coverage and UNICEF added value.

A total 17 **review questions** (and an additional 11 related sub-questions) have been developed covering each of the evaluation criteria. All questions will be answered using triangulation of information collected. The review questions and the associated data collection methods are presented in the Analytical framework (Annex 1).

### 3.3 Evaluation methodology

#### Data collection, sampling and analysis.

**The review methodology is mostly qualitative.** Data collection methods included:

- A **documents review** included legal and policy documents, project documents, curriculum, training materials, teaching resources, studies etc. List of documents reviewed in [Annex 3](#).

- **Consultations with 18 key stakeholders** took place through individual semi structured interviews with persons who have played an essential role in the LSE program or who represent organization who have held LSE programmes. List of key stakeholders interviewed in [Annex 4](#).

- **Observation of LSE tools and activities** were planned but could not take place because the review was scheduled during the students' examinations and over a very short timeframe.

- **Consultations with 36 teachers and other life skills facilitators** took place in four schools. School personnel participated in Focus Group Discussion (FGD) facilitated by the consultant to discuss specific questions and make recommendations on the different points examined in the review.

- **Consultations with 118 children** also took place in 4 schools. Students of different grade classes participated to a FGD using child/youth friendly methodologies (drawings, games, active discussions – see below).

- **Consultations with 28 parents** took place in the 4 schools visited.



### Summary of participants to consultations in schools

	Immadudin (Male')		CHSE (Male')		Maafushi		Mahi badhoo		total		TOTAL
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	-
<b>Students</b>	13	9	3	7	28	13	28	17	72	46	<b>118</b>
<b>Parents</b>	0	1	4	1	11	0	9	2	24	4	<b>28</b>
<b>LSE facilitators and other school personnel</b>	17	0	5	0	4	3	1	6	27	9	<b>36</b>
<b>Total</b>									<b>123</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>182</b>

*The sex and school grade distribution of children who participated to Focus Group Discussions is presented in [Annex 5](#)*

### Summary of tools and targets

Method	Tools (in <a href="#">Annex 7</a> )	Initial target	Target achieved
1.Desk review	List of documents reviewed <i>TOOL 1</i>	All documents made available	See List of documents in <a href="#">Annex 3</a>
2. Consultations with key stakeholders	Schedules for semi structured interviews <i>TOOL 2</i>	7 interviews	18 interviews
3. Consultations with teachers & other LSE facilitators	Guiding questions for FGDs <i>TOOL 3</i>	30 teachers & other LSE facilitators	36 teachers & other LSE facilitators
4. Consultations with students	Guiding questions for FGDs <i>TOOL 4</i>	120 children	118 children
5. Consultations with parents / caregivers	Guiding questions for FGDs <i>TOOL 5</i>	30 parents	28 parents

Note: A larger number of project stakeholders than expected was interviewed as the consultant experienced challenges in accessing documentation and data on the LSE program and was using meetings with stakeholders to reach out to documentation.

It became clear after the initial meetings with UNICEF and the MoE that documentation informing the implementation of the program was scarce. Monitoring of the LSE program had been limited and there were very few technical reports available. The data collection process was therefore designed in three consecutive steps building upon each other:

Step one (November 9 and 10): Interviews with key program stakeholders to gather initial information on the LSE program design and seek documentation available. The consultant held

individual interviews with the main stakeholders who had been involved in the implementation of the LSE program (different departments at the MoE and UNICEF) to gather a basic understanding of the program. Only fragmented program documentation had been shared with the consultant prior to his arrival.

Step two (November 12 to 18): Field visits and interviews with the program beneficiaries to assess the actual implementation of the program and their perception of its benefits and challenges. The consultant ran field visits to collect information directly from the beneficiaries of the LSE program in four different schools (with students of different ages, school principals, teachers and counsellors). Information collected during FGDs and interviews was transcribed on Word documents on the same day it was collected.

Step three (November 16, 17 and 18 – during afternoons): Conduct a second series of individual interviews with the key program stakeholders to better understand specific aspects of the program and to discuss the information collected during the field visits. The consultant was able to access key program documents - such as the LSE program Operational Framework, the scheme for Monitoring and Evaluation of LSE programs, the National Education Curriculum Framework or the situational assessment of LSE conducted by Ufaa in September 2015 – at that stage.

The consultant designed a PowerPoint document to present initial findings to the Ministry of Education concerned departments and UNICEF during a two hours workshop on November 19<sup>th</sup>. This short workshop aimed at engaging dialogue on findings and future programming through Focus Group Discussions. This session was unfortunately shorter than the expected 2 hours as several key stakeholders could either not attend or had only a limited availability.

The consultant then conducted a final review of the documentation available, which had been collected gradually during the mission to the Maldives. The transcript of all interviews and FGDs were reviewed a second time between November 25<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> and the consultant used the evaluation questions to group data and look for similarities and differences. Evaluation questions were finally responded by cross cutting and analysing all those data and information.

### Evaluation principles and ethical considerations

The proposed methodology is based upon the guiding principles of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). It complies with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Standards for Evaluation and UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.

The external consultant recruited to conduct the LSE review did not have any responsibility in the design, implementation or supervision of the LSE program.

During implementation of the evaluation, the consultant and his local counterpart from the MoE kept disruption in schools to a minimum by ensuring school personnel were involved in establishing times and locations for FGDs to take place.

The consultant's local counterpart played an essential role in guiding the consultant and ensuring respect for local differences. The evaluation instruments used with children (games, drawings, type of questions) were discussed with the local counterpart to ensure they were appropriate to the cultural setting.

The purpose of the review was communicated to all stakeholders, school personnel, students and parents involved in the review. Their informed consent was sought before engaging into an interview or a group discussion. Students were informed that they could withdraw from a consultation at any time. School personnel were invited to observe and participate the consultations with students. The consultant did never run a FGD with children on its own. FGDs always took place in open areas in a manner that other students or school personnel could observe the activity.

The consultant has used the *ChildHope* code of conduct and child safety procedures. No cases of suspected child abuse were identified during the LSE review.

### Limitations and challenges

Because of the limited time allocated for the review, no peer review took place to design the methodology of this review.

For the same reason, no reference group approach has been developed with the students and teachers participating to the review.

Collection of documentation has been very challenging. It has been a continuous process throughout the assignment as documentation on the LSE program was not immediately available.

A random selection of schools could not be completed as the selection of schools took place on the arrival of the consultant in Male' and logistical considerations as well as existing positive relations with schools had to be prioritized to be able to run field visits in the very next days.

The review took place during school exams period, which meant school personnel and students were available for limited time. As a result not a single observation of the delivery of the LSE program could take place.

Informed consent of the student's parents or caregivers could not be sought in advance, days prior to the consultations, because of the last minute changes in the schedule and in the selection of target islands. The consultant has systematically sought the informed consent of the children prior to the FGDs.

No complete interviews could be conducted with those NGOs involved or related to the LSE program, in particular the Society for Health Education (SHE) or Advocating the Rights of Children (ARC) as it was already challenging to engage with all the stakeholders directly concerned.

## 4. FINDINGS

### 4.1 Relevance

*To what extent is the LSE program aligned with the international commitments and policies of the MoE?*

The LSE program is aligned with the **international commitments** of the Maldives, particularly:

- The UNESCO Constitution, through the SAARC / UNESCO 2008 Cooperation agreement,
- Goal 16 of the SAARC Development Goals (SDGs) - quality education allowing students to better engage with the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**At the national level**, the LSE program is implemented within the frame of the 2008 Constitution of the Republic of Maldives, taking good note of Article 29 and Article 36(c).

LSE is integrated in the Child Friendly Baraabadu Standards (CFBS), through indicator 3.1.9 (Health and Safety dimension): *schools provide Life Skills programs that are age appropriate for all students to improve knowledge and skills*. The LSE program is consequently included in the school evaluation processes as the School Improvement, Quality Insurance and Accountability framework (SIQAAF) <sup>11</sup>repeatedly refers to the CFBS as the framework providing a basis for making evaluative judgements about the extent to which the various elements of quality are practiced in schools.

The newly designed Child Protection Policy (to be implemented in all schools in 2016), recognizes that it is the responsibility of the Senior Management Team (SMT) to ensure that the Life Skills curriculum is implemented in full in the school<sup>12</sup>.

*Is the LSE program design the most appropriate way to achieve intended outcomes?*

This review exercise could not identify a document presenting the theory of change of the LSE program or a logical framework that presented the expected impact and outcomes of the LSE program.

The 2011 *Operational Framework for Life Skills Education in the Maldives* is the only comprehensive document providing a general picture of the LSE program that could be identified. Under a section entitled Vision and Mission statement for LSE it states that “*vision and mission statements need to be created based on an envisioning exercise with team members. Ministry of Education’s policy statements and commitments to LSE need to be defined. The vision would respond to the LSE needs in the country for adolescents and young people in schools*”<sup>13</sup>.

This review exercise finds that **the program design, as presented in the 2011 Operational Framework for Life Skills Education in the Maldives, is appropriate in achieving the intended outcomes**. It provides guidelines for the provision of LSE in Male’ and in the atolls,

<sup>11</sup> Quality Insurance and Accountability framework (SIQAAF) – MoE, 2014 – p.19

<sup>12</sup> National Child Protection Policy for Maldivian Schools – MoE, 2015 – p.12 (Template for annual self-assessment of child protection policy by Senior Management Team)

<sup>13</sup> p. 9

guidelines for the monitoring and evaluation of the program and indications as to the capacity building efforts required. It present the central role of a “Life Skills Unit” that would coordinate those efforts (and the human resources therefore needed).

**No document presenting UNICEF’s strategic approach to support the implementation of the LSE program could be found.** It is therefore difficult to comment on how UNICEF designed its support to the MoE. The UNICEF country program for the period 2011 – 2015 states that *life Skills based education will be scaled up bringing greater emphasis to drug abuse, sexual and gender based violence and HIV prevention among children in and out of school and most at risk adolescent*. It does however not provide measurable indicators.

One of the six program component results to be achieved by UNICEF over 2011 – 2015 includes the mention that *families are equipped with the knowledge and skills to prevent drug abuse and HIV AIDS*. The current review did however not explore activities developed towards caregivers outside of the school context. Looking at the school related activities planned in the Annual Work plans with MoE it appears that activities towards parents and caregivers have been limited to training in relation to LSE to be provided to parents in 12 schools in 2012. The consultant was also not able to source any of the training modules used for training sessions with parents.

Looking at the yearly work plans signed between UNICEF and the Government of Maldives (GoM), it appears that **little or no consideration was given to the monitoring and evaluation of the LSE program**. UNICEF and the MoE put an emphasis on the monitoring or evaluation of the LSE program only in 2015, the last year of a five years collaboration on LSE.

Those yearly work plans present a number of targets to be reached by the MoE in regards to LSE: training LSE facilitators, implementing LSE in schools and providing training to parents. The yearly distribution of indicators for output 4.3 (support to strengthen LSE) presented in the Annual work plans between GoM and UNICEF is as below:

#### 2011 Annual Work plan indicators

- Revision of LSE modules
- 31 schools are using the revised LSE program

#### 2012 Annual Work plan indicators

- 52 LSE facilitators are trained
- 25% of schools are implementing LSE program
- Training related to LSE is providing to parents in 12 schools

#### 2013 Annual Work plan indicators

- LSE program implemented in 5 schools, including Maafushi
- 52 LSE facilitators are trained

#### 2014 Annual Work plan indicators

- 150 LSE facilitators are trained
- 60 schools are implementing the LSE program

#### 2015 Annual Work plan indicators

- Tool developed and used before and after life skills training by students

- Number of schools delivering LSE program
- Number of monitoring visits
- Review of Life Skills conducted

## 4.2 Coverage

*Are the content, methodology and materials of the LSE program adapted to the needs and situations of students, including the vulnerable and at risk students?*

16

The review found that the ASRH Life Skills packs designed by Ministry of Education and UNFPA in 2004 are the principal materials used by the LSE facilitators. The methodology used and the content of the Life Skills packs are age appropriate and adapted to the needs of the students.

There are currently a total of 4 Life Skills packs:

- Pack 1 for students in grade 6-7
- Pack 2 for students in grade 8-9
- Pack 3 for students in grade 11-12 (students in grade 10 are not expected to receive LSE)
- Pack 4 for out of school youth

None of the visited stakeholders was able to immediately present the latest versions of the 4 packs, whether in printed or digital copies.

The Life Skills packs have been revised at 4 occasions since 2004. The last review was conducted in 2011 with the support of UNICEF. The review could not find out whether students and teachers had been involved in the revision of the materials.

In 2011, the sessions on HIV AIDS and gender were revised.

A session addressing child abuse is part of the Pack 1 only (grade 6-7 students) and a session on Domestic violence and abuse is part of Pack 3 (grade 11-12 students). Those sessions were already part of the initial versions of the packs in 2004. No revision of these session or inclusion of additional child abuse sessions in other packs took place in 2011.

The Life Skills packs do not cover the issues of substance or alcohol use. The Ministry of Education developed a “Life Skills Education programme towards the prevention of Drug and Child Abuse” which was meant to be initiated in 12 schools in 2011 (as mentioned in the preface of its Manual for Facilitators). This manual is inspired from existing resources, namely: *Skills for drug education in schools (Colombo plan)* and the *Life skills based education for drug use prevention (UNICEF)*.

No information could however be found indicating that this program was implemented. None of the children who participated in group discussions in schools indicated ever receiving information about drugs in schools as part of the LSE program. One Grade 11 student said he once participated to a workshop run by the National Drug Agency (NDA).



### **Note on the manual of the *LSE* program toward the prevention of Drug and Child Abuse**

Although the review did not identify that LSE facilitators used this resource, it is the opinion of the consultant that the revision of some sections of the manual should be considered. In particular the introduction to adult learning in the Facilitation Skills section (p147 to 149) which presents the difference between children learning and adult learning. This section could create confusions as it indicates that adult learning is different from children learning in the sense that:

- Adults are voluntary learners, they have the right to know why a topic or session is important to them,
- Adults have experience and learn by rechecking their learning against past or present experience,
- Adults learn best in an atmosphere of active involvement and participation,
- Adults are best taught through a real world approach.

Besides drugs abuse and Violence Against Children, it is the opinion of the consultant that a number of other risks that children and youth are facing in the Maldives could have been included during the revisions of the Life Skills packages:

- The web based aspect of existing issues (cyber bullying, cyber peer pressure, etc)
- Emerging cyber threats such as the online sharing of personal details and pictures,
- The issue of unaccompanied children traveling to islands other than their home islands.

Children who participated in FGDs massively indicated they would be keen on receiving additional information on:

- How to deal with situations of violence (was mentioned by students of all ages)
- How to use internet and social media (was mentioned by students of all ages)
- How to develop adequate relations between boys and girls (mentioned by students in grade 6 and up)
- How to prevent and react in cases of electric shocks, fire, natural disasters, sinking ships or presence of a string ray (issues usually mentioned by students in primary levels)

Only 2 out of the 36 teachers and other school personnel interviewed had actually been running LSE sessions themselves. There was however very large consensus among the school personnel interviewed that LSE was adapted to the needs of students and that it positively impacted their knowledge and learning skills.

It appears the LSE sessions have also been used in a targeted manner with children requiring additional attention. In the Addu atoll, Sharafudden School, the school team decided to conduct LSE sessions with a small group of children who required additional attention. UNICEF, in one of its monitoring visits found that some of the children who had received life-skills sessions have demonstrated a positive change in their behaviours. In Immadudin School in Male' ([case study 4](#)), the counsellor (newly arrived in 2015) has been using some of the LSE sessions as a tool for facilitating individual counselling and found it very effective.

*Are the content, methodology and materials of the LSE training program adapted to the needs and situations teachers?*

The content and methodology of the LSE program appear adapted to the needs and situations of teachers. The teachers interviewed who participated in LSE training indicated unanimously that the training they received was of high quality and very inspirational. They also felt the Life Skills pack were practical and user friendly. It appeared however that the Life Skills packs were available only in one school, out of 4 schools visited.

In the atoll schools, the teacher to students ratio is very low (teachers commonly run classes with 12-15 students) compared with Male'. This low ratio should allow teachers in the atolls to provide a more individual attention to children and to organise their timetables with greater flexibility. This situation did however not lead to LSE sessions being conducted regularly in the atoll schools visited as part of the review.

The absence of a dedicated time in the school timetable was mentioned as a challenge for the implementation of LSE sessions. This bottleneck was addressed in the Immadudin School where a specific time for life skills has been attributed in the general curriculum.

The consultant initially assumed that the length of the LSE sessions (60 minutes) could be a challenge to the integration of LSE sessions in the school timetable. This was never presented as a challenge by the LSE facilitators interviewed.

Only 2 expatriate teachers participated to the discussions undertaken as part of the review (out of a total 36 school personnel). Considering the expatriate teachers represent a consequent portion of the educational system's workforce (40% is commonly admitted) this low representation of expatriate teachers in the review exercises raises the question of how much expatriate teachers have been involved in the implementation of the LSE packages. The LSE packages were indeed designed for secondary students whose teachers are expatriates in the majority of cases (Maldivian teachers are more prominent in the primary levels)

Including LSE in the pre-service training of teachers would have been an essential step in ensuring the new teachers arriving in employment are familiar with the concepts and methodologies related to LSE. Such an effort was initiated as it appears that:

- 4 LSE facilitators who were involved in the delivery of the MoE/UNFPA ASRH life skills packs confirmed their participated to a pilot training (before 2010) on LSE at the Faculty of Teacher training.
- The Maldives Accreditation Board accredited a training module for the inclusion of the LSE facilitator training in the Faculty of Education at an unknown date, prior to 2011.<sup>14</sup>

For reasons that the consultant could not comprehend the process however stopped.

---

<sup>14</sup> Accreditation of Life Skills facilitators Training Programme – UNFPA – 2011

*Were quality standards defined, and did activities achieve high levels of quality in implementation of LSE?*

No LSE sessions could be observed during the visit, it was therefore not possible to assess whether the LSE sessions were implemented using good practice standards.

The review did however not find that quality standards were established for LSE facilitators to implement the LSE program.

In 2015, Ufaa initiated the first guidelines for LSE facilitators, in Dhivehi language, a welcome initiative. It is the opinion of the consultant that those guidelines require additional attention before being shared, especially so as to:

- Ensure they indicate that LSE is now also integrated in the new National Education Curriculum and avoid confusion between the curricular-based LSE and the extra curricular Life Skills packs. A clear mention should be made that those guidelines refer to the extra-curricular program which complements but does not replace LSE components integrated in the new National Curriculum.
- Review section 3 (requirements) to ensure the absence of a specific space for the LSE program is not perceived as a bottleneck to its implementation. The Maldivian teachers are used to rearranging class rooms regularly, running a LSE session can take place directly in a classroom if space is properly arranged.
- Review section 3 (requirements) to give greater flexibility to the number of students participating in a LSE session. The current guidelines refer to groups of 25 to 33 students. Teachers will in many atoll schools be working with classes of less than 20 students which should not prevent them from running sessions. Also running sessions with small groups within a large class should be encouraged (this however requires that teachers are able to establish multi group learning in their class)
- Review section 3 (requirements) to ensure teachers look for ways to run sessions over the period of 2 classes or to run sessions with smaller groups and over the 35 minutes class period. The length of a LSE session is indeed estimated at 60 minutes when a class period is 35 minutes.
- Review the baseline situational analysis form, which is currently taking disciplinary issues as the main indicator for assessing the impact of the LSE program and look into developing a beginning of the year / end of the year assessment form that explores changes in the knowledge, attitude and practice of students.

The LSE facilitators interviewed in their vast majority identified the Life Skills packs as the only guiding documents available, and considered them to be user-friendly tools providing clear guidance.

The limited level of achievement of the LSE program can also be analysed through a human resources perspective: It was identified in 2011 that, although some of the trained LSE facilitators regularly conduct sessions, the majority of the trained LSE facilitators had dropped out of the program. It appears from the review that no strategy to address this situation was

designed. There were for instance no guidelines as to which school personnel should be involved in LSE training.

Although no data could be found indicating the positions of the personnel who participated to LSE training, it appears that a large variety of school members participated in 2012 and 2013/ librarians, medical assistants, teachers from all school levels, counsellors, administrators. This has probably led to a situation where school counsellors often took the lead of the LSE program. It however has also probably contributed to the good understanding of the LSE concept that could be observed at all levels. Different sources at the MoE and in schools indicated that from 2014 on only teachers were participating to LSE training.

It also appears from field visits undertaken during the review that very few expatriate teachers have been engaged in the LSE program, although expatriate teachers represent the majority of secondary levels teachers (LSE packs have been designed for secondary level students). The large majority of teachers trained are Maldivians who are expected to remain in position while expatriate teachers are working in the Maldives on a more temporary basis. This however means that the majority of teachers trained were primary level teachers when the LSE packs were designed for secondary level students.

*To which extent were gender issues, disability issues and other relevant human rights considerations incorporated into the project cycle?*

Gender issues are incorporated in the LSE program content. A specific session on gender and sex is part of the Life Skills pack 2 (for students in grades 8 and 9) and there are a number of sessions addressing gender related issues in the pack 3 (for students in grades 11 and 12): gender roles, starting a family, conception, dual use of condoms, responsible parenthood.

This means that children who will not reach higher secondary schools will only participate to one single session that explicitly addresses gender issues during their scholarship.

Disability issues are not incorporated in the LSE program content.

### 4.3 Efficiency

*To what extent did the program achieve its objectives?*

The review finds that the program is not getting the most results for its inputs. Although the capacity of a large number of LSE facilitators was built, the LSE program was not implemented as per established standards in any of the 4 schools visited. No data providing information on the implementation of the LSE program appears to be recorded and collated.

**Objective 1** of the program was to boost students' knowledge and skills to enhance their personal and social competence to resist risky situations that impact on their well-being such as drugs, HIV/AIDS, sexual health and others.

It is not possible to estimate the number of students who have overall directly benefited from LSE sessions since no monitoring / reporting systems were set up that could have provided regular data and information on the delivery of LSE sessions in schools.

UNICEF considers that the LSE program was implemented in 52 out of 219 schools in 2014 alone. Ufaa conducted a review of the LSE program in 2015 and found that 109 schools were conducting LSE sessions. This review was conducted through phone calls and email exchanges and it does not allow assessing to what extent, and in which conditions, schools are implementing the program.

The case studies conducted in four schools during the review as well as the information collected in two schools in the Addu atoll during two monitoring visits conducted by UNICEF in 2015 illustrate that the delivery of LSE has been inconsistent, with each school designing its own systems, with varying degrees of regularity and quality. Considering the number of personnel involved in the LSE program and time allocated, it is, in the opinion of the consultant, unlikely that all students from any one of the four schools visited will have benefited from the entire LSE curriculum during any year of their scholarship.

In the 4 schools that were visited during the present review, none was conducting LSE in a systematic manner (see [case studies](#)), meaning that all children from grade 6,7,8,9, 11 and 12 would participate to the majority of life skills sessions that are defined in the LSE program.

The review identifies that students were not provided with knowledge and skills allowing them to respond to risky situations related to substance use. As mentioned earlier, substance use was not included in the main Life Skills packs used. However, several of the secondary students who participated to FGDs mentioned receiving education on drugs from the Islam teachers. The Islam teachers who participated to FGDs indicated that the information they provided on drugs consisted of informing students that drugs are forbidden by Islam. The impact of this teaching should not be underestimated. On its own, its impact might however be limited towards those children who are most at risk of engaging in drugs.

Children from secondary levels indicated receiving information on human body development and the human reproductive system. In many cases children however mentioned such information would be provided by the biology teacher and it is unclear if it was provided as part of the regular curriculum or by using LSE methodologies and materials.

**Objective 2** was to strengthen the institutional capacity at the Ministry of Education and schools to roll out the school-based Life Skills Education (LSE) programme for students in secondary schools across the country.

Looking first at the institutional capacity at the Ministry level, the review finds that this objective has not been fully reached as:

- The MoE has not implemented the LSE program with a clear logical sequence of activities, as described in the 2011 Operational Framework
- The MoE has outsourced the running of the LSE facilitators training workshops, mainly to one of the remaining Master Trainers (currently working for the Health Protection

Authority) and to the NGO SHE. As a result, the Ministry does not appear to have kept this training capacity in-house.

- No information could be collected indicating that MoE teams have been supported to develop the monitoring, evaluation and support systems that the LSE program required.

Looking now at the school level: the LSE review conducted by Ufaa in September 2015 found that a total of 596 facilitators have been trained since 2011, out of which 393 facilitators remain in activity. A database provided to the consultant shows that 320 LSE facilitators have been trained between 2011 and February 2015.

The present review found that the implementation of the LSE program in schools has been limited and inconsistent: the capacity building workshops did not lead to the expected implementation of the LSE program at school level.

The four schools visited have implemented the program at a different scale, defining their own modalities which in certain areas were different from the guidelines provided in the Operational Framework and from the indications provided at the beginning of the LS packs. It is worth noting also that in three out of the four schools visited the NGO SHE participated to the delivery of LSE.

#### Planned activities Vs Actual implementation

<b>Planned Activities as presented in the Annual Workplans from 2011 to 2015 between the GoM and UNICEF</b>	<b>Actual implementation of activities as found in the current review (November 2015)</b>
<b>Revising the LSE modules</b> and ensuring schools are using the revised model (target 60 schools in 2014)	-LSE modules have not been revised -An additional training manual focusing on child abuse and drugs abuse has been developed but is not being used in schools
<b>Providing training to LSE facilitators</b> - a total 254 LSE facilitators to be trained from 2012 to 2014	-596 facilitators trained since 2011 (393 facilitators remain in activity) according to Ufaa LSE situation analysis dated September 2015 -320 facilitators trained between 2011 and February 2015 according to a spreadsheet presenting the number of facilitators trained provided by UNICEF
The <b>monitoring of the LSE program</b> to be developed in 2015 through the: - development of an assessment tool to be used before and after life skills training by students - Monitoring visits to take place - A review of LSE to be conducted	-Ufaa developed a draft “baseline situational analysis form” which was not ready for implementation in November 2015 -two monitoring visits undertaken by Unicef in 2015 - review of LSE is the current exercise

*Note: this information is compiled from the yearly distribution of indicators presented in the Annual workplans between the GoM and UNICEF.*



One **unintended positive result of the program** is that counsellors in different schools appear to have started using the Life Skills packs on an individual basis as a mechanism to develop a trust based relations with children requiring special attention.

*What factors influenced the efficiency with which the achievements observed were attained?*

A number of factors influenced the efficiency of the LSE program:

- No strategic vision has been developed for LSE in the Maldives and shared with the relevant stakeholders,
- The capacity building strategy has focused on the implementation of training workshops. Those workshops are of high quality and provide a strong foundation but do not include training on program content and should have been completed with practical on site capacity building,
- Monitoring and review of the LSE program have been limited thus not allowing for changes required to be made timely. No baseline / endline assessments were undertaken, making it difficult to measure the impact on the knowledge and skills of students,
- The recent handover between ESQID and Ufaa seems to have been minimal, creating a gap in the continuity of the program,
- The main program tools, the Life Skills packs, were not made available online. They are available in a fragmented manner at school levels leading to confusions as to which materials were the latest versions,
- LSE is often not perceived as priority by the SMTs and/or school principals. As a result little or no troubleshooting took place when LSE programs stopped functioning in the schools visited.

#### 4.4 Effectiveness

*Does the LSE program stipulate plausible and feasible pathways to achieve results?*

Processes for the implementation of the LSE program were defined in the *Operational Framework for LSE in the Maldives (2011)* and in the related *Scheme for the Monitoring and Evaluation of Life Skills Programmes*.

The operational framework provides a comprehensive and realistic frame for the implementation of the LSE program. It includes:

- The formulation of a national logical framework for the program,
- Embedding LSE in teacher training institutions,
- The development of a national Life Skills Unit,
- The establishment of a LS focal point at school level,

- The provision of guidance to LSE facilitators for building perspective on sensitive issues,
- The modalities of rolling out the LSE services at school level,
- Ongoing capacity building modalities.

The *Scheme for the Monitoring and Evaluation of Life Skills Programmes* presents possible monitoring and evaluation systems, including:

- Monthly meetings of LSE facilitators in schools,
- Professional development journal,
- Observation of LSE facilitators at least 3 times / year.

The key project stakeholders (ESQID and Ufaa) appeared to be aware of the existence of those reference documents but for reasons that could not be determined in the review, those documents were not used as central references for the development of the LSE program.

### *Have the program activities been implemented as designed ?*

The processes and activities defined in the *Operational Framework for LSE in the Maldives (2011)* have been implemented in a very limited manner. Only certain of the actions required for the implementation of the LSE program (as listed above) have been implemented:

1. The development of a national Life Skills Unit: Ufaa was established in 2015. The human resources allocated to Ufaa are however limited compared with the human resources requirements specified in the operational framework.
2. The modalities of rolling out the LSE services at school level, particularly the following modalities:
  - Training of LSE facilitators. The operational framework however presents 3 steps of training: an initial week long training, a 2<sup>nd</sup> week long training on program content and two weeks of practice under supervision. Only the first steps of training appears to have been implemented.
  - Advocacy in the atolls through awareness for all parents, teachers and community leaders: FGDs undertaken with parents during field visits indicate that awareness raising sessions have taken place. [See case study 2](#)

A systematic monitoring system was set up in 2011 at a time when the LSE program was implemented in 12 schools, with regular phone calls and online meetings between stakeholders and LSE facilitators. This system did not sustain with the expansion of the program to a larger number of islands. The review did not find evidence that the Monitoring and Evaluation activities presented in the 2011 *Scheme for the Monitoring and Evaluation of Life Skills Programmes* were in use at the time the review took place. Among others, this scheme recommends to maintain individual facilitator registers and files. Such records could not be identified either during the review.

*To what extent did the LSE program work effectively with partners (local authorities, other central authorities, youth groups, PTAs, CSOs etc)*

It appears coordination of efforts took place at the level of UN agencies:

UNICEF and UNFPA shared roles, deciding that UNICEF would support the MoE for the implementation of the extra-curricular Life Skills program, while UNFPA would support the MoE to integrate LSE components in the new National Curriculum.

UNICEF partnered with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) to ensure the Life Skills Program would integrate the issue of drugs abuse. As presented in section 4.2, this integration did not take place. A new manual<sup>15</sup> was created in 2011 with a focus on substance use but there was no indication that it has ever been used by LSE facilitators or would still be in use in 2015.

The different schools visited appear to have a functional collaboration with the NGO SHE and to a lesser extent with the NGO ARC for the provision of LSE to students.

It does not appear that the Family and Children Service Centers (FCSCs - an atoll based structure under the Ministry of Law) who have the mission to provide awareness raising at community level where associated to the LSE program. They could in particular be a relevant partner for reaching out to disengaged youth.

## 4.5 Sustainability

*How sustainable are the outcomes of the program?*

The sustainability of the extra curricular program is very limited for a number of reasons:

- No tailored capacity building plans have been developed for LSE facilitators and as a result, the activities developed are not consistent nor systematic, they are developed based on the perceptions and goodwill of the LSE facilitators. When committed LSE facilitators change positions, the program disappears.
- Most actors interviewed foresee that Ufaa (which is not a MoE department but rather a standalone project) will stop operating within the next couple years.

On the other hand, including LSE components at all levels of the new National Education Curriculum is a great step towards the sustainability of LSE for the future generations of students.

*To what extent is LSE institutionalized in the relevant national structures?*

All MoE departments met during the review had a good understanding of the LSE concept and considered the LSE program as part of the core projects managed by the MoE.

---

<sup>15</sup> Life Skills Education Programme towards the Prevention of Drug and Child Abuse, Manual for Facilitators – Ministry of Education - 2011

At school level, LSE was found to be institutionalized in only one out of the four schools visited (Immadudin) in the sense that materials were available, strategies were set up to deal with changes in LSE facilitator and plans had already been drawn for 2016. The 2015 implementation of the LSE program was however limited, as described in the case studies (section 5 of the report)

#### 4.6 UNICEF added value

*To what extent did UNICEF ensure that the LSE program matches quality standards and is reaching the intended beneficiaries?*

No evidence was found that regular field monitoring of the implementation of the LSE program had taken place between 2011 and 2014. This would have been a prerequisite for assessing the quality of program delivery and introducing changes.

The review could actually not find any evidence that monitoring of the delivery of LSE at school level ever took place either by UNICEF or by the MoE.

Two monitoring visits took place jointly by UNICEF and MoE in 2015 in the Addu atolls. The observations made during those visits were taken into account in the present review.

*To what extent did UNICEF ensure program data was being collected and analysed?*

No evidence was provided to the consultant that a consistent system was set up at MoE to ensure data related to Life Skills Education was collected and analysed.

A list indicating the number of school personnel who participated to training between 2011 and February 2015 is available.

As mentioned earlier, a greater emphasis on data collection and monitoring systems could have been introduced in the yearly UNICEF – GoM work plans for education.

*To what extent did UNICEF ensure that sufficient resources are allocated to the LSE program?*

The consultant was not able to draw a clear image of the technical assistance / support that UNICEF provided to the MoE.

UNICEF, through its partnership with UNODC, ensured the Life Skills packs were revised and that a separate manual for facilitators, focusing on substance and child abuse, was designed. As mentioned earlier, those materials have however not been combined with the Life Skills packs into a user friendly set of materials for LSE facilitators.

Considering the gaps observed at MoE in regards to strategic planning, Human Resources management, design and implementation of operating procedures and of monitoring mechanisms, the support provided by UNICEF appears limited.

UNICEF provided USD 104,740.00 in financial assistance to the MoE for implementation of LSE program.

## 4.7 Good practices and lessons learned

### Good practices:

The LSE program is integrated in major new policies and tools. Integration in the Child friendly Baraabar Schools indicators is of particular relevance and allows for LSE to be part of the yearly self-assessments that schools are conducting.

Promotion of LSE towards parents has been effective and resulted in parents being supportive of the LSE program and willing to participate to its implementation.

### Lessons learned:

**Capacity building of school personnel has to be school based and focus on practical support and assistance.** The cascade Training of Trainers used over the last 4 years to train school based stakeholders on the LSE program has not been sufficient to ensure the systematic implementation of LSE in schools. Field based training would allow to solve issues such as the identification of the materials to be used and would allow the possibility for peer training among school stakeholders working in close by islands.

**LSE program has best been implemented when “LSE teams” formed at the school level and worked cooperatively** (see [case study 4](#)). This allowed for creative initiatives to be established and for the sessions to sustain longer period of times. Involvement of the school principal is also a key component to success.

There are encouraging signs that the “**whole school approach**”, engaging students, parents, teachers, school management and other potential stakeholders such as NGOs can lead to the effective implementation of LSE covering issues usually perceived as sensitive.

**Internal strategic exercises have to be regular within the body coordinating the LSE program** (at a minimum on a bi-yearly basis) and feed from continuous monitoring, to ensure program implementation is up to standards and that improvements to be made are identified and planned for.

## 5. CASE STUDIES

### **Case study 1: Mahibadhoo School**

Five members of the school personnel have participated to the ten days LSE program training in 2014. The participants found the training to be useful and inspiring; they were satisfied with the materials distributed. Early 2015, the SMT conducted awareness sessions with parents. Program implementation has however been limited to one LSE session conducted this year during a scout camp, with boys from grade 6. This session discussed the issue of tolerance (note: there is no module on tolerance in the Life Skills packs received by LSE facilitators after training)

Teachers consulted during the review considered that the LSE program was not implemented because there was no “driving force” within the school. Other reasons mentioned for not implementing the LSE program on a more regular basis and using the materials received included:

- The overload of work experienced in 2015 because of the compulsory certification of teachers and of the roll out of the key stage out of the new National Curriculum;
- The absence of any monitoring to follow up on the implementation of the LSE program.
- The fact that training took place before school holidays “we forgot about the training during holidays”

The school principal (in place since 15 months) is unclear on which materials are to be used. When looking at his computer files, it appears that he has a large number of LSE materials from different sources, as well as different versions of the ASRH Life Skills packs, none of them being a compiled version.

Parents met in Mahibadhoo showed a good understanding of the LSE concept and stated students should receive more LSE. They insisted LSE should be provided from a variety of sources: parents, school, uniform camps. They also showed great appreciation of sessions run by SHE which involved children and their parents. They are worried that information on alcohol would push children to experience it.

*This information was collected in the Mahibadhoo Educational Center on November 15<sup>th</sup> 2015.*

### **Case study 2: Maafushi School**

Seven members of the school personnel were trained on LSE in 2011, all of them Maldivian primary teachers. They used to run sessions to students from grade 6 and 7 with the support of the counsellor. The students very much enjoyed the LSE sessions.

The counsellor stopped working in that school in 2013 and the program consequently stopped. The perception of the SMT is that conducting LSE is the responsibility of the counsellors. A



new counsellor has been recruited this year but “she cannot yet conduct LSE sessions since she has not been trained”.

The school principal declared that teachers in grade 1,2 and 3 had rolled out the new National Education Curriculum in 2015 but had not started using the sections related to LSE. It is the assumption of the consultant that he might not have been not fully aware of which sections of the curriculum did relate to LSE.

Students from grade 1, 2 and 3 indicated they learned about nutrition and safe touch this year. 6 out of 7 children from grade 4, 5 and 6 who joined a FGD answered “yes” when asked: *do you know other children who have big problems but you do not know to whom you can talk about it?*

The persons who participated to a FGD (100% mothers) value LSE and are convinced LSE will change the behaviour of children and youth. They received a presentation on LSE and consider LSE will ensure children and youth:

- Take further responsibility for their actions, particularly in regards to petty crime
- Better understand their roles in the family
- Have improved communication skills with other children of their age and with adults
- Are better able to set personal goals

Parents also stated that when LSE sessions took place “there was never a problem”. One mother commented that speaking about body changes was useful for teenagers because many people would not dare do it at home.

Parents overall appeared very keen on playing a greater role in school.

*This information was collected in the Maafushi Educational Center on November 12<sup>th</sup> 2015.*

### **Case study 3: Center for Higher Secondary Education (CHSE), Male’**

The LSE program has been implemented in CHSE between 2009 and 2013 by the school personnel. It was then outsourced to SHE and ARC in 2014 and 2015. When asked why, teachers interviewed answered that “SHE and ARC offered their services and since we are so busy we accepted”.

Four teachers have been trained on LSE. The consultant could meet with two of them (one was trained in 2004 and one in 2007). They used to conduct LSE sessions in the CHSE at the beginning of the school term, with all classes, which they considered was a good start for students and teachers to get to know each other. Teachers enjoyed this experience. The main challenge they faced was accessing an adequate space to conduct the LSE sessions.

They created an additional session on the topic of internet safety, designing their own materials (those materials could not be observed by the consultant). They also tried to communicate on LSE topics within the school by creating a blog where resources would be available. This however did not happen, for technical reasons.

Experience showed that running LSE in small groups was more effective.

One of the teachers participating to a group discussion previously worked in another school in Male', and explained that as far as she knew the LSE program had been implemented there for two years and then it faded away.

The parents interviewed were aware that children were participating in the LSE program at the beginning of the school term and supported that effort. They also mentioned that students who participated to the program this year visited places where they could access additional services if required.

Students interviewed, who participated to LSE sessions at the beginning of the school term, requested career guidance and information on drugs and alcohol to be included in the LSE program. They consider the LSE program to be useful but they would usually search a lot of information on the internet by themselves as "what we learn in LSE, we have already experienced 5 years ago".

*This information was collected in the CHSE on November 17<sup>th</sup>..*

#### **Case study 4: Immadudin school (all levels – Male')**

Until 2014, one counsellor implemented the LSE program with grade 6-7 classes. To do so, this counsellor was working closely with a school nurse and with the physical education teacher who both received LSE training. The three of them would work as a team with one class. The counsellor was also supporting (an unknown number of) other teachers who received LSE training to run sessions with their class. They would run sessions with grade 6 students during six months and then run sessions with grade 7 students during the next six months. All LSE sessions were conducted using the MoE/UNFPA ASRH packs. This counsellor is currently on maternity leave. In 2015, a new counsellor was recruited and she has been using some of the LSE packs sessions during individual sessions with students. She cannot provide sessions to groups of students as she has not received training.

The sports teacher commented that LSE should start in grade 4 or 5 because female students have their first period and both boys and girls have hygiene issues.

The school will develop awareness on LSE within the Parents and Teachers Association (PTA) and the SMT in 2016. The school principal considers LSE to be an essential part of the role of the school and believes it brings positive changes to the behaviour of children.

Fifteen teachers from grade 1, 2 and 3 were interviewed (none of them was ever trained on LSE). They feel the capacity building exercises that took place to prepare for the use of the new National Education Curriculum were not sufficient for them to properly implement the new syllabus, and in particular to address the new topics included in the Health and Physical Education section.

The school has also involved the NGO SHE in certain school camps for the NGO to run LSE sessions. 4 students from grade 7 and 8 participated to a group discussion and requested to be able to participate to more LSE sessions.

*This information was collected in the Immadudin Educational Center on November 16<sup>th</sup>.*

## 6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 6.1 Summary of findings

Commitment to LSE is very high at policy level. The review finds that this commitment has not yet led to a sustained and qualitative implementation of the LSE program.

31

Lack of data does not allow to draw a precise picture of the level of implementation of the LSE program but it appears it has been implemented in certain schools in a limited fashion and in an inconsistent manner. Main reasons to this situation are weaknesses in the management of the LSE program: absence of guidelines for implementation at school level, limited capacity building scheme for LSE facilitators and absence of regular monitoring and evaluation systems.

The LSE program was not implemented as per the design set in the 2011 LSE Operational Framework. Program activities have mainly focused on the implementation of training workshops for LSE facilitators. A large variety of school personnel participated to the training: teachers from all grades (although the LSE packages target secondary level students), librarians, administrative staff, counsellors, medical assistants etc... Although no exact number of LSE facilitators trained could be collated, it is estimated that approximately 1000 members of school teams did benefit from LSE training within the last 10 years<sup>16</sup>. Limited strategic planning and monitoring have not allowed for this massive training effort to turn into a dynamic school based LSE program but those numerous LSE facilitators available all over the country constitute a strong foundation for future programming. This situation has also ensured that there is a very good understanding of the concept of LSE, which paves the way for LSE to be provided as part of the new National Education Curriculum in the future.

The methodology and content of the Life Skills packs are age appropriate and adapted to the needs of the students – they do however not cover web related risks. The Life Skills packs also do not cover the issue of drugs abuse, which was one of the central aspects of the involvement of UNICEF in the LSE program and they cover the issue of child abuse in a limited fashion only.

Expectations that school personnel and parents place on LSE, in particular regarding “behaviour change” of students, are very high. The students met were keen on participating to larger number of LSE activities and were clearly expressing the need to update LSE program contents to the risks they are facing in 2015 and will be facing in the future.

The four schools visited during the review had implemented the LSE program at some stage since 2011. By end 2015, only one out of those four schools was still providing LSE to its students (through the NGO SHE). In the 3 other schools, the LSE program had previously been led by school counsellors and was interrupted when those individuals changed work locations or went for long period leaves.

---

<sup>16</sup> The MoE estimated that approximately 450 LSE facilitators had been trained in 2011 (An operational framework for LSE in the Maldives – 2011 - p. 5) and the Ufaa estimated in September 2015 that 596 LSE facilitators had been trained since 2011. Additionally a number of training workshops took place between September and December 2015.

## 6.2 Conclusion

The LSE concept is well understood and accepted by all stakeholders. Teachers have very high (sometimes unrealistic) perception of the benefits of LSE on the behaviour of children. Students and parents interviewed understood the LSE concept and were of the opinion that students should access LSE more regularly. LSE Camps are perceived as a realistic manner of developing the program.

The main strengths of LSE in the Maldives are the quality of initial training provided to LSE facilitators and the broad set of Life Skills that have been integrated across the new National Curriculum, at all levels.

The main bottlenecks to the implementation of the LSE program are related to:

- Management and coordination, as the LSE program was not managed based on internationally accepted project development standards. The lack of program monitoring and analysis in particular did not allow for adjustments to be timely made. Coordination among the different concerned stakeholders within the MoE, in particular between the ESQID and Ufaa, is too limited.
- Quality of care: the pathway designed for the implementation of the LSE program has not been followed, in particular in regards to the capacity building strategy and to the monitoring system to be used. A logical framework with expected results and activities defined in a strategic manner was never established.
- Access to information: no systems were designed for the required tools and for a data recording system to be easily available to the LSE facilitators
- Budget and human resources allocated to the management of the LSE program seem to be too limited to allow for the proper implementation of a nation-wide LSE program (one staff based in Male' is currently coordinating the LSE program at Ufaa)

The main challenges to the LSE program in the Maldives are monitoring and ongoing capacity building to LSE facilitators so that they implement the extra-curricular LSE program (despite high levels of confidence expressed by the facilitators after training).

The rolling out of the new National Curriculum, which is inclusive of a large number of LSE related learning, is a great opportunity for the Maldives to ensure all children in the country receive basic appropriate LSE. Teachers have to adapt their teaching and assessment methods and this move will require a massive, practical and school based capacity building effort.

It would come as no surprise that the teachers who did participate to LSE training workshops in the past will more easily adapt to those changes.

## 6.3 Recommendations

The analysis of findings, together with the good practices and the lessons learned identified, has led to the development of recommendations.

Different strategic options should have been discussed during the presentation of initial findings and recommendations in Male' on November 19<sup>th</sup> 2015, in particular in regards to how the extra curricular LSE packs and the curriculum based LSE should be aligned in the future. The tight schedule of several key participants did unfortunately not allow for such a discussion to take place.

### **Recommendations to the MoE**

#### **1. MoE to ensure that LSE components part of the new National Education Curriculum are effectively implemented**

- Pre service training to include LSE methods and participatory approaches.
- Minimum Professional Development requirements to be reinforced so as to include child protection procedures and further build teacher's capacity on multi sessions teaching and participatory methodologies.
- Development of atoll-based capacity building schemes (and allocation of required resources) focusing on coaching, co work and practical peer training. A key role is to be played by TRCs and selected leading teachers in the atolls.
- Guidelines for understanding and addressing social norms that are likely to affect the implementation of the LSE related sections of the curriculum.
- M&E to be regular and supportive as per the SIQAAP; and to increasingly consider the opinion of children and parents.

#### **2. MoE to reinforce extra-curricular LSE program to complement curriculum based LSE and to reach children out of school**

##### **2016 to achieve efforts initiated in 2015**

- Develop a theory of change and a logical framework for a holistic LSE project (including curricular and extra-curricular components). The theory of change developed should ensure that LSE is integrated in a larger environment in which parents play an essential role in ensuring their children have the necessary skills and knowledge to enhance their personal and social competences. It should also include disengaged children and youth.
- Disseminate the latest LS packages online and in a user friendly manner
- Reinforce and disseminate LSE Guidelines and ensure they are linked with wider MoE systems

- Develop a simple online tool for monitoring the impact of LSE on students' knowledge, attitude and practice (beginning of year and end of year brief assessments). Data entry to be undertaken directly by students.

From 2017 on, focus on developing specific LSE projects for out of school children:

- Regular update of existing LS packages to keep up with social changes and ensure the extra curricular LS packs (for secondary students) are effectively complementing curriculum based LSE. Revise packages to ensure children are guided on identifying and assessing online information by themselves.
- Develop projects reaching out to children and youth out of school and to young parents in collaboration with relevant partners (collaboration with CSOs/NGOs is key to accessing disengaged children and youth)
- Support child and youth-led educational, cultural, business or solidarity projects in schools (practical initiatives building personal and interpersonal skills)
- Ensure all new projects take into account project cycle components: research / participative design / implementation with strong monitoring and support / evaluation

### **3. MoE to participate to the reinforcement of the national and atoll based child protection systems**

- Ensure school management is up to international standards. The development of LSE will lead to the increasing reporting of child abuse situations by children. Those situations cannot be addressed in the absence of clear ToRs for school boards and SMTs and without ensuring the child protection procedures (code of conduct, reporting pathways) are visible to all personnel, students and visitors in schools.
- Collaboration with MoLG, MoH, police and NGOs to ensure early detention and care of situations of suspected child abuse.
- Advocate for the functioning of 1412, as the hotline is being communicated to students in the new syllabus.

## **Recommendations to UNICEF**

UNICEF should support MoE to roll out the new National Education Curriculum effectively. This support should take the form of (1) technical support for design and implementation of policies and (2) practical, continuous and field based capacity building of teachers. Financial support should be considered carefully as bottlenecks identified are mostly related to HR management and to the absence of continuous capacity building. Financial assistance will be needed to pilot new extra-curricular LSE initiatives for the benefit of disengaged children and young parents.

UNICEF to support MoE to design a capacity building system (building upon the existing TRC scheme) for schools to benefit from practical support and hands on capacity building. This capacity reinforcement aims for teachers to embrace the active and participatory methodologies that are required for the delivery of LSE (and more generally for the implementation of the new National Curriculum), including group work in class rooms, an essential mechanism for being able to provide LSE to small groups of students.

UNICEF should support MoE to gradually transform the LSE activity of Ufaa, from being a “core” service provider to becoming a more specialized service provider that would be fillings gaps in the curriculum based LSE and providing services to out of school children and youth. It is recommended to explore options for developing child led projects - a practical way for children to develop life skills and entrepreneurial skills.

## **Recommendations for MoE and UNICEF collaboration**

Ensure that every collaboration agreement between both entities clearly defines a monitoring and evaluation mechanism.



## ANNEXES

### ANNEX 1 – Field mission schedule (November 2015)

Sunday 8	Monday 9	Tuesday 10	Wednesday 11	Thursday 12	Friday 13	Saturday 14
	<b>MALE'</b>	<b>MALE'</b>	<b>MALE'</b>	<b>MAAFUSHI</b>	<b>MALE'</b>	<b>MALE</b>
	<p>Morning <b>Preparation with UNICEF and MoE</b> (Ms Azza DG ESQID)</p> <p>Afternoon <b>Observation of Ufaa training of facilitators</b></p> <p><b>Meeting Ufaa (Ms Ofraze)</b></p>	<p><b>8.00 Mr Hussain</b> (Deputy Director ESQID)</p> <p><b>8.30 NIE Deputy director</b></p> <p><b>9.00 NDA (CEO)</b></p> <p><b>10.30 Ms Sana (CPP in MoE)</b></p> <p><b>Literature review</b></p>	<b>Literature review</b>	<p><b>9.00 Minister of education</b></p> <p><b><u>11.00 MAAFUSHI case study</u></b> -Meeting school management - FGD with LSE facilitators - LSE observation - 3 x FGD with students - Meeting with parents</p>	<b>Literature review and analysis</b>	<b>Literature review and analysis</b>
Sunday 15	Monday 16	Tuesday 17	Wednesday 18	Thursday 19		
<b>MAHIBADHOO</b>	<b>MALE'</b>	<b>MALE'</b>	<b>MALE'</b>			
<p><u>MAHIBADHOO case study</u> -Meeting school management - FGD with LSE facilitators - LSE observation - 3 x FGD with students - Meeting with parents (see note 1)</p>	<p><b>9.00 Meeting Himaduthin principal &amp; counselor</b></p> <p><b>1.00 – Ufaa team (sophie etc)</b></p> <p><b>2.00 - FGD with experienced LSE facilitators</b> selected by Ufaa</p> <p><b>4.00 UNFPA</b></p>	<p><i>Morning</i> <b><u>8.30 CHSE case study</u></b> -Meeting parents -Meeting SMT - 1 FGD with students</p> <p>10.30 Meeting with NIE curriculum developers</p> <p>1.00 - FGD with LSE facilitators in CHSE</p> <p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p><b><u>HIMADUTHIN school case study</u></b> -Meeting SMT - FGD with LSE facilitators - LSE observation - 2 x FGD students - Meeting parents</p> <p><b>1.30 NIE training section</b> <b>2.30 ESQID</b> <b>4.00 UNICEF</b> <b>8.00 Mr Hameed (HPA)</b></p>	<p>Morning <b><u>10.00 Presentation of findings and recommendations</u></b> <b>At MoE</b></p> <p>Afternoon <b>Report writing</b></p>		

## ANNEX 2 – Analytical framework

Criteria	Evaluation questions	Data collection methods
<b>1. RELEVANCE</b>  The extent to which the objectives and the design of the action are consistent with the MoE policies and with the needs of beneficiaries	<b>Q1.1 To what extent is the LSE program aligned with the international commitments and policies of the MoE?</b> Related question: Are the LSE concepts identified and accepted by the concerned stakeholders?	ALL, except: - Consultations with students - Consultations with parents
	<b>Q1.2 Is this program design the most appropriate way to achieve intended outcomes?</b> Related question To what extent is the integration of the existing LSE program in the new National Curriculum an effective strategy to introduce LSE in schools?	ALL, except: - Consultations with students - Consultations with parents
<b>2. COVERAGE</b>  The extent to which different target beneficiary groups were positively affected by the action	<b>Q2.1 Are the content, methodology and materials of the LSE program adapted to the needs and situations of students, including the vulnerable and at risk students?</b> <i>Related question: Did beneficiaries encounter any difficulties accessing the program? How were those addressed?</i>	ALL
	<b>Q2.2 Are the content, methodology and materials of the LSE program adapted to the needs and situations of teachers?</b>	All, except: - Consultations with students - Consultations with parents
	<b>Q2.3 Were quality standards defined, and did activities achieve high levels of quality in implementation?</b> <i>Related question: Does the action comply with international LSE standards? Are the interventions age appropriate for knowledge, skills and behaviour change?</i>	ALL
	<b>Q2.4 To which extent were gender issues, disability issues and other relevant human rights considerations incorporated into the project cycle?</b>	ALL
<b>3. EFFICIENCY</b>  The extent to which the action has achieved, or is	<b>Q3.1 To what extent did the program achieve its objectives?</b> What have been the main quantitative and qualitative effects of the intervention? Related questions: -Is the program getting the most results for its inputs? -Were there any important unintended results, either positive or negative?	ALL

expected to achieve, its results efficiently and economically	<b>Q3.2 What factors influenced the efficiency with which the achievements observed were attained?</b> <i>Related question: How much are the management, monitoring/evaluation and support systems used relevant to demonstrate efficiency?</i>	ALL
<b>4. EFFECTIVENESS</b>  The extent to which the action has achieved, or is expected to achieve its objectives.	<b>Q4.1 Does the LSE program stipulate plausible and feasible pathways to achieve results?</b> <i>Related question: How similar is the perception that the different stakeholders have of the program's results and pathways?</i>	ALL
	<b>Q4.2 Have the program activities been implemented as designed ?</b>	ALL
	<b>Q4.3 To what extent did the LSE program work effectively with partners (local authorities, other central authorities, youth groups, PTAs, CSOs etc)</b> <i>Related question: Was their input taken into account? Are they satisfied with the action?</i>	ALL, except - Consultations with students
<b>5. SUSTAINABILITY</b>  The extents to which the action and its benefits are likely to continue over time.	<b>Q5.1 How sustainable are the outcomes of the program?</b> <i>Related question: -What are the main factors that affect, either positively or negatively, the sustainability of program outcomes? -Are human and material resources committed?</i>	ALL, except: - Consultations with students
	<b>Q5.2 To what extent is LSE institutionalized in the relevant national structures?</b> <i>Related question: is LSE recognized in professional and public opinion?</i>	ALL, except: - Consultations with students - Consultations with parents
<b>6. UNICEF ADDED VALUE</b>  The extent to which it can be argued that the impact of the program is due to the intervention of UNICEF	<b>Q6.1 To what extent did UNICEF ensure that the LSE program matches quality standards and is reaching the intended beneficiaries?</b>	ALL, except: - Consultations with students - Consultations with parents - Consultations with teachers and LS facilitators
	<b>Q6.2 To what extent did UNICEF ensure program data was being collected and analysed?</b>	ALL, except: - Consultations with students - Consultations with parents - Consultations with teachers and LS facilitators
	<b>Q6.3 To what extent did UNICEF ensure that sufficient resources are allocated to the LSE program?</b>	ALL, except: - Consultations with students - Consultations with parents - Consultations with teachers and life skills facilitators

### ANNEX 3 – List of documents reviewed

#### ***UNICEF documents***

Rolling workplan 2011 – 2012, UNICEF Maldives and Maldives Ministry of Education - 09/02/2011

Government of Maldives – UNICEF Annual workplan 2012 PCR4 - 06/03/2012

Government of Maldives – UNICEF Annual workplan 2013 PCR4 – 13/08/2013

Government of Maldives – UNICEF Annual workplan 2014 Outcome 4 education – 05/08/2014

Government of Maldives – UNICEF Annual workplan 2015 Outcome 4 education – 09/03/2015

Maldives Country Program Document 2011 – 2015 – UNICEF Maldives – 11/02/2011

Country Office Annual report 2011 – UNICEF Maldives

Country Office Annual report 2012 – UNICEF Maldives

Country Office Annual report 2013 – UNICEF Maldives

Country Office Annual report 2014 – UNICEF Maldives

Travel report - Travel to Addu Atoll, Hithadhoo to monitor the Life Skills program - Report by Mazeena Jameel, UNICEF program specialist – 14/06/2015

Travel report - Travel to Addu Atoll, Hithadhoo to monitor the Life Skills program - Report by Mazeena Jameel, UNICEF program specialist – 19/08/2015

#### ***MoE documents***

ASRH Life Skills Development Package 1: Grade 6-7 – Ministry of Education / UNFPA – 2004 (English versions)

ASRH Life Skills Development Package 2: Grade 8-9 – Ministry of Education / UNFPA – 2004 (English versions)

ASRH Life Skills Development Package 3: School leavers – Ministry of Education / UNFPA – 2004 (English versions)

An operational framework for Life Skills Education in the Maldives – *document not mentioning a date and an author. Ufaa confirmed document produced in 2011 by Ministry of Education*

Accreditation of Life Skills Facilitator Training Programme – *document not mentioning a date and an author. Ufaa confirmed document produced in 2011 by Ministry of Education*

Integration of Life Skills Education (LSE) modules in National Curriculum – *document not mentioning a date and an author. Ufaa confirmed document produced in 2011 by Ministry of Education*

Review of content of the Life Skills Education Packages – *document not mentioning a date and an author. Ufaa confirmed document produced in 2011 by Ministry of Education*

Scheme for the Monitoring and Evaluation of Life Skills Programmes – *document not mentioning a date and an author. Ufaa confirmed document produced in 2011 by Ministry of Education*

Life Skills Education Programme towards the Prevention of Drug and Child Abuse, Manual for Facilitators – Ministry of Education - 2011

Quality Indicators for Child Friendly Baraabar Schools, Maldives – Ministry of Education / UNICEF – 2010

Powerpoint presentations used during LSE facilitators training (Understanding Adolescent Well Being / Facilitation Skills / Life Skills Education Overview)

Report on the Training of Life Skills Facilitators Adh Mahibadhoo School – Abdul Hameed, Workshop facilitator - 2014

DRAFT Life Skills Education implementation guidelines for schools (Dhivehi) 2015 - Ufaa

Different tools established by Ufaa in 2015 for LSE facilitators:

- Facilitators record sheet
- LSE Action Plan format
- LSE School Annual Report
- Situation Analysis Form

Turning the key competencies into reality, a practical guide for teachers – National Institute of Education – 2015

The National Curriculum Framework - National Institute of Education – 2014 ?

Pedagogy and Assessment Guide (PAG) - National Institute of Education – 2015

National Child Protection Policy for Maldivian Schools – Ministry of Education – 2015?

First Graders Early Risk Assessment Guidelines – Ministry of Education – 2015?

Inclusive Education Policy – Ministry of Education - 2013

School Improvement, Quality Assurance and Accountability Framework (SIQAAF) – Ministry of Education – 2014

Review of the LSE program – *Tamo Wagener* – January 2016

Situation Analysis of LSE in the country – Ufaa – September 2015

***Other documents***

Maldives Human Development Report 2014 – UNDP

Improving Education in the Madives: Stakeholders perspective on the Maldivian Education Sector – Madives Research – March 2013

Education For All Mid decade assessment, National Report – Ministry of Education – February 2008

Human Capital for a Modern Society: General Education in the Maldives – World Bank – 2012

Status of LSE in Teacher Education Curriculum in SAARC countries: a comparative evaluation – Journal of Education and Social Policy – June 2014

Life Skills Based Education in South Asia: A regional overview prepared for the South Asia Life Skills Based Education Forum 2005 – UNICEF ROSA – October 2005

Review of the LSE program – *Tamo Wagener* – January 2016

#### ANNEX 4 – List of project stakeholders interviewed

- Minister of Education, MoE – *Ms Aishath Shiham* (courtesy visit)
- Director General, ESQID, MoE – *Ms Azza Fathimah*
- Deputy Director, ESQID, MoE – *Mr Hussain Rasheed*
- Education Development Officer, ESQID, MoE – *Ms Fauziyya Ali*
- Program Specialist, Education and WASH, UNICEF – *Ms Mazeena Jameel*  
(supervising the consultant)
- Program Specialist, UNICEF - *Ms. Aishath Shahula Ahmed*
- Health Protection Authority (LSE Master Trainer) - *Mr Abdul Hameed*
- Head of Ufaa, *Ms Sofiya Fathimath*
- Director of Ufaa - *Ms Faraha Mariyam*
- Deputy Director General, NIE – *Mr Ahmed Yusuf*
- Education Development Officer, Ufaa - *Ms Afrose Husnu*
- Assistant Representative, UNFPA – *Ms Shadiya Ibrahim*
- Head of school of teacher development, NIE - *Ms Shuhdha Rizwan*
- CEO, National Drug Agency – *Mr Hassan Shaheel*
- Curriculum developers, NIE – *Ms. Aminath Ismail, Ms. Irene Fathmath, Mr Ahmed Rafiu, Mr Mohamed Ashir*



## ANNEX 5 – School grades and sexes of students who participated to FGDs

	Boys	Girls	total
<b>Maafushi Education Center</b>			
Grade 1-2-3	4	7	<b>11</b>
Grade 4-5-6	7	8	<b>15</b>
Grade 7-8-9	2	13	<b>15</b>
Total	<u>13</u>	<u>28</u>	<b><u>41</u></b>
<b>Mahibadhoo Education Center</b>			
Grade 1-2-3	8	7	<b>15</b>
Grade 4-5-6	6	9	<b>15</b>
Grade 7-8-9	3	12	<b>15</b>
Total	<u>17</u>	<u>28</u>	<b><u>45</u></b>
<b>Immaddudin School (Male')</b>			
Grade 1-2-3	5	6	<b>11</b>
Grade 4-5-6	4	3	<b>7</b>
Grade 7-8-9	0	4	<b>4</b>
Total	<u>9</u>	<u>13</u>	<b><u>22</u></b>
<b>CHSE (Male')</b>			
Grade 11	7	3	<b>10</b>
Total	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<b><u>10</u></b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>118</b>

UNICEF & Ministry of Education - Maldives

# Inception Report

**REVIEW OF THE LIFE SKILLS EDUCATION PROGRAM SUPPORTED BY UNICEF  
MALDIVES FOR THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, MALE' MALDIVES.**

Evaluator: Tamo Wagener – Consultant  
01/01/2016

## 1. INTRODUCTION (objective, background, scope)

UNICEF has supported the Ministry of Education (MoE) to develop and implement the Life Skills Education (LSE) program since 2011, with the **objectives** to:

- 1- Boost students' knowledge and skills to enhance their personal and social competences to resist risky situations that impact on their well-being such as drugs, HIV/AIDS, sexual health and others.
- 2- To strengthen institutional capacity at the Ministry of Education and schools to roll out the school-based Life Skills Education (LSE) programme for students in secondary schools across the country.

The **expected result** was that students participate in LSE programs and have appropriate knowledge and skills to protect themselves from abuse and exploitation and prevent them from engaging in risky behavior including substance abuse.

The MoE and the National Institute of Education (NIE) are gradually rolling out a new National Curriculum (in grade 1,2 and 3 for school year 2014-2015, grade 4,5 and 6 next year) and the National Institute for Education (NIE) has integrated life skills into this new curriculum.

UNICEF Maldives and the MoE wish to conduct a review of the LSE program that UNICEF has supported since 4 years. The purpose of the LSE review is to assess the relevance, coverage, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of the LSE program. As defined in the ToR it will primarily:

6. Review the progress achieved so far
7. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the programme, challenges encountered and means of addressing the challenges.
8. Review the national curriculum and curriculum materials to identify how LSE is integrated and to make recommendations to strengthen delivery through the curriculum.
9. Undertake a cost analysis of the Programme to strengthen the results based management of the programme and make recommendations for efficient delivery of the Programme – going forward.
10. Identify students knowledge of life skills, students' perceptions on the importance of LSE, and their perceived benefits in their day to day life and how students think LSE can be improved.

In consultation with UNICEF, It was decided that the cost analysis of the programme (point 4 above) could not be taking place because of the limited timeframe of the assignment.

The review will be undertaken in November and December 2015. The consultant will be based in Male' from November 8 to 19<sup>th</sup> and will conduct the rest of the review from home.

In the Maldives the review will geographically cover the capital city Male' and 2 islands. The review will include case studies of 4 schools (2 schools in Male' and 2 in the islands).

UNICEF Maldives, the Ministry of Education and the National Institute of Education will use the findings of this review to improve the life skills education content, delivery and to strengthen institutional mechanisms needed for effective delivery of life skills to students.

This **inception report** specifies the evaluation methodology, determining the exact scope and focus of the evaluation. As such, it defines the evaluation questions, the methods and tools used to collect data and information. Finally, it proposes a schedule for the visit of the consultant to the field (RSS and DRC) and indications regarding the format of the final report.

The **Review Report** will be developed based on the UNEG report format. Length of the report will be 20 to 30 pages + annexes.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

The proposed methodology is based upon the guiding principles of the UN CRC. It complies with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Standards for Evaluation.

### Evaluation criteria and questions

**The review methodology is mostly qualitative.** The results of the review will be measured based on the evaluation questions developed in the enclosed **Analytical framework**.

UNICEF has defined in the ToR that the review would be based upon 4 OECD-CAD (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability,) as well as two additional criteria: coverage and UNICEF added value.

A total 17 **review questions** (and an additional 11 related sub-questions) have been developed covering each of the evaluation criteria. All questions will be answered using triangulation of information collected. The review questions and the associated data collection methods are presented in the Analytical framework.

Case studies will capture the complexity of the delivery of LSE in 4 schools. Each case study will include:

- Background information on the development of LSE in this specific school
- Details about the implementation process
- Details about human resources involved and material resources used
- Perception by the students, the school personnel and the larger community
- Challenges and successes

The different school's case studies will be compared and used for identifying lessons learned.

### Conceptual framework

"Life skills"<sup>17</sup> are defined by UNICEF as psychosocial abilities for adaptive and positive behaviour that enable individuals to deal effectively with the demands and challenges of everyday life. They are loosely grouped into three broad categories of skills: cognitive skills for analyzing and using information, personal skills for developing personal agency and managing oneself, and inter-personal skills for communicating and interacting effectively with others.

Life skills education is a structured programme of needs- and outcomes-based participatory learning that aims to increase positive and adaptive behaviour by assisting individuals to develop and practise psycho-social skills that minimize risk factors and maximize protective factors.

For the purpose of the proposed review, **Life skills Education (LSE) is defined as knowledge and skills to enhance people's personal and social competence to resist risky situations that impact on their well-being such as drugs, HIV/AIDS, sexual health and others.**

### Analytical approach

Data and information are collected from a variety of sources including direct beneficiaries (children), indirect beneficiaries (parents and teachers), implementers (school personnel, technical stakeholders), monitoring agencies and policy makers.

Evaluation questions will be responded by cross cutting and analysing information collected from those different sources as described in the Analytical framework.

---

<sup>17</sup> [http://www.unicef.org/lifeskills/index\\_7308.html](http://www.unicef.org/lifeskills/index_7308.html)

A reflection workshop (half day in Male) will take place for the consultant to present initial findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations for future strategic planning and programming. The consultant will use a PowerPoint presentation and will engage dialogue on findings and future programming through Focus Group Discussions.

### **Evaluability assessment**

A number of factors challenge the evaluability of the assignment:

- There is a limited number of documents and data related to the design and implementation of the LSE program available at UNICEF. At time of writing the inception report no initial narrative presentation, detailed logical framework or action plan, measurable performance indicators specifically designed for the LSE program could be identified. Only 2 recent project monitoring reports were identified.
- The absence of a baseline measurement of students' knowledge and skills to protect themselves from abuse, exploitation and risky behaviours

### **Data collection methods and tools**

- A **documents review** will include legal and policy documents, project documents, curriculum, training materials, teaching resources, studies etc. **TOOL 1: Desk review template**

-**Consultations with key stakeholders** will take place through individual semi structured interviews with persons who have played an essential role in the LSE program or who represent organization who has. Interviews will take place in Male' mostly (but also in both islands). Stakeholders to include: MoE (ESQID, NIE, Ufaa), UNICEF, Health Protection Agency (HPA), UNFPA, National Drugs Agency (NDA), NGOs involved in LSE (SHE, ARC). Each interview will last for 60 to 90 minutes and the consultant will be taking notes on a laptop computer directly during the conversation if the participants agree. **TOOL 2: Stakeholders interview schedule**

-**Observation of LSE tools and activities** are an essential part of the review and should take place in 4 schools. However because the review takes place during the students examinations and over a very short timeframe it is envisaged that very few – if any – observation of activities can take place. When it is not possible to access activities, the consultant will request access to photos or videos that were taken during implementation or LSE programs and to the materials used.

-**Consultations with teachers and other life skills facilitators** will take place in 4 schools, 20 teachers will be consulted in total. Teachers will participate in Focus Group Discussion (FGD) facilitated by the consultant to discuss specific questions and make recommendations on the different points examined in the review. Consultations with teachers will last approximately 45-60 mn. It is expected that 30 teachers and other school personnel will be consulted through FGDs. An additional 10 LSE facilitators will be consulted through a longer group discussion in Male' organized with the support of Ufaa which is currently in charge of training life skills facilitators. When considered relevant by the consultant, a *Project River* will be drawn in different schools. *Project River* is a methodology inspired from River of Life, a visual narrative method to understand and reflect on the past and imagine the future. **TOOL 3: Guiding questions for FGDs with LSE facilitators.**

-**Consultations with children** will take place in 4 schools (3 classes per school – total 12 classes). Students of each class will participate to a FGD using child/youth friendly methodologies (drawings, games, active discussions – see below). 10 to 15 students will participate to each FGD which will last approximately 45 minutes. They will start and finish with a game. They will take place in locations where the children feel comfortable: in the shadow, in an area where it is possible to sit in a circle, ideally in an area where the group can be seen but not heard. School personnel will be able to observe the FGDs if they wish to. The FGDs will build around concrete examples of sessions that the children participated to and of situations related to abuse, exploitation and risky behaviors that could take place in their community. Different techniques will be used to collect the knowledge, understanding, experience and reflections of children on LSE. Guiding questions are presented in **TOOL 4: Guiding questions for FGDs with children**

Techniques used by the consultant during the FGDs include:

- Games to build the dynamic within the group (for instance “clap and point” or “muddling messages”)
- *Flower Map* – a visual method to explore children’s views on whom they seek and gain support from and the kind of support they expect or receive.
- *Smileys* - a visual rating method to rate project activities
- *10 seeds technique* (a participatory learning exercise to gather qualitative information on social issues – will be used only if a specific social issue arises from discussion and if the consultant feels it should be further explored)

The consultant and his counterpart will keep a detailed record of the group discussions, including:

- Level of participation and level of interest;
- Opinions and key statements
- Emotions, reluctance, strong feelings, and so on

**-Consultations with parents** will take place through the Parents Teachers Associations. Parents will participate to a 35-45 mn Focus Group Discussion. It is expected that 24 parents will be participate to 3 different FGDs.

**TOOL 5: Guiding questions for FGDs with parents**

Summary of tools and targets

Method	Tools	Target
1.Desk review	List of documents reviewed with key notes TOOL 1	All documents made available
2. Consultations with key stakeholders	Schedules for semi structured interviews TOOL 2	7 interviews
3. Consultations with teachers and other LSE facilitators	Guiding questions FGDs TOOL 3	30 teachers & other LSE facilitators
4. Consultations with students	Guiding questions for FGDs TOOL 4	120 children
5. Consultations with parents / caregivers	Guiding questions for FGDs TOOL 5	30 parents

Limitations and risks

Because of limited time allocated to the review, no peer review is taking place for the methodology of this review.

For the same reason, no reference group approach will be developed with students and teachers participating to the review.

Observation of LSE implementation at school level is likely to be limited (if any) because of the period of implementation of the review (school exams).

Informed consent of the student’s parents or caregivers should be sought prior to the consultations. It is however likely because of the last minute changes in the schedule and selection of target islands that time will be too limited to seek the informed consent of students’ caregivers. The consultant will seek the informed consent of the children prior to the FGDs.

### **3. PROGRAMME OF WORK**

#### **Phases of work**

The review is being developed in 3 main phases:

- Phase 1: Documentation review and preparation of inception report
- Phase 2: Field collection of data and information in Maldives & initial analysis
- Phase 3: Full analysis and report

Because of the limited time period, phases 1 and 2 overlap.

#### **Team composition, responsibilities and management**

All activities are undertaken directly by the consultant, Tamo Wagener, who is responsible for the implementation of the review as per good practice standards. He is working together with his counterpart from the Ministry of Education, Ms Nasira Sadiq (Education Development Officer in ESQID) who is providing support and translation services to the consultant.

Ms Mazeena Jameel is supervising and providing support to the consultant on behalf of UNICEF.

The consultant will conduct the evaluation using a participatory approach - representatives of UNICEF and of the MoE will be involved in the design, the carrying out and the interpreting of the evaluation as much as their schedules and resources allow.

The consultant will pay particular attention to:

- Using a child friendly and non-judgmental approach
- Performing interviews and group discussions on a strictly voluntary and informed basis.
- Being responsive and adapting to the various changes in the local environment/context.

#### **Locations and calendar of work**

As mentioned in the ToR the LSE review will prepare case studies for schools in 4 locations (2 in Male' and 2 in the islands). A random selection of schools could not be completed as the selection of schools took place on the arrival of the consultant in Male' and logistical considerations as well as existing positive relations with schools had to be prioritized to be able to run field visits in the next days.

It was therefore decided during a meeting between UNICEF and the Ministry of Education that field visits would take place in schools in Male', Maafushi island and Mahibadhoo island.

The calendar of work for the review was developed by the consultant, together with UNICEF and the MoE



## TOOL 1 – DESK REVIEW TEMPLATE

Prepared by Tamo Wagener for UNICEF Maldives  
Review of LSE program

Status: 12 November 2015

UNICEF LSE PROGRAM DOCUMENTS and program related documents		
	<i>Document name, date, author</i>	<i>Essential information and data collected</i>
1		
2		
3		

MoE LSE PROGRAM DOCUMENTS and program related documents		
	<i>Document name, date, author</i>	<i>Essential information and data collected</i>
1		
2		
3		

LSE PROGRAM ENVIRONMENT (legal framework, research and studies on Maldives, LSE and general education)		
	<i>Document name, date, author</i>	<i>Essential information and data collected</i>
1		
2		
3		

OTHER DOCUMENTS (related technical publications, concept papers, research and studies etc)		
	<i>Document name, date, author</i>	<i>Essential information and data collected</i>
1		
2		
3		

## TOOL 2 – KEY STAKEHOLDERS - INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Prepared by Tamo Wagener for UNICEF Maldives  
Review of LSE program

DAY / TIME \_\_\_\_\_

PERSON NAME / POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

Review of the LSE program – Tamo Wagener – January 2016

### **General introduction questions**

1. What is the focus, history and main projects/activities of your organization?
2. How does your organization link with the LSE program?
3. Which role have you personally played (or are you playing) in the LSE program?

### **A. Relevance**

4. Can you summarize the objective of the LSE program, using your own words?
5. Can you share your knowledge on the history of the LSE program? Which have been the milestones?
6. Can you describe the current operating of the LSE program ? (is this different from last year?) – look at questions of age of children, places and times of sessions, geographical coverage, operators?
7. In your opinion, to what extent is the LSE program aligned with the international commitments of the Maldives?
8. In your opinion, to what extent is the LSE program aligned with the national laws or policies that your work is based upon?
9. Can you think of other strategies that could have been used to provide students with appropriate life skills?
10. What would you like to change in the LSE program?

### **B. Coverage**

11. In your opinion, has the training of facilitators followed a logical plan (selection of facilitators, geographic location of facilitators?)
12. In your opinion are the content, methodology and materials of the LSE program adapted to the needs and situations of students, including the vulnerable and at risk students?
13. In your opinion are the content, methodology and materials of the LSE program adapted to the needs and situations of the teachers?
14. To what extent are gender issues and disabilities addressed through the LSE program?
15. Are you aware of standards that were defined for the LSE program? Are they being used? What is your opinion on them?
16. How satisfied are you with the monitoring of the LSE program?

### **C. Efficiency**

17. In your opinion, to what extent are children in school today gaining knowledge and skills to protect themselves from abuse, exploitation and risky behavior?
18. Can you comment on the following aspects of the implementation of the LSE program:
  - Integration in new National Curriculum
  - Training of teachers and other school personnel

-Content of the program (personal and interpersonal skills, SRH, drugs etc)

How satisfied are you with these different aspects? why?

19. Which resources has your organization invested in LSE ? is that going to change in the future?
20. Can you comment on the consistency of LSE in schools across the country (age of students, LSE facilitators, in or out of school time implementation?)
21. Did the project have any negative results? if so, details and why? How could they have been prevented?
22. Did the project have any positive results that you did not expect or foresee initially? If so, details and why?
23. In your opinion, what is the achievement of the LSE program that has had or will have most impact on the CYP?
24. In your opinion what lessons have been learned during the last couple years through the LSE program and its integration in the National Curriculum?
25. Are there some areas where you think that more results could have been reached or more activities developed?
26. Do you think that certain other groups of children should have been included in the project? Which ones? Why?
27. Can you comment on the planning and monitoring tools that were used throughout the project?

#### **D. Effectiveness**

28. In your opinion is the LSE program being implemented as planned? Why ?
29. Which stakeholders have been associated to the development of the LSE program? (local authorities, other central authorities, youth groups, PTAs, CSOs etc)
30. Has the LSE program collaborated with other projects or initiatives (other than those supporting the rights of children) to build synergies?
31. What is the current strategy for implementing LSE, regarding the selection of islands, selection of teachers and other school personnel for instance?
32. What are the main steps that have to be taken to improve the delivery of LSE in schools?
33. In your opinion, what are the main obstacles the project faced? Were they overcome? How?
34. Do you consider activities have been developed and decisions made fairly to both males and females ?  
Did you find any situations of gender equality?
35. Did the project address the situation of persons with special needs in any aspect?
36. Did you notice specific instances of waste or inefficiency during the project implementation?

#### **E. Sustainability**

37. Would you say LSE is recognized by the concerned professionals (teachers, ESQID, NIE )? How much do they value LSE?
38. Would you say LSE is recognized by the children? How much do they value LSE?
39. Would you say LSE is recognized by parents and the general public? How much do they value LSE?

40. Can you comment on the integration of LSE in the new curriculum?
41. Do you think the LSE program will be fully integrated in the New Curriculum in 3 years? Why?
42. If yes: in your opinion what are the main challenges that will come up?
43. If yes, what resources or conditions will be needed?
44. Would you say that the LSE program has inspired other initiatives?
45. Has your experience in this project led you to develop new projects based on the experience, the tools gained in the LSE program?

#### **F. UNICEF added value**

46. Can you comment on UNICEF's participation to the project in regards to:
  - Program design
  - Development of quality standards
  - Research, monitoring and evaluation
  - Technical support
  - Financial support to activities
47. Can you provide an overall comment on the role that UNICEF has played in the project?

#### **Final point**

Is there anything else you would like to add to what you have already said?

*Note: Additional questions might be included in the schedule depending on information collected prior to the interview or during the interview*

## **TOOL 2 – LSE facilitators FGDs – GUIDING QUESTIONS**

Prepared by Tamo Wagener for UNICEF Maldives  
Review of LSE program

**DAY / TIME** \_\_\_\_\_

#### **PARTICIPANTS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Structure</b>	<b>Position</b>

#### **General introduction of participants**

1. What is the focus, history and main projects/activities of your organization?
2. Which role have you personally played (or are you playing) in the LSE program?

### A. Relevance & coverage

3. **Can you summarize the objective** of the LSE program, using your own words?
4. Can you share your knowledge on the **history** of the LSE program? Which have been the milestones?
5. Can you describe the current **operating of the LSE program** ? (is this different from last year?) – look at questions of age of children, places and times of sessions, materials used?
6. In your opinion are the **content, methodology and materials of the LSE program** adapted to the needs and situations of the teachers?
7. Can you think of **other strategies** that could have been used to provide students with appropriate life skills?
8. Are you aware of **standards** that were defined for implementing the LSE program? Are they being used? What is your opinion on them?
9. Can you describe and comment the **training** you have received to conduct LSE sessions ?
10. If the project was being developed again, what would you change?
11. If the project was being developed again, which current aspects or activities would you absolutely keep?

### C. Efficiency & effectiveness

12. In your opinion, to what extent are children in school today gaining knowledge and skills to protect themselves from abuse, exploitation and risky behavior?
13. Can you comment on the following aspects of the implementation of the LSE program:
  - Integration in new National Curriculum
  - Content of the program (personal and interpersonal skills, SRH, drugs etc)
 How satisfied are you with these different aspects? why?
14. What are the main challenges you face when running LSE sessions? if so, details and why? How could they have been prevented?
15. Did the project have any **unexpected positive results** that you did not expect or foresee initially? If so, details and why?
16. In your opinion, in which sense did the **LSE have most impact** on the CYP?
17. Are there some areas where you think that more results could have been reached or more activities developed?
18. Do you consider activities have been developed fairly to both males and females ? Did you find any situations of **gender** equality?
19. Do you think that **certain other groups of children** should have been included in the project? Which ones? Why?
20. Did the project address the situation of **persons with special needs** in any aspect?
21. How do you **plan and monitor the sessions you give**? Can you comment on the planning and monitoring **tools** that were used throughout the project?
22. Are you satisfied with the **monitoring and support** you are receiving? Who? How?
23. Did you notice specific instances of **waste or inefficiency** during the project implementation?

## E. Sustainability

24. Can you comment on the integration of LS in the new National Curriculum?
25. Would you say LSE is **recognized by the concerned professionals** (teachers, ESQID, NIE )? How much do they value LSE?
26. Would you say **LSE is recognized by the children**? How much do they value LSE?
27. Would you say LSE is **recognized by parents and the general public**? How much do they value LSE?
28. Do you think the LSE program will be **fully integrated in the New Curriculum and operational** in 3 years? Why?  
If yes: in your opinion what are the main challenges that will come up?
29. If yes, **what resources or conditions** will be needed?
30. Would you say that the LSE program has **inspired other initiatives**?

## Final point

Is there anything else you would like to add to what you have already said?

*Note: Additional questions might be included in the schedule depending on information collected prior to the interview or during the interview*

## **TOOL 4 – FGDs WITH CHILDREN – GUIDING QUESTIONS**

Prepared by Tamo Wagener for UNICEF Maldives  
*Review of LSE program*

**LOCATION** \_\_\_\_\_

**DAY / TIME** \_\_\_\_\_

**PARTICIPANTS total:** \_\_\_\_\_ **BOYS** \_\_\_\_\_ **GIRLS** \_\_\_\_\_

Introduction talk: Objective, seek informed consent, game to start

### **1. Discussion with the entire group - Using red and green paper circle for saying Y or N**

Have you ever received information in school (from teacher or from other persons) on:

1. Communicating effectively with other persons
2. What is peer pressure and how to deal with peer pressure
3. How to solve a conflict

4. How our body develops (*and how the reproductive system functions – for students grade 7 and above*)
5. What are drugs and why it is not safe to use drugs
6. Who should be informed and who can help if a child is victim of violence or abuse

If yes:

- Who provided information? teacher or other person?
- Was it this school year or previously?

Among those topics which one did you find most useful, why ?

## 2. Flower map

- If you needed more information on (topic after topic), who would you ask ?

Using flower map with circle rates

**Summary to recap what LSE means**

## 3. Students comment the following sentences using Smileys

1. The LSE sessions were interesting, I learned useful information
2. I think LSE sessions take place too often
3. I have materials to help me remember important information
4. I want to learn more about relations between boys and girls
5. I want to learn more about topics such as drugs or HIV
6. I know other children who have shared pictures of themselves on the internet or through phone and who got into trouble
7. Some people in the island were annoyed when we participated to LS education
8. I know some children who have big problems but I do not know who to talk about it
9. I know what I should do if I see someone who is hitting a child

## 4. Small Group discussion (3 to 5 students)

*Which topics or issues do you think should be further discussed in school?*

*Any other points you want to talk about ?*

**Game to finish**

*Questions might be edited depending on information collected in the community or about the community prior to the focus group discussion*



## TOOL 4 – FGDs WITH PARENTS – GUIDING QUESTIONS

Prepared by Tamo Wagener for UNICEF Maldives  
Review of LSE program

LOCATION \_\_\_\_\_

DAY / TIME \_\_\_\_\_

PARTICIPANTS total: \_\_\_\_\_ MALE \_\_\_\_\_ FEMALE \_\_\_\_\_

57

Introduction talk: Objective, seek informed consent, presentation of LSE concept

In your opinion which are the dangers or risky behaviour that your children might be facing?

In your opinion are your children today gaining knowledge and skills to be able to protect themselves from abuse and exploitative behaviour? If yes, where? How ?

Do you know if you children are receiving LSE at school?

Is it important to you that students receive LSE at school?

Do you know which topics or situations are being addressed in the LSE program?

*(list the topics that are part of the curriculum)*

If yes

Can you explain to me how you think the LSE program operates?

Did you get comments from your children about the LSE program?

Would you say they enjoy LSE?

What do you think are the challenges faced by the school and the teachers for running LSE?

Did you see any effect on the children after they participated to LSE? Can you give examples?

Which topics do you find most useful?

Which topics do you find less useful?

If no

Would you like your children to receive LSE at school?

Which skills, which topics do you think should be included in the LSE program?

ALL parents

Which other LSE skills / topics would you like to develop in school?

Do you think LSE can have negative effects as well?

In your opinion what role should parents play in LSE (in school and out of school)?

*Questions might be edited depending on information collected in the community or about the community prior to the focus group discussion*

## ANNEX 7 – Terms of Reference of the LSE review

Terms of Reference for Individual Contract for an

### **International Consultant to undertake a review of life skills education programme**

**TOR Reference Number: TOR/2015/10**

59

#### **1. Purpose of assignment (attach background documents if any)**

##### **Background:**

Maldives has attained Universal Primary education (94.4% in 2013, MoE statistics) and achieved high rates of enrolments at Lower Secondary education Levels (92.3% in 2013, MoE statistics). While attendance in primary education is near universal, net attendance rate for lower secondary is 66.3%, with girls having a higher attendance rate (74.3%) compared to boys (58.7%) (DHS, 2009). Drop-out rates for lower secondary level (for Grade 7) is higher for boys than for girls. Students in the remote islands drop out of school at Grade 7 more often than children in Male'.

Evidence suggest adolescents face deprivations and vulnerabilities in their homes, communities and schools that predispose them to dropping out of school and/or migrate to other islands in search of schooling and a protective environment. Adolescents are also at risk of abuse, exploitation and are increasingly engaging in criminal behaviour including drug abuse. The case records at the Maldives Police Services shows an increase of 32.5% of juvenile crimes from the cases reported in 2013. 40% of the cases were related to drugs while another 18% were related to violent assault. The Juvenile Justice statistics shows that 61% of children in conflict with the law are school drop outs (16% from grade 7 at 13 years; 37% from grade 8 at 14 years; and 20% from grade 9 at 15 years.) The data also indicate that 31% of these children in conflict with the law are from broken families. Furthermore, the National Drug Use Survey shows 47.6% of drug users in Male' were aged between 15-19 years. Evidence suggest that children and adolescents experience high level of violence against them at home, in school and in the community.

Evidence suggest that given correct information and skills, they can make informed choices and prevent themselves from getting into risky behaviour. Further, building skills to protect themselves from harm will enable them to complete education, help them reach their potential and develop a balanced personality and make a smooth transition into adulthood.

It is to this end, UNICEF Maldives supported the Ministry of Education to develop and implement Life skills education to:

1- Boost students' knowledge and skills to enhance their personal and social competence to resist risky situations that impact on their well-being such as drugs, HIV/AIDS, sexual health and others.

2- To strengthen institutional capacity at the Ministry of Education and schools to roll out the school-based Life Skills Education (LSE) programme for students in secondary schools across the country.

The expected results was that students participate in LSE programs and have appropriate knowledge and skills to protect themselves from abuse and exploitation and prevent them from engaging in risky behaviour including substance abuse.

With UNICEF Maldives support, the strong ownership and commitment of the Ministry and participation of schools, the LSE program was implemented in 52 out of 219 schools in 2014 alone.

The LSE programme had met with challenges in implementation which includes limited financial resources and limited number of qualified life skills facilitators to travel to the farfetched islands to train teachers in the islands. Weak institutional capacity has also limited monitoring of the programme.

While the LSE Programme was being rolled out, the Ministry of education and the National Institute of Education has integrated life skills into the new National Curriculum. The curriculum stipulated the vision that is set out to achieve quality of education for Maldives, the shared values the society deems important and the key competencies that all children and young people are expected to acquire through schooling, upon which all learning is organized. These competencies form the common core of achievement and emphasizes achieving the knowledge, skills, values, skills and attitudes identified with in each key competency. Since January 2015, the foundation stage and pre-primary stages of the curriculum is been rolled out, with the next stages planned for 2016.

As UNICEF has supported LSE for the last 4 years, UNICEF plans to undertake a **review** of the LSE programme and the support UNICEF has extended to the Ministry of Education. For the purpose of the proposed review, **Life skills are defined** as a large group of psycho social and interpersonal skills that can help people make informed decisions, communicate effectively, and develop coping and self-management skills that may help lead a healthy and productive life. Life skill education refers to educational interventions that seek to provide these skills.

1. What is the basic project objective to which the consultancy is related?

UNICEF has supported the LSE program throughout the current country programme, which is completing at the end of 2015. Hence, it is pertinent that a review of the LSE programme be undertaken at this point in time, so as to inform:

- i) The progress made in implementing LSE
- ii) The challenges faced and how they can be addressed
- iii) How the LSE programme can be scaled up to all schools.

The purpose of the consultancy is to:

1. Review the progress achieved so far

**2. To identify the strengths and weaknesses of the programme,** challenges encountered and means of addressing the challenges.

**3. Review the national curriculum and curriculum materials** to identify how LSE is integrated and to make recommendations to strengthen delivery through the curriculum.

**4. Undertake a cost analysis** of the Programme to strengthen the results based management of the programme and make recommendations for efficient delivery of the Programme – going forward.

**5. Identify what students’ knowledge of life skills, students’ perceptions** on the importance of LSE, perceived benefits in their day to day life and how students think LSE can be improved.

The review will specifically assess issues of relevance, coverage, efficiency of delivery, effectiveness, sustainability of the LSE programme and UNICEF additionally.

For the purpose of this review, **relevance** is defined as “the alignment of the LSE programme with International commitments, Ministry of Education policies, needs of young people and their vulnerabilities and the ability to adapt programs to changing circumstances and environments.

**Coverage** is the extent to which the interventions meets quality standards for those that are able to access it. In assessing the coverage of the LSE programme, the consultant will also identify if LSE interventions are targeted at ages appropriate for knowledge, attitudes, skills and behaviour change, if they are gender sensitive and inclusive and if the interventions are adapted to the needs and circumstances of students, including the vulnerable and at risk students.

**Efficiency:** The extent to which LSE is delivered in ways that make good use of adequate resources to deliver and maintain quality learning.

**Effectiveness:** Focusses on whether the LSE program stipulates plausible and feasible pathways to achieve results and whether efforts are in place to monitor implementation and measure the intended outcomes.

**Sustainability:** The LSE programmes are planned and implemented in gender sensitive and sustainable ways through the education system response. The consultant will assess if LSE is institutionalized in the national structures, if materials and human resources are committed and whether LSE has been recognized in public and professional opinion.

### **OECD criteria done plus**

**UNICEF Additionality:** Determines if UNICEF contributed to LSE that is of high quality and matches standards, reaches intended learners and is making an impact on their lives.

The findings of this review will be used by UNICEF Maldives and the Ministry of Education and the National Institute of Education to improve the life skills education content, delivery and to strengthen institutional mechanisms needed for effective delivery of life skills to students.

## 1. Duty station:

Male', Maldives (for Data collection phase) **2. Major tasks to be accomplished**

### Tasks Time period

a. **Review documents** on the LSE policy and practice, including the LSE program content, training materials for teachers, curriculum and teaching resources.

b. Produce an **inception report** outlining the background, the issue to be reviewed, methodological approach, including types of data and information to be reviewed, persons to be interviewed and the time line and schedule of activities for completing the assessment. **4 days from Home base**

c. **Conduct stakeholder consultations** to get additional information **2 days in Male'/Maldives**

d. **Undertake case studies in 4 schools (2 schools in the islands and 2 in Male'). 10 days in Maldives with travel to 3 islands.**

e. **Present the findings to MOE, NIE and UNICEF 1 day in Male'**

f. **Draft review report** with key findings from the desk review, key informant interviews and focus group discussions and recommendations to address the issues. **3 days (Home base)**

g. **Finalize the report 2 days (Home base)**

**No. of consultancy days: 22, No. of DSA days: 10. 3. Deliverables**

The assessment consultant will deliver the following products:

1. An inception report outlining the methodological approach, including types of data and information to be reviewed, the report outline and timeframe for completing the assessment based on this TOR
2. Draft evaluation report to be submitted to the UNICEF and Ministry of Education for review and comments
3. Presentation of key findings and recommendations for comments from UNICEF and Ministry of Education
4. Final Review report **4. Estimated duration of contract.**

22 working days between 5<sup>th</sup> Oct – 5<sup>th</sup> November 2015. **5. Official travel involved (itinerary and duration)**

The consultant will make one trip into the country and will travel locally to the islands if needed. **6. Qualifications or specialized knowledge and / or experience required**

· Qualifications or specialized knowledge and/or experience required

- An advanced university degree or equivalent in social sciences,
- At least 6 years of experience in conducting/ leading similar reviews and evaluations.
- Excellent report writing skills, analytical skills as well as good computer skills;
- Experience in working with teams and team processes;
- Understanding of UNICEF programme policies, strategies and approaches as asset.

How to apply:

**Deadline for application is 17<sup>th</sup> September 2015**

Interested candidates should submit an Expression of Interest along with;

- (i) An updated CV with proof of similar work previously undertaken,
- (ii) A proposal on how the applicant will undertake this assignment with methodology, and produce the deliverables.
- (iii) Proposed lump sum fee (in USD)

To: [muaahmed@unicef.org](mailto:muaahmed@unicef.org) with a copy to [asmohamed@unicef.org](mailto:asmohamed@unicef.org)

**ONLY SHORT-LISTED APPLICANTS WILL BE NOTIFIED.**

# ANNEX 8 – Contents of manuals (including module number)

	<i>Communication</i>	<i>Assertiveness</i>	<i>Self esteem</i>	<i>Values</i>	<i>Self-awareness</i>	<i>Relationships</i>	<i>Decision making</i>	<i>Peer pressure</i>	<i>Anger</i>	<i>Stress</i>	<i>Conflict resolution</i>	<i>Child abuse</i>	<i>Body image</i>	<i>Media influence</i>	<i>Gender and sex</i>	<i>HIV/AIDS</i>	<i>Gender roles</i>	<i>Anger management</i>	<i>Starting a family</i>	<i>Conception and pregnancy</i>	<i>Contraception</i>	<i>Sexual Transmitted Infections</i>	<i>Dual use of condoms</i>	<i>Responsible parenthood</i>	<i>Domestic violence and abuse</i>	<i>Becoming organized</i>	<i>Preparing for and starting a family</i>	<i>Conception</i>	<i>Pregnancy and contraception</i>
<u>Pack 1 - Grade 6-7</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	11	12	13		9															
<u>Pack 2 - Grade 8-9</u>	1	2		3	8	12	5	6	10	11	14		4	7	9	13													
<u>Pack 3 - Grade 11-12</u>	1	2						3			7			4			5	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15			
<u>Pack 4 out of school</u>	1	3	2	4		12	6	5		8	10			9	11			7	14	15		13		16	17				15