

Frances Ferreira  
Commonwealth of Learning  
1055 West Hastings Street  
Suite 1200  
Vancouver  
BC V6E 2E9  
Canada

15 August 2008

Dear Frances

**Confidential**

You have received our draft report documenting our evaluation findings for the capacity building work undertaken with the Bangladesh Open School and its partners, particularly in respect of the interesting development of programmes for Junior Secondary Education (JSE). We feel that some of the reasons behind our rather negative conclusions may be best presented in a confidential letter to you, rather than in the more public arena of the report.

A reminder to all of us first. The development of the JSE work is presented as a three-year partnership project, funded by four donor agencies who are traditional supporters of CAMPE (Campaign for Popular Education), and by COL for elements of capacity building. CAMPE carries the full responsibility for budgeting, financial management and delivery of the project (including regular monitoring and evaluation). BOS/BOU is expected to contribute its expertise in relation to curriculum, preparation of instructional materials and the setting of examinations.

What we have seen is a very uneven partnership, and here we move to examples of this:

1. The BOS Co-ordinator is Mirzan Rahman, a relatively junior member of staff. As of now, he is weakly supported by the new Dean of Education at BOS, who comes new to ODL and has only the slightest of understandings about the JSE project. Please note that we believe Mirzan works beyond the call of duty to try to motivate BOS/BOU colleagues to be pro-active. We have detected little interest in this development from the top of the organisation, perhaps because it is seen as a small pilot project with a mere 2000 students. By contrast, CAMPE, leads with its very senior Programme Manager, Tapon Kumar Das; their Director, Roshina Chaudrury, a very influential educator currently running primary education in the MoE, takes a close personal interest in the project.
2. This lack of seriousness on the part of BOS/BOU has a number of frustrating implications. These include:

- The failure of BOU, nearly two years into the project, to finalise the MOU between the partners which is a standard part of the relationship where donor money is involved. The Registrar, when tasked with this, simply said that it was being dealt with and would be concluded ‘within 2 to 3 months’.
- The failure of BOU, despite a long lead-time, to articulate the process of summative evaluation and certification for the JSE learners.
- The failure of BOU to repay, in timely fashion, funds loaned to it by CAMPE to allow the process of the second instructional materials workshop to proceed.
- The failure of BOU to share the presentation of the project at the recent PCF5 meeting, where ten BOU staff participated and yet no single professional from the partner NGOs was invited.

At the end of the three-year project cycle, it is in principle agreed that the JSE programme will be institutionalised at BOU. It is already clear that there is a large potential population ‘out there’ for a first-class JSE programme. It is our anxiety that lack of serious engagement by BOS/BOU now, may result in a less than optimal programme being taken forward, with poor intellectual and practical commitment from the open school/university in the future. We note here that the particular target population for the JSE programme is not one from which serious fee income may be generated; the university may well find itself seeking subsidies in the future, which are much more likely to be forthcoming for a course recognised as state-of-the-art.

3. Where BOS/BOU should be pulling its weight as a specialist ODL institution is in the preparation of sound instructional material for the students. As you know, the materials produced for Grade 6 were at best modest and at worst a disgrace (having in one case to be withdrawn prior to use!). The BOS Co-ordinator believes that there is some improvement in the already completed Grade 7 materials, and is determined to manage a much tighter drafting operation for Grade 8 materials. Hopefully, then, things are going in the right direction, but anxieties remain:
  - BOS/BOU staff still dominate the writing teams even though they have the most tenuous links with teaching and learning in Grades 6 – 8. We have recommended that at least draft materials be trialled with subject tutors in the centres, prior to finalisation.
  - Even for the withdrawn instructional material, BOS/BOU staff insisted they should be paid, in the face of serious and justified unhappiness at CAMPE. We propose that full payments to writers not be made until publication has been agreed.
4. We are concerned that the JSE project is at high risk of failure, for three principal reasons:
  - There has been insufficient analysis of the realistic learning outcomes for this particular JSE population (drop-outs from Grade 5; many in full-time, low-income, long-hours employment), given the present inputs – 45 minutes face-to-

- face teaching in each subject per fortnight, textbooks (sorry, instructional materials) of variable but generally poor quality.
- The very committed teachers, who give up half of their only free day of the week, have predictably not changed, in the classes we have observed, from being teachers to tutors. We have made proposals for addressing this issue.
  - And we view the prospect of the forthcoming five weeks of examinations set by BOS/BOU with some trepidation. Will the test items be (i) properly related to the students' learning and (ii) representative of sound testing practice and error-free?

5. To conclude on a more optimistic note, we have a small vision that, if the project really got its tutors behaving differently with their Friday classes, if provided with suitable incentives, there might even be positive feedback into the mainstream school teaching that is their business for the rest of the week. We understand there is scope for improvement of classroom practice in conventional schools.

Obviously, we stand ready to discuss this letter with you, by whatever mechanism seems best.

With all good wishes.

Yours sincerely

Terry Allsop

Alicia Fentiman

CONFIDENTIAL

**An Evaluation of the Impact of Capacity Development  
Supported by the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) at  
the Bangladesh Open School (BOS) in the Context of  
the Development of a Junior Secondary Education  
Programme with the Campaign for Popular Education  
(CAMPE)**

**Alicia Fentiman**

**Terry Allsop**

**March – September 2008**

## **Contents**

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Acronyms</b>	
<b>Section 1: Executive Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Section 2: Project Context</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Section 3: Monitoring and Evaluation Purposes</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Section 4: Monitoring and Evaluation, Design and Implementation</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Section 5: Findings</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Section 6: Conclusions</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Section 7: Recommendations</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Annexes</b>	
<b>A Terms of Reference</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>B Data Collection Instruments</b>	<b>29</b>

## **Acknowledgements**

Many colleagues have contributed to making this an interesting assignment, specifically:

From COL: Frances Ferreira, Educational Specialist and Carol Walker, administrator for Basic Education.

From BOS/BOU:

Mirzan Rahman - JSE Co-ordinator, to whom we are particularly indebted

Motaharul Islam - Assistant Co-ordinator

Alinoor Rahman - Dean, Open School

We also held meetings with Vice-Chancellor, Registrar and Treasurer

From CAMPE:

Tapon Kumar Das – Programme Manager

Nilufar Zarin – Assistant Programme Officer

Mizanur Rahman Akhand – Deputy Programme Manager

From DAM:

Kazi Rafiqul Alam, President and Chief Executive

Ehsanur Rahman – Deputy Executive Director

Md. Mohsin, Assistant Director, Training and Materials Development

M.A. Rashid

Salma Pervin, Programme Officer

From VERC:

Md Mainul Islam Coordinator, Education

From CARITAS:

Pintu Albert Peris

Most importantly, the Supervisors, Tutors and learners of the following JSE Study

Centres:

Notre Dame

Sonagaon

Kathaltola (Muripal)

Savar

## **Acronyms**

APOSS      Andhra Pradesh Open School Society

BOS         Bangladesh Open School

BOU         Bangladesh Open University

CAMPE      Campaign for Popular Education

CD           Compact Disc

DAM	Dhaka Ahsania Mission
F2F	Face-to-face
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GoB	Government of Bangladesh
JSC	Junior Secondary Certificate
JSE	Junior Secondary Education
SLM	Self Learning Materials
ODL	Open and Distance Learning
OS	Open School
SLM	Student Learning Materials

## 1. Executive Summary

The Bangladesh Open School in collaboration with the Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE) launched in 2007 an innovative Junior Secondary Education programme aimed to provide a flexible mode of education to disadvantaged youth in Grades 6-8. The rationale for this is that a significant number of children in Bangladesh do not have access to education at the Junior Secondary level. It is well documented that there is a significant decline in enrolment from primary to secondary school because of economic, social, and cultural constraints which lead to a large number of children and youth dropping out of school. As a result, a new opportunity to provide JSE equivalence was devised by the Bangladesh Open School and the Campaign for Popular Education.

The Commonwealth of Learning has been involved in the conception of this new initiative and has assisted in various ways in developing the programme. Most recently, COL has provided technical assistance by identifying three key areas which were deemed critical for the success of the pilot project. These included the enhancement of course development skills, training staff in implementing open schooling and the enhancement of managerial/financial management capacity.

Three intended Outputs were identified with a number of planned activities which would aid in providing a quality education project and to enhancing skills of Open School staff.

- Output 1: Staff capacity to develop ODL material will be enhanced through a series of activities which include training in materials development, on-line support, training of two staff members in digital content development and to develop a house style manual for materials development.
- Output 2: Tutor capacity to support the implementation of the curriculum will be enhanced through training activities and the development of a tutor guide.
- Output 3: Staff will receive training in the development and implementation of budget preparation and monitoring of expenditure and will be supported through the use of an online training guide.

The purpose of this evaluation is to examine how successful and effective these three core activities have been in supporting the JSE Programme. The results of the Monitoring and Evaluation report will be used to provide feedback to the Educational Specialist at COL and the BOS partnership.

We realised early on that there is potential for confusion regarding the scope of this evaluation as it relates to the overall JSE initiative. Therefore we shall try to use the following distinctions throughout this report:

**JSE Programme** relates to the overall initiative

**COL Project Contribution** relates solely to the specific COL inputs to the JSE Programme.

The key findings from the report are:

### **1. Appropriateness of the three Outputs/Outcomes**

All of the three outputs/outcomes from the COL contribution were appropriate in conception; they were necessary elements in the creation of an effective ODL programme. But, there were two major shortcomings in their delivery and execution:

\* Outputs 1 and 2 needed a much clearer grounding in the realities of the JSE programme population and the tutors who would be working with the students. While significant consultation did take place between COL and the implementing partners, CAMPE and BOU, this did not always carry through into the working partnership. Thus, Outputs 1 and 2 provided important **general** introductions to working in the context of ODL, without being responsive to the particular local context (youthful learners often working in full-time jobs with poor study conditions; tutors making a teaching contribution on their one rest day in the week). The necessary grounding could not have come from BOU staff, as they have the most tenuous links with Grade 6 – 8 schooling. There needed to be a much stronger analytical base and much stronger participation in planning from the NGO partners.

\* Output 3 was conceived well enough as a contribution to the strengthening of budgeting and financial management at BOU/BOS, but was largely wasted because two of the three participants have since disappeared from the ODL world, and the third, the BOU Treasurer, does not yet engage with the budgeting for this programme.

### **2. About the project context, appropriateness of the activities, the role of the partners, the quality of the management & implementation of the activities**

\* [Project context] The population for take-up of this programme is clearly there and potentially huge. For the NGO partners it is a logical extension of their work in non-formal basic education. There is evidence from elsewhere that a flexible mode of delivery, using genuine ODL approaches, can work with this age group.

\* [Activities] There are many anxieties here, which include

- Serious weaknesses in the quality of the course materials and their appropriateness for individual study in difficult environments
- Whether the extent of training for those who teach the programme has been sufficient to shift their roles from being classroom teachers on Thursdays to facilitators on Fridays, which leads to anxieties about the effectiveness of the F2F sessions
- Whether it is realistic to expect students to take so many courses in each year, effectively asking them to cover the same material in the same time as full-time school students

- Which raises questions about the number of subjects studied each year. In contrast, the APOSS approach is to offer a limited number of core/key subjects and aim for high quality in those few subjects.

\* [Role of the partners]

- There is a serious imbalance in the partnership charged with delivering this programme; it doesn't really even feel much like a partnership. In summary, the NGOs do all the programme delivery, supervision, etc, - on the whole rather well; while BOS/BOU have limited responsibilities which, to date, they have discharged weakly.

\* [Quality of management]

- NGO management is effective and results-orientated  
- The BOS/BOU Coordinator struggles manfully, but is hampered by the very low level of ownership of the programme by his institution, at all levels

### **3. About the effectiveness of COL's direct and indirect contributions to this project**

\* Output 1

- Very good consultants were appointed; their presentation in relation to materials development was at a rather general level, but of good quality. What appears to be missing is a link between consultant inputs, BOS/BOU faculty participating, and the level of instructional materials required for the target population.

- Although discussions were held with the NGO partners in relation to the matching of the needs of the population to the design of the materials, two explanations appear possible

(i) The NGO partners were unable to articulate clearly the context of the student population

(ii) The views of the NGO partners did not prevail in the creation of the materials in cooperation with BOU/BOS faculty.

- Have BOU faculty become any more effective in creating quality learning materials for this population? It is clearly too early to make an accurate assessment of this question; we have to wait to see the quality improvement in the Year 8 materials. Nevertheless, we have significant anxieties, caused chiefly by the almost complete failure of the BOU/BOS faculty, who dominate the writing, to begin to understand the context of writing for this student population.

Output 2

- Again, good training of tutors with a good introductory manual for ODL techniques. There was an issue of the language of the manual and the language of training (both English) when the lead trainer was a Bangla/Bengali speaker. Participants would have preferred to have had the workshop in Bangla even though there was simultaneous translation from English to Bangla.

- But the course was poorly linked to the reality of the tutorial context, with the result that we were able to see **no** evidence of ODL approaches being used in any of our field visits.

It must be appreciated, however, that the tutor training was recent. The course was developed in consultation with the tutors.

### Output 3

- Sadly, the financing/budgeting inputs have made no difference at all to the quality of financial management within BOU/BOS. Given that the three participants in the training had no engagement with the JSE Programme, whose financial management rests with CAMPE, it clearly has not assisted in the financial affairs of this programme. None of the three who participated have utilized the training they received.

## **4. Lessons learned – regarding the programme and/or the conduct of M&E**

Our major conclusion is that the JSE Programme was poorly conceptualised, with inadequate stakeholder analysis; that the BOU – CAMPE partnership is rather weak, with BOU taking a very detached position; that as a result, the COL Project Contributions were much less effective than they might have been. What was needed was a carefully structured pilot programme, based on an exhaustive stakeholder analysis and subsequent design process. Now there is much remedial work to be done to get the JSE Programme on to a sustainable track.

### **Recommendations**

The following recommendations are based on the findings of the evaluation. Where possible, they are linked to the categorisations of **COL Project Contribution** and **JSE Programme**. In one case they are joint recommendations.

#### **R.1 Use of Technology and ICT at all levels need to be appropriate** [COL Project Contribution]

Technical and on-line resources at BOU are limited and this needs to be taken into account when devising workshops and assignments which require constant on-line access. Clear criteria were given by COL regarding access to ICT, and agreed by the partners; these were not met.

#### **R.2 Adapt User Friendly Materials** [COL Project Contribution + JSE Programme]

The materials need to be matched to the population with writers who are familiar with the learners and their level of abilities. It is essential that tutors and educational writers in NGOs lead or have significant input in drafting the materials and are involved in pilot testing the materials before they are printed. This would aid in devising appropriate, relevant and user friendly material. Advice was given clearly by COL in this respect, but poorly taken up.

#### **R.3 More detailed Stakeholder Analysis** [JSE Programme]

It is recommended there is a need for more thorough stakeholder analysis given the fragile nature of partnership between the Bangladesh Open School and CAMPE, the roles of each, and the needs of the target population.

**R.4 Invest in BOU-CAMPE partnership [JSE Programme]**

The quality of the partnership needs to be improved. Presently, it is a very unbalanced partnership and the resources, key people and responsibilities need to be clearly defined.

**R.5 Revise the Course Structure [JSE Programme]**

The course structure (which is a mirror of the formal sector) of 7 core subjects and 1 vocational course is *not* appropriate for the targeted audience of disadvantaged learners (many of whom are working 6 days/week in tough environments). There are too many subjects being offered and very limited face to face instruction of only 45 minutes/course every two weeks. This affects the quality of the course.

**R.6 More Teacher Training and Support [JSE Programme]**

The teachers who teach in the formal sector during the week and become tutors on Fridays require more training in how to support learners who are largely studying independently, using elements of ODL methodology, and they require more on-going support and greater incentives.

**R.7 Devise an Action Plan from BOU/CAMPE on Tutor Support [JSE Programme]**

A detailed Plan of Action and Guidelines should be developed to ensure that the Lead Tutors, who train the tutors on the ground, have the necessary support and encouragement to continue their training. The training of tutors in ODL methodology is crucial for the programme to work effectively.

**R.8 Financial Plan of the Partnership [JSE Programme]**

A coherent Financial Plan of the partnership between BOU and CAMPE needs to be developed and made public. For example, money which has been provided to the BOU Open School needs to be transparently accounted for without further delays. There is still an outstanding issue of payment due to CAMPE for a training workshop. There are no records of it within BOU; who is responsible? Is it the treasurer at BOU or the Open School? Proper documentation and clarification from BOU needs to be put in place to eliminate the possibility of future misunderstandings.

**Limitations**

The consultants received overwhelming support and assistance from COL, BOU and NGO staff. However, some problems we faced during the consultancy were:

- Lack of continuity of staff (the former BOU Dean did not make himself available to be interviewed)
- Some staff on sabbatical and not available for meetings
- The consultants did not read or write Bangla and were dependent on translators during visits to classrooms to interview learners and tutors
- Some monitoring reports of the implementing partners were in Bangla
- Three implementing NGO partners were not visited because of distance from Dhaka and the limited time available. These included the following NGOs: CDA, GBK and Ashroy)

- Severe rain and flooding took place during the evaluation and as a result the consultants were prevented from visiting tutorial centres outside of the Dhaka area
- Only four tutorial centres could be visited because of the time frame. In addition, the exams were due to start the following week on the 11<sup>th</sup>.

## 2. Project Context

**2.1** The context of the evaluation is described in the original framework which was devised by COL to evaluate the support in helping to develop the capacity of the Bangladesh Open School. The nature of the activity is described below.

We realised early on that there is potential for confusion regarding the scope of this evaluation as it relates to the overall JSE initiative. Therefore we shall try to use the following distinctions throughout this report:

**JSE Programme** relates to the overall initiative

**COL Project Contribution** relates solely to the specific COL inputs to the JSE Programme.

### *Description and background information*

This activity will develop capacity of open schools to prepare quality course materials and to enhance their capacity to successfully implement it. The main focus is therefore to enhance the skills of staff to develop and implement the curriculum of open schools while enhancing the skills of senior management in the guidance of open schools.

In identifying an activity it was critical to look at the current year. For this reason the Educational Specialist has identified only one institution: *The Bangladesh Open School (BOU)*. The Open School has introduced the first phase of its Junior Secondary Education (JSE) Programme earlier this year. COL was involved in the programme since its inception and has contributed in capacity building of the course writers who developed the materials for Grade 6. When the ES visited Bangladesh in May 2007, it was realized that they have a long way to go regarding the development of quality distance education materials, its implementation as well as the management of the open school.

Three areas were identified which are critical in the success of this project, and for successful ODL namely, enhancement of course development skills, training staff in implementing open schooling and the enhancement of managerial capacity.

### *Identify the Millennium Development Goals that relate to this activity:*

- Achieve universal primary education.
- Promote gender equality and empower women.

***Describe the outcomes and related performance indicators for this project:***

*Outcome 1: Enhance the capacity of staff at the open school to develop quality distance education material.*

*Indicators:*

- Material developed by staff of the open school will be judged to be of high quality by external evaluators.
- Materials will have been developed for 5 additional courses to support the offering of the Open School.
- The Open School will have developed digital material to complement at least two of its print based courses.

*Outcome 2: Enhance the capacity of staff to implement the open school's curriculum successfully.*

*Indicator:*

- The subject completion rate of the Open School will improve by at least 10% within the next 5 years.

*Outcome 3: Enhance the capacity of management at the open school to ensure sustainability.*

*Indicator:*

- Over the next year the Open School will establish procedures for collecting information in the order to identify the current per capita cost of subject completion.
- The per capita cost of subject completion will decrease over a 5 year period.

***Describe the expected Outputs and Performance indicators for this project.***

*Output 1: Staff capacity to develop ODL material will be enhanced through:*

1. Training in materials development.
2. Online support.
3. Training of 2 staff members in digital content development.
4. Develop a house style manual for materials development.

*Indicators:*

1. 25 staff members are trained in materials development and will have the capacity to develop quality materials as evidenced by the material produced over the course of the training.
2. 2 staff members are trained in digital content development and will be able to develop multimedia and video programmes as evidenced by the material developed during the training.
3. Self study materials are available to train staff on a regular basis
4. Staff assesses the online support provided to be useful and are able to site examples of using it.

*Output 2: Tutor capacity to support the implementation of the curriculum will be enhanced through:*

1. training activities and
2. development of a tutor guide

*Indicators:*

1. A tutor manual developed on the basis of tutor feedback is available along with an established process for monitoring use as a basis for future revision.
2. 25 staff members are trained as evidenced by the providers of the training and will have the capacity to prepare organised and interactive tutorial sessions.

*Output 3: Staff will receive training in:*

1. the development and implementation of budget preparation and monitoring of expenditure; and
2. will be supported through the use of an online training guide.

*Indicator:*

1. BOU Open School and other Open schools will have an online training guide on cost and financing.
2. Management will be able to develop budget models appropriate to ODL in the context of an Open school as evidenced by a review of the models developed.

## **2.2 Activities for achieving outcomes and outputs:**

***Description of the Activities /Actions of COL and its partners that have been undertaken to achieve the Outputs***

*Bangladesh Open School requested assistance from COL in different areas:*

Tutors to be trained to implement the Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ToR was agreed between COL and BOU</li> <li>• COL identified a consultant and an agreement was signed</li> <li>• BOU identified and invited the participants</li> </ul>
Course writers to be trained for the development of grade 7 & 8 materials.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ToR was agreed between BOU/COL</li> <li>• COL identified the consultant</li> <li>• Consultant developed a training proposal in collaboration with BOU</li> <li>• Contract signed between COL and Consultant</li> <li>• BOU and NGO partners identified participants</li> <li>• COL invited two staff members from BOU Open school to training in SA at Mindset Network</li> </ul>
Training of Management in Cost and Financing of Open schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COL invited Dean of BOU Open School training in Botswana</li> <li>• COL invited policymaker and Finance Director from Bangladesh to training</li> </ul>

### 2.3 Partners involved

There are two kinds of partnership relating to the delivery of this programme:

\* The core partnership within Bangladesh is between the Bangladesh Open School and CAMPE, the Campaign for Popular Education, the latter being the implementing agency for the programme in 40 centres.

\* The Commonwealth of Learning has engaged with the Bangladesh Open School, and to a lesser extent the partnership NGOs, to deliver discrete capacity-building inputs directed at supporting the development of the JSE Programme.

## 3. Monitoring & Evaluation Purposes

### 3.1 Why and for whom

The justification of why this is being conducted is for a summative assessment of outputs.

The findings of the monitoring and evaluation are directly for the Educational Specialist at COL, the whole of COL as well as for BOU.

This evaluation will examine the various activities described in Section 2.1 which were identified as significant in developing the capacity of open schools to prepare quality course materials and to enhance their capacity to successfully implement it. The main focus is therefore on the enhancement of the skills of staff to develop and implement the curriculum of open schools while enhancing the skills of senior management in the guidance of open schools.

The Bangladesh Open School launched the programme in August 2007 in collaboration with the NGO coalition, Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE) with six well established and reputable field level educational NGOs. The collaborating NGOs were: CARITAS, DAM, VERC, CDA, Ashroy and GBK. At the time of the evaluation a total of 40 ODL centres, 326 tutors and 2000 learners had participated in the first year of the project.

The main aim of the JSE programme is to provide education at Grades 6-8 through Open and Distance Learning for disadvantaged children of Grade 5 who participated in NGO/community schools run by the NGOs in Bangladesh and for those who have dropped out of formal school. The course is modelled on the formal school curriculum and consists of 7 compulsory subjects and the choice of 1 vocational subject. The learners meet once a week on Fridays with tutors who teach them in each subject for 45 minutes.

## 4. Monitoring & Evaluation Design & Implementation

### 4.1 Structure of the Evaluation

- Data collection strategies
- Issues arising during implementation, limitations, etc.

The objective of this consultancy was to examine and scrutinise the structure, process and activities in the development of the capacity of the Bangladesh Open School. Three core areas were identified: enhancing course development skills, training staff in implementing open schooling, and enhancing managerial capacity. The consultancy took place over a 30 day period. It was structured into three phases as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: Outline of the Evaluation Activities

<b>Timetable for Evaluation of the BOU Open School March – September, 2008</b>	
<i>Phase 1</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instrument Design and Framework</li> </ul>

<i>(Cambridge Based)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of Tools for Data Collection: Questionnaires, Interviews and Focus Group Discussion</li> <li>• Documentation Scrutiny and Analysis</li> <li>• Preliminary Contact with Open School staff via e-mail and preparation for Open School visit</li> </ul>
Phase II (BOU) Bangladesh  June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field Visit to Bangladesh to meet with Open School staff at BOU and at study/tutorial centres</li> <li>• Data Collection</li> <li>• Cross-checking of Data</li> </ul>
Phase III (Cambridge)  August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of Data</li> <li>• Draft Report to COL</li> <li>• Revision of Report based on Comments from COL</li> <li>• Final Report to COL</li> </ul>

A conference call was set up between Frances Ferreira, Terry Allsop, Alicia Fentiman and Carol Walker on the 30<sup>th</sup> April, 2008 to discuss the terms of reference, the evaluation preparations, the time frame and framework for the evaluation. This provided a forum for clarification based on the initial proposal.

#### **4.2 Instrument Design and Framework**

The consultants met to discuss the various instruments that were to be used during the consultancy period. A timetable of activities relevant to the work was devised and the consultants decided that the field visit to Dhaka would take place over a two week period in order to maximise their time and to allow for cross checking of information and data.

#### **4.3 Development of Tools for Data Collection: Questionnaires, Interviews and Focus Group Discussions**

A variety of tools were devised including questionnaires, semi-structured interview guides and probing questions for the moderator of the focus group discussions in Dhaka (See Annex 8.2). In addition, the materials were examined in detail with participants from the relevant workshops (ie. Tutor Training and Materials Development) to observe whether the participants fully understood the content of the training workshops, and to

find out whether the participants have been able to put what they have learned into practice.

#### **4.4 Stakeholders**

A wide range of stakeholders as outlined in the original framework were assessed. These included consultants, trainers, BOU staff, CAMPE staff, implementing partners, tutors, learners, and participating non governmental organisations.

#### **4.5 Documentation Scrutiny and Analysis**

Documentation and reports were sent electronically by COL and downloaded by the consultants. They were reviewed and the methodology for Phase II was established based on the materials and participant lists. A series of well organised and relevant workshops were held for Capacity Building for BOU Open School staff and other invited guests (participating NGOs, members from other open schools) including material development, tutor training and cost analysis. Close scrutiny of the documentation shows that the materials have been well designed, structured and accessible. However, Phase 2 of the consultancy examined whether the materials and training sessions have succeeded in building the capacity of BOU open school staff. Two of the main questions were:

- i. Have the staff been able to put into practice the skills they have been taught?*
- ii. Has the training been sufficient to acquire the necessary abilities and capabilities of applying good practice in ODL?*

#### **4.6 Dhaka Field Visit**

Phase Two of the evaluation consisted of a field visit to the Bangladesh Open School from the 27<sup>th</sup> June to 10<sup>th</sup> July 2008. A series of meetings, focus group discussion, interviews and observations were made with a wide range of stakeholders. The consultants decided to overlap their visits in order to make better use of the time; Alicia Fentiman was in Dhaka from the 27<sup>th</sup> June - 5<sup>th</sup> July; Terry Allsop was in Dhaka from the 2<sup>nd</sup> -10<sup>th</sup> July.

#### **4.7 Analysis of Data and Draft Report**

Data were analysed and the draft report prepared to send to COL for comments.

#### **4.8 Limitations**

The consultants received overwhelming support and assistance from COL, BOU and NGO staff. However, some problems we faced during the consultancy were:

- Lack of continuity of staff (the former BOU Dean did not make himself available to be interviewed)

- Some staff on sabbatical and not available for meetings
- The consultants did not read or write Bangla and were dependent on translators during visits to classrooms to interview learners and tutors
- Some monitoring reports of the implementing partners were in Bangla
- Three implementing NGO partners were not visited because of distance from Dhaka and the limited time available. These included the following NGOs: CDA, GBK and Ashroy)
- Severe rain and flooding took place during the evaluation and as a result the consultants were prevented from visiting tutorial centres outside of the Dhaka area
- Only four tutorial centres could be visited because of the time frame. In addition, the exams were due to start the following week on the 11<sup>th</sup>.

## **5. Findings**

### **5.1 Setting the Scene**

The key elements of the JSC/JSE programme are:

There is an assumption that there are a large number of potential students for a Grade 6-8 programme offered in open/distance mode. This population is clearly there, in large numbers, comprising those who dropped out after Grade 5 of primary school or Grades 6-8, and those who came through a non-formal primary route. Typically, the students enrolled will either be unemployed or working long hours in a lowly paid job. A key assumption is that the students can find time and focus to study independently throughout the year.

The delivery mode is simple. Text materials have been developed for 7 core and 3 vocational subjects. Those produced for Grade 6 show minimal orientation towards self-study, and are deemed too challenging for the student population by their tutors.

The programme enrolled 50 students in classes at each of 40 tutorial centres (normally school premises). Each student studies 7 core courses and 1 vocational course. These classes meet on Friday morning each week, with 4 x 45 minute classes. This means that each subject is visited only once in two weeks, a bare minimum of face-to-face tuition. The contract with the student promises setting and marking of regular assignments.

The tutors are virtually all teachers of JSC level, often from the same school where the tutorial centre is sited. They tutor one class every two weeks and are responsible for the setting and marking of assignments. They have received some training in working in ODL settings, but almost universally act in identical mode to that which they employ in their normal teaching.

Examinations have been set by BOS for the first Grade 6 group, and are being taken on Fridays over a five-week period from 11 July. We wait with trepidation judgements about the quality and appropriateness (validity) of these examinations.

No clear decisions have been made and transmitted to the learners, regarding the nature of the certification which they will receive at the conclusion of their three years of effort.

## **5.2 Output 1: Staff capacity to develop ODL material will be enhanced through Four key activities were identified as important in assisting staff to develop ODL material**

- 1. Training in materials development**
- 2. Online support**
- 3. Training of two staff members in digital content development**
- 4. Develop a house style manual for materials development**

### **5.2.1 Training in Materials Development**

Workshops were held to train 25 BOU staff members in materials development for writing the books for the JSC course. The training workshops were well structured and, in theory, provided an important overview in writing ODL materials. The first F2F workshop on the “Capacity Building in Learning Material Development on WikiEducator for Open Schooling” took place on 10-14 February, 2008 and the second in April. The three main objectives of the first workshop were to discuss ODL methods, to develop the skill of writing self-learning materials and to expose the participants to on-line material development strategies with a particular focus on WikiEducator.

Outcomes: Materials Development workshops generated a tight template approach to the writing, but the staff did not feel confident that they had (a) the right team of writers, and (b) a consistent structure for the materials.

The template that was devised conforms to the simplistic framework of – aims, objectives/learning outcomes, content, worked examples, student self-assessed examples and is not difficult. It really just mirrors what is pretty standard best practice in the production of modern school textbooks!

In several discussions with various implementing partners it was expressed that BOS/BOU had not endeavoured to put together teams of writers who were familiar with the context of Grade 6-8 education and in particular, for their targeted audience who are predominantly young labourers who work 6 days in week in jobs such as the textile industry.

There are significantly more Grade 8 writers from the NGOs and fewer from BOS/BOU, though the latter still appear to dominate. We have an undertaking from the JSE coordinator that he will be insisting that the writers conform to the template. It was suggested and reinforced that it would be useful to **trial** the draft materials, at least by exposing them to comment (paid for) by tutors working on the programme.

### **5.2.2 Online Support**

A focus group was held with BOU staff, and they provided comments on their participation in the on-line support and their experience with WikiEducator. Overall, 21 staff developed their draft SLM unit, and the staff thought the training they received in on-line support was extremely worthwhile and useful. During the evaluation, a sample of staff made individual presentations of their assignments and experiences. This helped to illustrate how the on-line assignments were undertaken. In addition, they showed the comments and the feedback they received from the on-line facilitator.

Although the on-line support was well structured, the BOU staff identified several problems with on-line training. The most important issue was the lack of access to computers at the Open School. There is only one computer (in the Dean's office), and therefore, on-line training was difficult for most of the staff. A few of the members had computers at home but others had to pay to use computers at internet cafes. In addition, the intermittent electricity supply and constant power cuts throughout Dhaka interfered with consistent on-line sessions and with meeting deadlines for assignments. The following remark by one of the participants reiterates this point, "Firstly, it was very difficult for me to follow the instructions given by the on-line resource person. I do not have a computer at my home. Even I do not have enough computer and internet facilities in my office."

Overall, the on-line support and assignments were important and useful for the individual Open School staff members they provided a structure in developing a module by setting out the objectives, to writing text in an ODL style, to add a series of activities and illustrations. However, they did not seem relevant to the practical application of providing skills for devising materials for Grade 6 learners. The modules that were created were aimed well above the level of a Grade 6 learner. One of the challenges in the training is to be able to train BOU staff to write in an accessible and relevant style for a junior audience.

### **5.2.3 Training of Staff in Digital Content Development**

Two BOU staff members attended and participated in a MINDSET workshop in South Africa on Developing Digital Content. Interviews were held with Dr Abdul Karim and Md Mizanoor Rahman, both of whom thought the workshop was extremely informative and worthwhile. The workshop succeeded in providing the two staff members with new skills in digital content development; however, they pointed out that access to computers was limited at BOU. They have not been able to put into practice some of the skills they have learned because of the lack of technical equipment.

They have not (as at the time of the evaluation) developed any new digital materials to accompany the course materials. Three CDs were produced in science issues with private media, and additional CDs were developed previously by NGO partners to accompany vocational training courses. A promotional video has been designed publicising the JSE programme

## **5.2.4 Development of a House Style Manual for Materials Development**

Focus group discussions with staff members confirmed that the staff participated and engaged in developing a 'house style manual' which is a combination of what they devised after taking into the overall framework they were taught at the workshop.

## **5.3 Output 2: Tutor capacity to support the implementation of the curriculum will be enhanced through:**

- 1. Training activities**
- 2. Development of a tutor guide**

Interviews with tutors and implementing partners provide important feedback about the development of Tutor capacity for Grade 6 tutors.

### **5.3.1 Training Activities**

A series of training workshops were held for thirty core tutors with an external consultant, Dr Sushmita Mitra. An introductory workshop was held from the 13-17<sup>th</sup> May, 2007 and a second Lead Tutor workshop was held from the 24<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> November, 2007. During interviews and FGDs with a selection of tutors who attended the workshop it was agreed that the workshops were well structured and organised. . However, some of the tutors commented that they found the language of delivery (English) difficult to follow. There was simultaneous translation, but some tutors found it difficult to listen to both. One participant said he was frustrated because he wanted to express himself in Bengali but was asked to use English. English is the second language of the tutors and it was recommended by the tutors that Bangla should have been the language of instruction. *One participant from a leading NGO remarked that he attended both workshops and that he was very impressed with the facilitator. He said that prior to the workshop he did not really understand the concept of ODL and that the training helped him very much and provided him with a new perspective on the potential use of distance education. He also noted that this training was essential for the tutors because they are the 'practitioners' on the ground liaising with the learners.*

### **5.3.2 Development of a Tutor Guide**

A tutor guide was developed, and it is well structured and organised and conforms to the ODL methodology. The contents included topics such as: Introduction to Open and Distance Learning (ODL), Curriculum and Learning Materials, Tutoring in ODL, Process of Tutoring and Monitoring and Evaluation. All are relevant to ODL and the manual was written in a concise and coherent style with illustrations. However, the language issue arose again because the tutors would have preferred the manual to have been written in Bangla. This was an extremely important suggestion because the majority of tutors (especially those who did not attend the Lead Tutor workshop) do not have a good grasp of written English. As a result, CAMPE had to spend time and money (unexpected expenses) to translate the manual into Bangla.

The intention of the development of the manual was that it should be used as a self-learning training material to train future tutors through ODL mode in a cost-effective manner. However, this does not seem to have been the case as shown below.

### ***5.3.3. Practical Experiences of Tutors in the Classroom***

The majority of tutors received very little training in ODL methodology and it is questionable as to how effective the manual is for the tutors in the classroom. During interviews and focus group discussions with supervisors and tutors, who have to implement the programme, it does not appear to be used in practice. Participant observations at four tutorial centres revealed that tutors worked in ways which are indistinguishable from how they teach in a formal school. In other words, the distance education component does not seem to have been comprehended. The teachers appear to be good and committed teachers; however, they have not been able to put in practice what the guide suggests. It will take time for tutors to grasp the ODL and more training support, and assistance will be required.

It was also shown during field visits that the JSE learners only receive 45 minutes face-to-face instruction in each core subject every two weeks. And we assume that they are diligently digesting the textbooks, even when working full-time and studying in very difficult environments. So, in theory at least, most of the student learning comes from focusing on the textbook. Surely, then, the task of the tutor is to build on that learning, through assignments and through an openness to spend precious time in the 45 minutes dealing with common misunderstandings recognised by the marking of student assignments. That should be the basis of each tutorial session, but is clearly not so at present.

Some of the findings we found in our field visits were corroborated by one of the implementing NGO partners. It was written: “There are some **minor** problems found in monitoring:

1. *Tutors of ODL centres do not give any homework for the learners.*
2. *They don't maintain records of class tests.*
3. *There were no English grammar books in the ODL centres.*
4. *No similarity between curriculum and modules.*

So, it comes down to judgements as to whether or not ‘tutors’ can ‘change their spots’ on Friday mornings, with assistance. If the answer is ‘no’, then (i) this programme has no right to be called an ODL one, (ii) our students will perform very weakly. If the answer is ‘yes’, then they need very carefully structured training, at tutorial centre level, in the basic techniques of tutor support for independent learning, focusing particularly on: setting good and realistic assignments, constructive marking of assignments, identifying common misunderstandings from the assignments, using F2F sessions to address these misunderstandings and to move forward. Above all, they have to be encouraged to stop ‘teaching’ in the conventional sense. It is concluded that what is needed is for grassroots guidance on practical tutoring, based at each study centre, involving a smart Bangla-speaking facilitator, the supervisor and the group of teacher/tutors.

And then there is the crucial question of motivation/incentives for tutor behaviour change. Friday is, after all, their one day off in the week, so they are going well beyond the call of duty for 200T per day. Options might include:

1. Giving a cash incentive to high-performing tutors in each centre [The tutors thought this potentially divisive, but I would promote it as a reward for best practice.]
2. Giving a BOU certificate [value?] to tutors who made progress.

#### **5.4 Output 3: Staff will receive training in:**

- 1. The development and implementation of budget preparation and monitoring of expenditure**
- 2. Will be supported through the use of an on-line training guide**

**5.4.1** Three Bangladeshi professionals participated in the COL organised workshop on the Cost and Financing of ODL from 6-10 August 2007. The facilitator was Ed du Vivier. The three were:

\* Dr Md Arshed Ali Matubber, who was then Dean of the BOS at BOU. He has since moved to another university post within Dhaka, where his duties do not include the management of ODL programmes. We arranged two face-to-face meetings with Dr Matubber during our time in Dhaka; he disappointingly failed to show for either of them, despite the second attempt being scheduled at a time of his request. The Botswana facilitator indicates that Dr Matubber arrived at the workshop with high-level knowledge about ODL financing.

\* Md Ashraful Moqbul is with the GoB Ministry of Education. His duties do not include costing of ODL programmes. He has not been seen since the workshop, where he apparently made minimal contributions.

\* Mr A K M Rohul Amin Akanda is the Treasurer, or senior financial officer, of the BOU. He has only held this post at BOU for about a year. He was sick for part of the workshop and suffered from loss of his baggage by the airline. We interviewed him in depth at BOU. In relation to the JSE programme, he has no direct engagement, as it is off-budget as far as BOU is concerned. All programme finances are managed by CAMPE, as it is under contract to the funding agencies involved. On wider issues of the impact of the workshop on BOU thinking about ODL financing, we were not able to elicit any substantive examples. It appears that, although there is knowledge of thinking about ODL financing within BOU, it is not manifest in the way in which budgets are prepared.

**5.4.2** Partially as a result of the Botswana workshop, BOU does have access to sound technical resources, on-line, for costing and financing ODL. In addition to the COL CD-ROM, and Thomas Huelsmann's interactive resource entitled *Costing Open and Distance*

*Learning* (2004), all of the materials from the workshop are available on-line through WikiEducator. Our one interviewee had clearly not utilised any of these materials since the workshop.

**5.4.3** No budget models have been developed by BOU staff as a result of participation in the workshop. When a framework for such models was presented to the Treasurer, it became clear that they were not in use in the university.

**Commentary:**

**5.4.4** The point has been made that the principal intention of this output was to strengthen the budgeting and financial management skills of BOU/BOS. As we have indicated, there has been little or none of the anticipated impact. Given the overall interest in the development of the JSE programme, it was probably a significant oversight that a finance manager from CAMPE was not part of the Bangladesh delegation.

**5.4.5** The expenditure on sending three participants to the Botswana workshop has simply not been cost-effective.

## **6. Conclusions**

### **6.1 Appropriateness of the three Outputs/Outcomes**

All of the three outputs/outcomes from the COL contribution were appropriate in conception; they were necessary elements in the creation of an effective ODL programme. But, there were two major shortcomings in their delivery and execution:

\* Outputs 1 and 2 needed a much clearer grounding in the realities of the JSE programme population and the tutors who would be working with the students. While significant consultation did take place between COL and the implementing partners, CAMPE and BOU, this did not always carry through into the working partnership. Thus, Outputs 1 and 2 provided important **general** introductions to working in the context of ODL, without being responsive to the particular local context (youthful learners often working in full-time jobs with poor study conditions; tutors making a teaching contribution on their one rest day in the week). The necessary grounding could not have come from BOU staff, as they have the most tenuous links with Grade 6 – 8 schooling. There needed to be a much stronger analytical base and much stronger participation in planning from the NGO partners.

\* Output 3 was conceived well enough as a contribution to the strengthening of budgeting and financial management at BOU/BOS, but was largely wasted because the two of the three participants have since disappeared from the ODL world, and the third, the BOU Treasurer, does not yet engage with the budgeting for this programme.

### **6.2 About the project context, appropriateness of the activities, the role of the partners, the quality of the management & implementation of the activities**

\* [Project context] The population for take-up of this programme is clearly there and potentially huge. For the NGO partners it is a logical extension of their work in non-formal basic education. There is evidence from elsewhere that a flexible mode of delivery, using genuine ODL approaches, can work with this age group.

\* [Activities] There are many anxieties here, which include

- Serious weaknesses in the quality of the course materials and their appropriateness for individual study in difficult environments
- Whether the extent of training for those who teach the programme has been sufficient to shift their roles from being classroom teachers on Thursdays to facilitators on Fridays, which leads to anxieties about the effectiveness of the F2F sessions
- Whether it is realistic to expect students to take so many courses in each year, effectively asking them to cover the same material in the same time as full-time school students
- Which raises questions about the number of subjects studied each year. In contrast, the APOSS approach is to offer a limited number of core/key subjects and aim for high quality in those

\* [Role of the partners]

- There is a serious imbalance in the partnership charged with delivering this programme; it doesn't really even feel much like a partnership. In summary, the NGOs do all the programme delivery, supervision, etc, - on the whole rather well; while BOS/BOU have limited responsibilities which, to date, they have discharged weakly.

\* [Quality of management]

- NGO management is effective and results-orientated
- The BOS/BOU Coordinator struggles manfully, but is hampered by the very low level of ownership of the programme by his institution, at all levels

### **6.3 About the effectiveness of COL's direct and indirect contributions to this project**

\* Output 1

- Very good consultants were appointed; their presentation in relation to materials development was at a rather general level, but of good quality. What appears to be missing is a link between consultant inputs, BOS/BOU faculty participating, and the level of instructional materials required for the target population.
- Although discussions were held with the NGO partners in relation to the matching of the needs of the population to the design of the materials, two explanations appear possible
  - (i) The NGO partners were unable to articulate clearly the context of the student population
  - (ii) The views of the NGO partners did not prevail in the creation of the materials in cooperation with BOU/BOS faculty.
- Have BOU faculty become any more effective in creating quality learning materials for this population? It is clearly too early to make an accurate assessment of this question; we

have to wait to see the quality improvement in the Year 8 materials. Nevertheless, we have significant anxieties, caused chiefly by the almost complete failure of the BOU/BOS faculty, who dominate the writing, to begin to understand the context of writing for this student population.

#### Output 2

- Again, good training of tutors with a good introductory manual for ODL techniques. There was an issue of the language of the manual and the language of training (both English) when the lead trainer was a Bangla/Bengali speaker.

- But the course was poorly linked to the reality of the tutorial context, with the result that we were able to see **no** evidence of ODL approaches being used in any of our field visits. (FF: This is still a very strange statement given that the course was developed in consultation with tutors)

#### Output 3

- Sadly, the financing/budgeting inputs have made no difference at all to the quality of financial management within BOU/BOS. Given that the three participants in the training had no engagement with the JSE Programme, whose financial management rests with CAMPE, it clearly has not assisted in the financial affairs of this programme. None of the three who participated have utilized the training they received.

### **6.4 Lessons learned – regarding the programme and/or the conduct of M&E**

Our major conclusion is that the JSE Programme was poorly conceptualised, with inadequate stakeholder analysis; that the BOU – CAMPE partnership is rather weak, with BOU taking a very detached position; that as a result, the COL Project Contributions were much less effective than they might have been. What was needed was a carefully structured pilot programme, based on an exhaustive stakeholder analysis and subsequent design process. Now there is much remedial work to be done to get the JSE Programme on to a sustainable track. (FF: I thought that lessons learned will include: Partners do not honour their commitment to COL; the computers, the participants etc. And also, it remains the prerogative of the institution whom to send to a workshop. COL might suggest.)

## **7. Recommendations**

The following recommendations are based on the findings of the evaluation. Where possible, they are linked to the categorisations of **COL Project Contribution** and **JSE Programme**. In one case they are joint recommendations. (FF: The majority of these recommendations are FOR BOU and CAMPE?)

**R.1 Use of Technology and ICT at all levels need to be appropriate** [COL Project Contribution]

Technical and on-line resources at BOU are limited and this needs to be taken into account when devising workshops and assignments which require constant on-line access. Clear criteria were given by COL regarding access to ICT, and agreed by the partners; these were not met.

**R.2 Adapt User Friendly Materials** [COL Project Contribution + JSE Programme]

The materials need to be matched to the population with writers who are familiar with the learners and their level of abilities. It is essential that tutors and educational writers in NGOs lead or have significant input in drafting the materials and are involved in pilot testing the materials before they are printed. This would aid in devising appropriate, relevant and user friendly material. Advice was given clearly by COL in this respect, but poorly taken up.

**R.3 More detailed Stakeholder Analysis** [JSE Programme]

It is recommended there is a need for more thorough stakeholder analysis given the fragile nature of partnership between the Bangladesh Open School and CAMPE, the roles of each, and the needs of the target population.

**R.4 Invest in BOU-CAMPE partnership** [JSE Programme]

The quality of the partnership needs to be improved. Presently, it is a very unbalanced partnership and the resources, key people and responsibilities need to be clearly defined.

**R.5 Revise the Course Structure** [JSE Programme]

The course structure (which is a mirror of the formal sector) of 7 core subjects and 1 vocational course is *not* appropriate for the targeted audience of disadvantaged learners (many of whom are working 6 days/week in tough environments). There are too many subjects being offered and very limited face to face instruction of only 45 minutes/course every two weeks. This affects the quality of the course.

**R.6 More Teacher Training and Support** [JSE Programme]

The teachers who teach in the formal sector during the week and become tutors on Fridays require more training in how to support learners who are largely studying independently, using elements of ODL methodology, and they require more on-going support and greater incentive

**R.7 Devise an Action Plan from BOU/CAMPE on Tutor Support** [JSE Programme]

A detailed Plan of Action and Guidelines should be developed to ensure that the Lead Tutors, who train the tutors on the ground, have the necessary support and encouragement to continue their training. The training of tutors in ODL methodology and teaching is crucial for the programme to work effectively.

**R.8 Financial Plan of the Partnership** [JSE Programme]

A coherent Financial Plan of the partnership between BOU and CAMPE needs to be developed and made public. For example, money which has been provided to the BOU Open School needs to be transparently accounted for without further delays. There is still an outstanding issue of payment due to CAMPE for a training workshop. There are no

records of it within BOU; who is responsible? Is it the treasurer at BOU or the Open School? Proper documentation and clarification from BOU needs to be put in place to eliminate the possibility of future misunderstandings.

## **Annexes**

### **Annex A: Terms of Reference**

#### ***Re: Monitoring and Evaluation - The Bangladesh Open School (BOU)***

The Commonwealth of Learning (COL) seeks to engage Mr. Terry Allsop and Dr. Alicia Fentiman (the Consultants) to conduct a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the Bangladesh Open School (BOU).

#### ***Background:***

This activity will develop capacity of open schools to prepare quality course materials and to enhance their capacity to successfully implement it. The main focus is therefore to enhance the skills of staff to develop and implement the curriculum of open schools while enhancing the skills of senior management in the guidance of open schools.

The Open School has introduced the first phase of its Junior School Certificate (JSC) programme early 2007. COL was involved in the project since its inception and has contributed in capacity building of the course writers who developed the materials for Grade 6. BOU has a long way to go regarding the development of quality distance education materials, its implementation as well as the management of the open school.

Three areas have been identified which are critical in the success of this project, and for successful ODL namely, enhancement of course development skills, training staff in implementing open schooling and the enhancement of managerial capacity.

### **1.0 Statement of Work**

#### **1.1. The Consultants shall:**

- 1.1.1. assist the Education Specialist (ES) to implement an Evaluation Plan for the Bangladesh Open School;
- 1.1.2. review the Evaluation Plan with the ES to ensure full understanding of the project to be evaluated;
- 1.1.3. assist in the identification of appropriate data to be collected and in the development of data collection strategies;
- 1.1.4. implement the attached Evaluation Plan with specific reference to, research methods, timetables, verification of outputs against stipulated indicators and evaluation approach, as agreed with the ES.
- 1.1.5. produce a report according to the attached “Monitoring and Evaluation Report Format” by August 15, 2008.

- 1.2. All correspondence with COL should include reference to the contract number listed at the top of the contract.

## **2.0 COL Responsibilities**

- 2.1. COL shall:
  - 2.1.1. liaise with the Consultants and BOU to ensure that the various meetings have been booked;
  - 2.1.2. provide the Consultants with any requested reports, emails, documents to assist with the evaluation; and
  - 2.1.3. arrange conference calls between relevant staff of the BOU and the Consultants (if required).
- 2.2. The COL staff member with whom you should liaise on all matters related to this contract is Mrs. Frances Ferreira, Education Specialist, Basic Education and Open Schooling.

## **3.0 Deliverables and Timeframe**

- 3.1. The above consultancy will be for a duration of thirty days, starting May 2008, with the following deliverables and timelines:
  - 3.1.1. Phase I: Cambridge based (May – total 6 days) – instrument design and framework; development of tools for data collection, questionnaires, interviews and focus group discussions; documentation scrutiny and analysis; preliminary contact with Open School staff via email and preparation for Open School visit;
  - 3.1.2. Phase II: Bangladesh (later June/early July – 14 days) – field visit to Bangladesh to meet with Open School staff at BOU and at study/tutorial centres; data collection; and cross checking of data;
  - 3.1.3. Phase III: Cambridge (August – 10 days) – analysis of data; draft report to COL (August 15<sup>th</sup>); revision of report based on comments from COL; and final report to COL.

## **4.0 Monitoring**

- 4.1. The Consultant will report to COL every month on the status of the above mentioned activities. The report should take the format of a brief email covering:
  - 4.1.1. conduct of activities since last report;
  - 4.1.2. schedule of activities in the next reporting period; and
  - 4.1.3. issues or problems.

## **5.0 Evaluation**

- 5.1. The Consultant shall evaluate the outcome of the contract using the following impact indicators:
  - 5.1.1. cooperation of consultants, staff members, etc., in gathering information;
  - 5.1.2. availability and access of/to documents; and
  - 5.1.3. arrangements made by COL.

- 5.2. The Consultant shall prepare a brief evaluation report based on impact indicators and lessons learned. The final evaluation report shall be delivered to COL by August 15, 2008.

## **Annex B: Data Collection Instruments**

### **Questions Pertaining to Staff Capacity to Develop Materials Development**

<b>Achievement Questions</b>	
A	<i>BOU open school staff, NGOs and other Open School Participants (Sri Lanka)</i>
1.	Was the training in Materials Development relevant to your needs?
2.	Was the training beneficial to your current skills?
3.	Did you find the materials development training easy or difficult to understand?
4.	State the main strengths of the training you received
5.	State the main weaknesses of the training you received.
6.	Have you been able to put into practice what you have learned? If yes, how did you go about it?
7.	Do you have any recommendations for improvement?
8.	Was the quality of training sufficient?
9.	Was the consultant (s) accessible and helpful?
10.	Any other comments?

<b>Questions to Participants who attended the workshop on the Development of Self-Learning Materials (10-14<sup>th</sup> February, 2008)</b>	
1.	What did you learn from the workshop?
2.	Did you find the content of the workshop easy to understand? Or difficult?
3.	Did you find the methodology of the workshop relevant to your needs?
4.	Have you been able to communicate with the on-line resource person after you attended the face-to-face workshop?
5.	Do you have access to a computer? At home? Or At work? Or both?
6.	What problems did you experience with on-line assistance?

7.	What did you like about the on-line support?
8.	What did you dislike about the on-line support?
9.	Would you prefer more face-to-face training?
10.	What suggestions or recommendations do you have to improve support in the area of the development of SLMs?

**Specific Questions for the Training of two staff members in Digital Content Development: Mindset/Col Workshop 3-14<sup>th</sup> September, 2007**

	Two BOU staff attended the workshop in South Africa: Dr Abdul Karim and Md. Mizanoor Rahman
1.	Did you find the workshop useful?
2.	Was the workshop well organised and structured?
3.	Was the training beneficial and did you learn more skills relevant to developing digital content?
4.	Did you find the 'participatory' aspect of the workshop effective?
5.	State the main strengths of the training you received
6.	State the main weaknesses of the training you received.
7.	Have you been able to put into practice what you have learned? If yes, how did you go about it?
8.	Do you have any comments or suggestions?
9.	Has there been any follow-up (i.e. on line support) or communication with the facilitators from MINDSET after the workshop?

--	--

**ANNEX II: Questions Pertaining to Tutor Training Workshop and Manual (31 Participants).**

1.	Did you find the two workshops relevant to your needs?
2.	Do you understand the structure and content of the Tutor Manual? Do you find it easy to understand?
3.	What do you like about the manual?
4.	What do you dislike about the manual?

5.	What kind of further training do you require?
6.	Was the facilitator clear and concise?
7.	Do you require any additional skills to assist you with your work?
8.	Whom do you contact when you experience a problem with tutoring?
9.	Do you have any problems in your capacity as a tutor? If so, what are they?

**E-mail Interviews with Consultants and trainers in enhancing Capacity Building at BOU Open School**

Professor Panda and Professor Murthy	F2F Workshop Consultants Self Learning Material
Dr Sushmitra Mitra	Consultant for Tutor Training Development of Tutor Manual
Dr Sanjaya Mishra Dr Pankaj Khare	On-line resource Person WikiEducator
Dr Ed DuVivier	Consultant on Costs and Financing
Mindset facilitators; Rochelle Lyner and Sue Cohen	Consultants on Digital Content