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Introduction

Project Background Information

The second phase of the project, Speak Up II, was launched in August 2015 and ended in July 2019. The project was funded by Comic Relief and was implemented by Africa Educational Trust (AET) in partnership with Resource and Open Learning (ROLE) centres in Jubek State (former Central Equatoria), Gbudue State (former Western Equatoria), and Western Lake State (former Lakes State). Speak Up II aimed to (i) improve the literacy, numeracy and English language skills among excluded groups in three states of South Sudan; (ii) increase their opportunities for education and employment; and (iii) offer them the chance to take part in joint action for community development through REFLECT. The project introduced a 2-level English learning programme that reached non-literate adults and youth, starting with a 12-month development orientated REFLECT course, and followed by a 6-month course of Speak Up English Interactive Radio Instruction (IRI) based on social issues. Additionally, radio broadcasts of lessons provided educational programmes to a further 25,000 listeners nationwide.

The programme had the following 5 main outcomes:

- **Outcome 1**: Improved literacy, numeracy and English language skills for 7,500 out-of-school youth and adult learners from excluded groups in 75 communities;
- **Outcome 2**: Enhanced capacity of facilitators to deliver literacy and numeracy training using participatory approaches;
- **Outcome 3**: Enhanced capacity of Resource and Open Learning (ROLE) staff and local MoEST to deliver and monitor literacy and numeracy training using participatory approaches;
- **Outcome 4**: Communities define and lead their own development through the REFLECT groups; and
- **Outcome 5**: Improved access to quality English language lessons through radio broadcasts.

Final Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The final evaluation led by Carfax consultants investigated the extent to which the delivery of Speak Up II has achieved its planned objectives on one hand and identified lessons for future projects and offered suggestions and recommendations on the other. To this end, it addressed the following main research questions at project level, organisational, and partnership level:

- **Project Level**

  **Relevance**
  - Assess the relevance of the original objectives in terms of whether they were achievable and whether they met the needs and priorities of the target group.
  - The relevance of Speak Up materials in the context.

  **Effectiveness and Impact**
  - Assess whether the project activities generated the planned outputs and were they delivered on time? Did the project activities represent good value for money?
  - Assess the achievement of project outputs and outcomes and the overall impact on the lives of beneficiaries and local communities:
    - How have participants benefitted from improved English language skills and how are they using them in their everyday lives?
    - How effective was REFLECT at building basic literacy and numeracy skills?
• To what extent were facilitators able to use participatory methods to develop English language skills?
• How effective was the mentoring support provided by ROLE and the MoE?
• To what extent did communities implement practical actions as a result of REFLECT classes (with or without microgrants)?
• To what extent was the project able to reach the most vulnerable, including women, returnees and people with disabilities?
• To what extent was the project able to reach those with no English language skills?
  ❖ Review significant achievements the project has brought about. Which approaches worked particularly well and why and which less well and why? Any unexpected or unintended outcomes – both positive and negative?
  ❖ Establish if there were any changes during the lifetime of the project in the project design or delivery and how and why these changes came about.
  ❖ Gather feedback about the project from people affected by the activities and provide an opportunity for them to participate in analysing project achievements
  ❖ Assess the extent to which the benefits received by the target group are having a wider overall effect on larger numbers of people in the communities or regions as a whole.
  ❖ Assess whether the positive outcomes of the project are likely to continue after the end of the project.
  ❖ Make recommendations for future interventions and projects. How could the project model be scaled up or replicated?

❖ **Organisational Level**

  ❖ Assess the extent to which the project’s structure has enabled it to meet its objectives and the needs of the target groups; and
  ❖ Assess the effectiveness of the monitoring, evaluation and learning system and tools used to measure success.

❖ **Partnership Level**

  ❖ Assess the level of effectiveness of partnerships at all levels of the project e.g. local communities, ROLE Centres, AET, South Sudan Government etc.

In addition to these research questions at project, organisational, and partnership level, the consultancy team will also investigate the following aspects:

  ❖ What was the usefulness and quality of the 2 level English approach? Were the approaches complementary? Were the approaches suitable for the context?
  ❖ Recommendations for the use/revision/adaptation/development of speak up materials beyond the project.

**Contextual and operational challenges**

A deep economic crisis, displacement, hyperinflation, food insecurity, and an under-resourced education system are all issues affecting the lives of people in South Sudan. These issues have also had an impact on the implementation and success of the Speak Up II project. Hyperinflation (currently around 160%) led to a substantial increase in the cost of basic goods and commodities for the project such as fuel, learning and teaching materials, or workshop refreshments or lunch. This also made travelling to communities for monitoring and supervision expensive and challenging. Additionally, the nationwide banking crisis
constrained banks to restrict withdrawals to $200 per day. According to AET’s annual reports, ROLE staff spent considerable amounts of time queuing at banks to withdraw their $200 a day. These efforts, however, were not sufficient to cover all project expenses and salaries. As a result, the local teams faced some delays paying the facilitators’ salaries, which has affected their motivation to work. Migration and insecurity also posed challenges to the implementation of the project. For instance, in some regions, attendance rates were affected by migration, particularly during the dry season, when people migrate in search of water, or more fertile lands.

None the less, according to AET’s annual reports, there were a number of individual challenges faced by the 3 target states:

**Jubek State** was greatly affected by insecurity and forced migration throughout the duration of the project. During 2016, due to insecurity on roads to communities around the capital city, Juba, 13 of the planned REFLECT circles were cancelled. What is more, 9 of the project communities fled to Uganda or to neighbouring regions. In response to this, AET established additional REFLECT circles in the second round (2017-19) in the suburbs of Juba. However, these communities were harder to engage with given a lack of leadership and social cohesion. While these security challenges were also present in both Gbudue and Lakes states, it was easier for AET to find additional communities in accessible and more secure areas.

**Lakes State** has been in a state of emergency since early 2018, as the military disarmed the population, causing considerable unrest in rural areas. Given the security challenges associated with this (organisations travelling to rural areas were required to travel with the UN in convoy), monitoring and supervision of centres was reduced. Moreover, inter-tribal clashes and cattle raiding persisted throughout the duration of the project and some 15 REFLECT circles near Yirol were inaccessible as a result.

**Gbudue State** has experienced a rise in insecurity in rural areas as rebel groups attack villages (for burglaries and abductions in particular). Many communities were forced to flee, and some areas were inaccessible for over 2 months at a time. To overcome this challenge, ROLE staff led monitoring with facilitators over the phone. This challenge also impacted on the transition rates from REFLECT circles to Speak Up radio classes. Over 700 REFLECT learners could not be found at the end of the course and have not been able to transition to the Speak Up radio classes.

The banking crisis mentioned above had a considerable impact on Gbudue, and Lakes states. In April 2017, Kenya Commercial Bank closed their branches with which ROLE had USD accounts. For around three months there was no banking alternative, which made it very challenging for AET to send any funds to these two states. AET resolved this issue by setting up a South Sudanese Pounds (SSP) account with Ivory Bank (the only operational bank in the two states) and an account with Ecobank in Juba. The latter is not tied to the central bank and so has been able to maintain a daily withdrawal limit of $5,000. This banking arrangement facilitated the transfer of funds to all the states for the remaining time of the project.
Methodology

Given the range of required data for effective evaluation, the consultancy team employed a mixed methods approach (Denscombe, 2010) (Hart & et.al, 2007), and collected both primary qualitative and quantitative data, and undertook a desk review of project documentation. None the less, the focus was on gathering rich and in-depth qualitative data from a variety of stakeholders across the 3 target locations. This approach supported effective data collection in both easily measurable outcomes and outputs as well as in more-challenging to measure areas such as beliefs and attitudes. Some of the challenges associated with the methodology can be found in the Annexes.

In addition to employing a mixed-methods approach the evaluation utilised a participatory methodology. This approach incorporated the views and feedback of key stakeholders and field teams at every stage, ensuring relevance, appropriateness, and ownership of both the process and findings of this evaluation. Such methodologies have been found by a range of research to be particularly effective within fragile, complex, and in-conflict contexts (Barakat, Chard, Jacoby, & Lume, 2002), and were consequently ideally suited to the requirements of this final evaluation.

The consultancy team undertook a desk review of project documentation provided by AET, including monitoring documents at the centres visited during fieldwork. This covered, amongst many others, the approved project proposal document; the project MEL framework; annual reports; mid-term review; or the Speak Up (2011 – 2013) final evaluation; teaching and learning material; and any other relevant documentation, as requested by the consultants.

Instruments adopted

The consultancy team designed, trialled, and deployed a set of instruments in English for this final evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>The following stakeholders were consulted for KIIs or FGDs: <strong>client and partners</strong> (AET and ROLE staff, radio station staff) and <strong>government and local leaders</strong> (local chiefs, county officials, MoE staff). The Comic Relief Programme Manager was not available for an interview, and, as an alternative, the consultant reviewed the formal feedback Comic Relief provided AET throughout the duration of the grant. In particular, the KIIs with AET staff provided key information on the achievements, impact and challenges faced during implementation, including management, monitoring, and reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII³ or FGD⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>The consultant conducted FGDs and KIIs with Speak Up facilitators in each of the 3 target locations to collect data on programme implementation. The facilitators preferred to organise the FGDs in English, and the interpreter was consulted only when there were language misunderstandings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD or KII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ For the complete list of documents, please consult the Annexes.
² With the exception of Speak Up beneficiaries’ surveys and local chiefs’ interviews (the enumerators asked the questions in either Arabic or a local language and recorded the answers in English), all other engagements were conducted in English.
³ Key Informant Interview.
⁴ Focus Group Discussion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiary Survey</strong></td>
<td>The enumeration teams undertook surveys in Arabic or a local language with Speak Up beneficiaries (REFLECT circles and Speak Up radio course) in the 3 states to investigate on (i) their experience at the course(s), and (ii) the impact the course(s) has had on their lives and communities. Given the security challenges present in many of the areas where AET operates and the limited time available for data collection in the field, the beneficiaries were randomly selected by their facilitators and invited to take part in the survey at an accessible and safe location (rather than having the enumeration team travel to multiple centres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiary FGD</strong></td>
<td>The enumerators led FGDs in Arabic or a local language with Speak Up beneficiaries in each target location. The enumerators were briefed and trained on the project’s context and objectives, and on best practices of qualitative data collection methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Beneficiary Radio Survey</strong></td>
<td>Surveys with indirect beneficiaries (i.e. those learners who listened to the broadcasted radio lessons only) were organised in Yambio and Rumbek. Indirect beneficiaries were randomly selected by the enumeration teams from 6 different neighbourhoods for each location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These instruments collected data across the multiple key evaluation questions mentioned in the section above. This promoted efficiency in data collection and ensured optimal use of resources. Moreover, different instruments collected data against individual indicators, engaging in a process of ‘triangulation’ of findings, ensuring stronger findings resulting from research activities (Denscombe, 2010; Hart & et.al, 2007).

**Gender and Excluded Groups**

Issues of gender and vulnerability were appropriately considered throughout all stages of the evaluation. Instruments were designed so as to be sensitive to the local culture, and to considerations of gender and vulnerability whilst also fully-aligned with a ‘Do No Harm’ approach.

**Questioning and Probing**

To limit bias and to ensure effective and sensitive questioning surrounding relevant topics, the tools were designed to avoid respondent leading. This was achieved, for instance, by using open questioning followed by probing which reduced respondent leading and offered greater depth and nuance of findings. This approach sought to ensure that the final evaluation is a transparent investigation of the activities’ outcomes against the project’s objectives, so that lessons for future projects, and beneficiary cohorts, can be learned. As a result, there was a possibility for both positive and negative outcomes.

**Sample Achieved**

Given the limited scope of this evaluation, it was not possible for the consultancy team to undertake an exhaustive review covering all of the work undertaken and all participants in detail. As a result, the sample was calculated at approximately 5% of the participating communities from the three regions targeted by the Final Evaluation. The sampling approach combined both purposive and random selection according

---

5 Indirect beneficiaries are those learners who listened to the broadcasted radio lessons.

6 The total number of participating communities is calculated by the number of learning centres (130), multiplied by the number of cohorts (2), and the number of students per cohort (25), arriving at 6,500. A 5% sample thus constitutes 325 respondents across the 3 locations, which was achieved by interviewing the 350-372 planned respondents, and the Radio Survey per location.
to the number and availability of each stakeholder group, and also consideration of factors such as security-related restrictions on travel.

Table 1: Beneficiary sample breakdown over location, course attended and gender (Beneficiary Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>REFLECT circles</th>
<th>Speak Up course</th>
<th>Both courses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubek</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbudue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Lake</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Indirect beneficiary sample breakdown over location and gender (Radio Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radio (city)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Good News (Rumbek)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yambio FM (Yambio)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these survey interactions, the consultancy team also conducted the following KII and FGD engagements:

Table 3: Qualitative sample breakdown by location and stakeholder role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and Stakeholder</th>
<th>Total interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jubek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder KIIIs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 × Outreach Officers, Juba and Luri Kondokoro</td>
<td>5 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 × Senior Inspector for Intensive English Course, Juba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 × Director of Private Schools, Juba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 × Senior Inspector for Alternative Education, Juba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 × Facilitator FGDs</td>
<td>8 male, 3 female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 × Beneficiary FGDs</td>
<td>11 female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbudue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder KIIIs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 × MoE inspector for Accelerated Education Systems, Nzara</td>
<td>2 female, 10 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 × Admin Officer, CCEWO, Yambio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 × Director of Alternative Education Systems, Yambio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 × County Education Director, Nzara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1× Director General, Minister of Information, Culture and Sports, Yambio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 × Local Chiefs, Nzara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 × High Commissioner (former outreach officer), Nzara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total **Speak Up beneficiary sample** gathered through surveys and FGDs was of 397 participants.

### Data Analysis Strategy

Given the relatively small size of the individual data sets and the open question format specified above for some of the instruments, all quantitative data was processed through Excel pivot tables rather than SPSS or another similar data analysis package. Moreover, the survey open responses were subject to coding or categorisation, enabling thus the quantitative analyses of all responses (Saldana, 2012, pp. 1-4; Denscombe, 2010, pp. 240, 284-286). Generally, such coding was relatively straightforward; however, where coding was more complex, the consultancy team provided the rationale for their designation within a specific category within the main body of the final evaluation (Saldana, 2012).

The data, once appropriately organised, validated, and coded where relevant, was analysed using statistical (primarily descriptive) and non-statistical methods (thematic analysis), with the intent of beginning to identify relationships between relevant inputs, activities, practices, and structures, and outcomes, as well as key themes in response (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010, pp. 614-616; Denscombe, 2010, pp. 235-237). All qualitative data collected did not only function in a typical, descriptive role, but also – through data coding – bolstered the primary and client-submitted quantitative data, facilitating data triangulation and therefore stronger, richer research.

A ‘gender lens’ was applied to data analysis and, all results were disaggregated according to age, gender, residence status, or level of education, and other vulnerability criteria as appropriate and within the scope of the collected data. These results, however, were only presented as such when substantive, or notable, differences are found between groups, or when insights from KII, FDGs, or observations suggest that such disaggregation may be important for other reasons.
Project Level Findings

Relevance

Since the South Sudan conflict began in 2013, poverty, displacement, hyperinflation, and food insecurity have all contributed to the deterioration of an already fragile, under-resourced education system characterised by poor attainment. According to UNICEF, 2.2 million school-aged children across the country are not in school, and more than 70% of primary level teachers are untrained or underqualified (UNICEF, 2019). The conflict has also left around 73% (65% male, 81% female) of the adult population illiterate (UIS, 2008), with limited opportunities to access education.

In 2011, the government removed Arabic as an official language, and English was adopted as the sole official working language in South Sudan and the main medium of instruction at all levels of education. However, even if provision of English language training is a priority of the Ministry of Education, access continues to be limited, especially in rural or remote areas. As a result, many South Sudanese remain disadvantaged, without the language skills required for participation in education or for decent livelihood.

The Speak Up II programme was developed in 2015 to respond to these challenges by (i) improving the literacy, numeracy and English language skills among excluded groups; (ii) increasing their opportunities for education and employment; and (iii) providing the chance to take part in joint action for community development through REFLECT circles.

Relevance of programme activities to beneficiary needs and priorities

Not being able to speak, read, and write English, or to afford school fees were the most commonly mentioned worries or concerns by the beneficiaries who took part in this final evaluation. As one of the FGD groups agreed:

“We want to learn how to read and write, but some of us have financial constraints, and we cannot afford to pay the school fees. Also, we have the issue of early or forced marriage for girls and many orphans who are disadvantaged.”

– MALE BENEFICIARY FGD, WESTERN LAKES

The facilitators interviewed for this evaluation voiced similar concerns, and they also stressed the issue of insecurity and tribal clashes, early marriage (particularly for the Dinka people in Western Lake and Jubek states), high dropout rates (especially for women), and the lack of teachers and school infrastructure.

The Speak Up II programme is appropriate to these educational worries and concerns expressed by beneficiaries and their facilitators, as it supports vulnerable communities to acquire English, literacy, and numeracy skills, and provides those who cannot afford school fees with the opportunity to learn and continue their education. The REFLECT circles also address some of the social issues that are impacting school access and attainment, as learners debate these problems and then take part in joint action for community development.
The beneficiaries were asked for the survey whether or not the AET Speak Up programme was relevant to their needs and priorities, and 95% of them indicated that the programme activities were either ‘very relevant’ or ‘relevant’\(^7\). When asked to provide more details, the following responses were recorded:

Table 4: Reasons why the AET Speak Up programme was relevant to your needs (Beneficiary Survey, by location)\(^8\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jubek</th>
<th>Gbudue</th>
<th>Western Lake</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquired English skills</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired literacy skills</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided access to education/continue education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to daily life situations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of beneficiaries who provided an answer reported that the programme helped them gain the English language skills and literacy skills they needed, namely being able to read, write, and speak little/simple English (only one respondent mentioned numeracy skills). Those who had never been to school mentioned that Speak Up provided them with the opportunity to study, while those who had dropped out of school responded that it supported them to continue their education (secondary and primary levels were mentioned). As an adult female beneficiary from Jubek state mentioned:

quote:The Speak Up programme was very useful to me because I have never been to school before and I needed to learn. It had taught me how to read, write and speak English.

-- FEMALE BENEFICIARY (46), JUBEK

Those who mentioned that the programme was relevant to their daily lives covered a variety of cases: Speak Up taught them hygiene and sanitation, how to solve community issues such as early marriage, provided career/business advice (how to start/run a business, or farming), empowered them to help their children with school homework, or it has changed their life for the better.

The responses from facilitator FGDs corroborate these findings. All facilitators interviewed agreed that Speak Up was relevant to dropouts and illiterate adults and youth who cannot afford to pay school fees, and to adult learners who can only leave other commitments in the afternoon to study. Particularly, REFLECT was singled out as a valuable activity because it encouraged learners to discuss social issues relevant to them and find solutions:

quote:Not only reading and writing, we are also educating the community to sit down and identify their problems so they can solve these problems themselves. […] For REFLECT, we did a needs assessment, and the learners identified the issues

---

\(^7\) Likert scale: Very Relevant/ Relevant/ Somewhat Relevant/ Not Relevant / I don’t know.

\(^8\) All open responses were coded into relevant categories.
important to them, such as war, early marriage, illiteracy, and then we planned our lessons based on that. They really liked it, all of them got involved, and we looked for solutions together. The Speak Up radio course was also useful, they got listening skills, they learnt how to listen to the radio, how to answer questions.

— MALE AND FEMALE FACILITATOR FGD, GBUDUE

These beneficiary and facilitator self-reported data indicate that the programme objectives were relevant to the educational challenges of the 3 target states, and that they met the needs and priorities of beneficiaries.

Community members who listened to the radio broadcast were also consulted during the survey on the relevance of the programme. All but one of the 80 survey respondents (>99%) answered that the AET Speak Up radio course was either ‘very relevant’ or ‘relevant’ to their needs. They mentioned similar reasons to the Speak Up beneficiaries:

Table 5: Reasons why the AET Speak Up radio lessons were relevant to your needs (Radio Survey, by location)²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gbudue</th>
<th>Western Lake</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved English language skills</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate for their level (clear message)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to daily life situations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged education in the community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant in general</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Speak Up radio broadcast appealed to community members who already spoke some English, the majority of those surveyed indicating that they have either improved their language skills (speaking, and listening, vocabulary, and grammar) or revised knowledge they had forgotten. Listeners also reported that the broadcast covered topics useful to their everyday lives such as hygiene, sanitation, health, work or business, and that it has taught them how to communicate with others effectively. Some, who are not in school, mentioned that the radio broadcast encouraged them to prioritise education.

The finding that most community members report they have improved their English language skills with the support of the Speak Up radio course reinforces the relevance of the programme’s objectives.

Teaching and Speak Up Materials

As the REFLECT circles were student-focused (i.e. the facilitators developed literacy and numeracy units based on learner’s interests), facilitators were not provided with teaching guides, but were instead encouraged to use local materials available within their environment and to be creative and adaptable. They were also trained to employ participatory methods to stimulate and engage learners in discussion. The topics covered by the REFLECT circles differed slightly for each community and included, in addition to literacy and numeracy, issues such as early marriage, farming, cattle rearing, poverty, insecurity, crime, illiteracy, dropout, etc.

² All open responses were coded into relevant categories.
According to the mid-term review and annual reports, it was problematic to find appropriate facilitators as most teachers had low levels of English, received limited teacher training and none of them had used participatory methods before Speak Up. This rendered the REFLECT teaching approach challenging for the facilitators, especially developing learning units and using participatory methods effectively. The programme manager in Juba highlighted some of these issues during the interview for this final evaluation:

"You need to go through many planning steps – problem identification and then literacy and numeracy curriculum development – it is not simple, even for the most experienced teachers […] REFLECT can work better when the capacity of facilitators is higher, here we have facilitators who still have to be taught. For instance, teaching in sequence, from easy to difficult material, is hard for some of the facilitators, sometimes they start with difficult topics without realising learners cannot understand."

– PROGRAMME MANAGER, JUBEK

To offset this shortcoming, ROLE Outreach Officers doubled the frequency of their support and mentoring, and some facilitators were visited more than 5 times a month and received monthly catch-ups and reviews. Moreover, ROLE staff in Gbudue created a teaching guide for all REFLECT facilitators. The themes and content of the guide were developed together with the facilitators and two MoE representatives in a workshop format. According to the ROLE staff interviewed, this simplified the monitoring process and created success criteria that were clear and easy to measure on one hand and built the facilitators’ lesson planning capacity on the other. However, the ROLE staff in the other two states indicated that they could not replicate this approach because there is greater variation in the needs and issues of their communities.

The content for the radio lessons was also designed in consultation with the target communities and addressed locally-relevant issues, such as hygiene, health, HIV/AIDS, human rights and environment. According to the mid-term review, the topics of the course had had a strong impact in some of the learners as they could relate to the two presenters and their stories. While most facilitators interviewed were positive towards the content and difficulty level of the Speak Up materials some reported a number of obstacles (in order of frequency):

- the vocabulary was too advanced for some of the learners who had just learnt how to read and write (e.g. ‘contamination’, ‘interpretation’, or ‘abduction’ were deemed too advanced);
- it mixed easy and advanced grammar topics from the first units; and
- the local accents made the content unintelligible at times.

As the male facilitators interviewed in Juba mentioned:

"The stories on the radio use different tenses, and it was difficult for them to understand, lessons should start with present simple, then progress to present continuous, etc. Also, some of the words in the workbook are a bit advanced for the learners, the lessons should use more simple English."

– MALE FACILITATOR FGD, JUBEK

The Speak Up radio course methodology (Interactive Radio Instruction) also presented some difficulties. While on the surface using IRI seems easier given that it is more guided, checking for understanding and
alternating between the one-way radio listening and active learning is challenging. The mid-term review noted that according to lesson observations, the most effective facilitators checked for understanding during lessons and encouraged participation by giving their own examples and explanations (resorting to mother-tongue where necessary), but that most of them were reliant on the radio recording and did not contribute as much.

AET addressed these challenges from early on and took a number of measures in response. The focus on facilitator training and mentoring should be increased during future projects to ensure that teaching methodologies match the capacity and resources of facilitators. Particularly for REFLECT, facilitators would benefit from more structured guidance on how to introduce topics on literacy and numeracy, and from teaching materials such as boards, stationary or books.

Effectiveness

This section will assess whether project activities generated planned outputs, whether or not these were delivered on time, as well as if project activities represent good value for money.

The project reports the following achievements across the two cohorts over the programming period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ 3,193 (1,354 male/1,839 female) enrolled on REFLECT</td>
<td>✓ 3,164 (1,147 male/2,017 female) enrolled on REFLECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 1,915 (60%) attended at least 80%</td>
<td>✓ 2,564 (81%) attended at least 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 2,576 (81%) completed REFLECT</td>
<td>✓ 2,979 (94%) completed REFLECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 2,023 (M 743/F 1,280) demonstrated improved language skills</td>
<td>✓ 2,995 (M 1185/F 1,810) demonstrated improved language skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 3,144 (1,158 male/1,986 female) enrolled on Speak Up</td>
<td>✓ 3,208 (1,287 male/1,921 female) enrolled on Speak Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 2,389 (76%) completed Speak Up</td>
<td>✓ 2,690 (84%) completed Speak Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 2,291 (96%) passed the final speak Up test</td>
<td>✓ 2,392 (89%) passed the final speak Up test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results are commendable, especially since 9 REFLECT circles in Jubek state were closed in 2017 due to displacement and insecurity. If these 9 centres are not included, the completion rate for the first REFLECT cohort rises to over 90%, and to 83% for Speak Up. The high rates of completion and attainment across the 2 cohorts suggest that learners were motivated and committed to the classes in spite of the many challenges, such as insecurity, displacement or financial issues, they face every day.

Also, according to the AET and ROLE staff, and the facilitators interviewed for this final evaluation, there were no delays or major obstacles faced throughout the period of the programme. The only challenge mentioned by some of the facilitators was that that there were salary delays due to the closure of USD bank accounts in Yambio and Rumbek, which affected their motivation to do their job effectively.
**Outcome 1 - Improved literacy, numeracy and English language skills for out-of-school youth and adult learners from excluded groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Indicators</th>
<th>% Target (no.)</th>
<th>End of Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of beneficiaries: 6,357</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of non-literate youth and adult learners attending at least 80% of the REFLECT course</td>
<td>80% (6,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of non-literate youth and adult learners on the REFLECT course demonstrating improved English language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) and numeracy skills</td>
<td>80% (6,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of non-literate youth and adult learners completing the REFLECT course and progressing to Speak Up classes</td>
<td>60% (4,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of youth and adults completing Speak Up classes and demonstrating improved English language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing).</td>
<td>80% (6,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Beneficiary targeting and selection**

The project targeted the most vulnerable community members, including women, returnees and people with disabilities, as well as those with no English language skills. The mid-term review highlighted that a particular achievement of the project was the engagement of learners from excluded groups:

- more than half of the Speak Up and REFLECT learners were female;
- 7-10% of them were internally displaced people (IDPs) and 6-9% were returnees;
- 2% of the learners reported having a disability (the rates were higher for REFLECT circles); and
- over 40% of Speak Up and 30% of REFLECT learners were youth (under 25 years).

The data collected throughout this evaluation corroborate these findings. **Beneficiaries engaged for the survey were asked if the programme has reached the most vulnerable people in their community, and >99% of them reported that it has.** What is more, all of the facilitators and key stakeholders interviewed indicated that Speak Up enrolled vulnerable groups in their community, namely women, people with disabilities (mental and physical), orphans, ex-soldiers, IDPs and returnees, or those financially poor.

On the other hand, the facilitators mentioned that even if the course was useful for the social inclusion of people with disabilities, educational attainment was limited for some of these learners:
I have one learner who is deaf, he does not understand much but he can write and really wants to take part [...] however, he needs to be referred to a specialised service, it is challenging for us to teach disabled people (the others agree) [...] I also had widows, elderly, and orphans in my class, these people could not have afforded education otherwise.

— MALE AND FEMALE FACILITATOR FGD, JUBEK

Access to educational facilities designed for people with disabilities is limited in the majority of locations where AET operates, which makes it unlikely that those students can be referred to other services or institutions. Therefore, if future programming targets people with disabilities, facilitators should receive additional and technical training on how to integrate these learners in the class.

Multi-level classes
As indicated by both data collected for this final evaluation and AET monitoring, classes enrolled learners from different levels, even if the programme was only targeting those with no English skills. The facilitators and outreach officers interviewed, particularly in Yambio and Rumbek, explained that in communities where access to education is very limited, discouraging higher level learners who want to join is morally wrong and goes against the project’s values. On the other hand, in some communities, especially in Jubek state, enrolment selection was limited because of the low value communities place on education, work commitments and displacement.

Teaching a multi-level classroom presented a series of challenges for the facilitators. While the discussion of social issues was enjoyed by all REFLECT participants (as these were usually led in the local language or in Arabic), some of the more advanced learners were left demotivated by the beginner literacy and numeracy content of REFLECT. According to facilitators’ monthly reports, some of them had to devote a significant amount of time to the lower level learners, which meant that higher level learners were often discouraged to join or dropped out. Others reported that they told the more advanced learners to come later during the course, after the beginners had mastered the basics.

The challenges associated with teaching a multi-level class can undermine the effectiveness of the 2-level approach, by demotivating some learners and disadvantaging others; this is because the approach was designed for a mono-level class. None the less, this challenge was identified during the mid-term evaluation, and the local teams made sure that the second cohort learners enrolled were above level 2 on the LAMP scale. Therefore, future projects should ensure that the scope is restricted to the most educationally marginalised members of the community without depriving the more advanced learners who want to join from the opportunity to learn. Lastly, if resources allow, the facilitators could be given the skills and learning materials to teach multi-level classes or AET could institute learning streams for different abilities.

Literacy and Numeracy skills
As reported above, 2,395 learners of the first cohort and 2,753 learners of the second cohort demonstrated improved language skills according to the end of REFLECT Literacy Assessment and Monitoring Programme (LAMP) scores. Similar positive findings were reported by beneficiaries for the evaluation survey:
Across the 3 target locations, 91% of beneficiaries reported that they have improved their literacy and numeracy skills since they started the REFLECT course. The beneficiaries engaged for FGDs gave some examples of the specific skills they acquired:

“We learnt mathematics, such as the shapes, addition, division, or how to calculate distance. We also learnt some vocabulary in English […] and we can say simple sentences such as ‘my name is …’ and how to write […] And this has had an impact on our households, we are now able to communicate at home and in the community using English, and we could not do that before.”

— FEMALE BENEFICIARY FGD, GBUDUE

Additionally, the facilitators interviewed for this evaluation all agreed that REFLECT was effective at building basic literacy and numeracy skills. They reported that their learners can count, do simple addition or subtraction which helps them use their phones and save numbers, or manage their budgets etc.; and that they know the alphabet, write and read a few words in English, or say a few short sentences in English.

These literacy and numeracy achievements should be considered against the numerous challenges identified above concerning facilitators’ capacity and resources, or the multi-level classroom environment. All in all, it appears that REFLECT was effective at building basic literacy and numeracy skills.

Demonstrating use of English language skills in everyday lives

According to AET’s annual reports, at baseline, learners felt they used English only rarely, whereas by the end of the REFLECT course they reported using English more frequently to read newspapers, listen to the radio and speak to foreigners or people from different ethnic groups at the market. The Speak Up beneficiaries engaged for this evaluation were asked how often they use English in their daily lives:
Across the 3 target areas, 63% (70% of all male, 57% of all female) indicated that they use English either ‘very often’ or ‘often’ in their daily lives. Given the lifestyle and economic differences between these 3 states, it is expected that frequency rates to be higher in Jubek state, as almost 75% of beneficiaries in Jubek report using English ‘very often’ or ‘often’, compared to 58% in Gbudue and 55% in Western Lakes.

The vast majority of beneficiaries surveyed (94%) reported that their English skills have improved since they started the REFLECT circles and/or Speak Up radio course. They also indicated that this created new opportunities for them, including promoting to further education, increased employability or finding a job/starting a business.

Further education

Figure 4: Did you transition to further education? (Beneficiary Survey, by location)

Around 65% of the learners surveyed (68% for males, and 62% for female) reported that they transitioned to further education.

When asked to which kind of education, 33% reported that they enrolled in primary, 30% in secondary, 27% to adult education, 6% to other NGO courses, and 4% to ALC. There were some differences noted when these data were disaggregated by location:

Table 6: If yes, what kind of further education? (Beneficiary Survey, by location)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Adult Educ.</th>
<th>ALC10</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gbudue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubek</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While these findings speak of opportunity, they also reveal potential gaps in services available and different starting levels for learners. The higher rate of beneficiaries transitioning to secondary school in Jubek state could indicate greater access as well as better financial means to afford school fees (even if these are ‘hidden fees’ such as uniforms and books), compared to the more rural or remote areas in the other two states11.

10 Accelerated Learning Centres.

11 Jubek State is closer to the capital city, Juba, and is more urbanised with higher access to services and a greater INGOs and NGOs support. In Western Lakes State, most communities are pastoralists and keep livestock, while in Gbudue State the majority engage in sustenance agriculture with any surplus sold at the market.
learners in Gbudue state transitioned to adult education, while most in Western Lakes enrolled in primary. AET monitoring data corroborates these survey results. One of the tracer studies undertaken in Jubek state indicates that 90% of the learners sampled had transitioned to further education: 25% to primary (mostly P8), 47% to secondary, and 18% to the government run Adult Learning Programmes (ALPs). What is more, all but one beneficiary agreed that the REFLECT and/or Speak Up radio courses were either ‘very important’ or ‘important’ for this transition to further education.

The feedback some facilitators received from learners included the request for Speak Up to integrate more school subjects, such as mathematics, science or social sciences which would facilitate the transition of those who have never been to school to further education:

"People want to transition to further education, but they told me that Speak Up does not have all the subjects they need, they only get English, but they need religious education, mathematics, science and social studies."

– MALE FACILITATOR FGD, WESTERN LAKE

Employment

Figure 5: Did the AET Speak Up programme impact on your employment opportunities? (Beneficiary Survey, by location)

Around 47% of learners overall (42% for female, 52% for male) indicated that the programme increased their employment opportunities, while 44% reported that they found a job or had started a business since completing the AET Speak Up programme. This achievement is considerable given that 19% of those surveyed are students who are not looking for employment. Moreover, the variation between states can be explained by different economic opportunities, as learners in Jubek are more likely to have access to jobs. It could also be that for learners from Gbudue and Western Lakes states acquiring other skills, such as vocational skills, would be required to maximise the language and literacy skills they have acquired. The vast majority also indicated that this achievement is due to their participation in Speak Up:

"Some of us are now working as secretaries because we are able to read and write English [...] (male beneficiary) I now work as a preacher in the community because I can read and interpret the Bible."

– MALE AND FEMALE BENEFICIARY FGD, GBUDUE

---

12 Question ‘If yes, how important was your participation in the REFLECT circle/ Speak Up radio course for the transition to further education?’ and Likert scale Very Important/Important/Somewhat Important/Not Important/ I don’t know’. 
Without this program, I could not get any job opportunities, I could not have gotten my job as a teacher, and this will help me grow in the future as well.

– MALE BENEFICIARY (18), JUBEK

All in all, the language, literacy and numeracy skills that learners developed from Speak Up helped them communicate with their teachers and colleagues at school, as well as with friends, family and others at the market. These skills supported the beneficiaries as they continue their education or access better employment opportunities. Most importantly, it is very likely that these positive outcomes will continue even after the end of the project.

Perceptions of learners on the need for English and the usefulness of the course and level 2 approach

According to data collected from learners surveyed for the mid-term review, they all strongly agreed that there is a great need for English in further education, employment and speaking to people from different places. Similarly, the beneficiaries engaged for this evaluation mentioned speaking English in the following contexts:

- at school in class, with teachers or colleagues (193 responses),
- with friends (78 responses);
- at the market or with foreigners (77 responses);
- at home with husband/wife or with children helping them with homework (73 responses); and
- at work (28 responses).

This suggests that English permeates all spheres of social life, not just providing access to education and employment, reinforcing the relevance of acquiring English language skills. Moreover, these self-reported data are a good indicator of the areas or spheres in which people perceive English to be useful or important.

Survey data collected during the final evaluation provides some evidence for the usefulness of the 2-level English approach to beneficiaries’ reported need to learn English:

Figure 6: What is your opinion of the usefulness of the AET Speak Up course (RELFECT and Speak Up)?

Almost all learners surveyed agreed that the 2-level English approach was either ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’, and only one learner reported that the approach was ‘somewhat useful’. However, when consulted about the successes and challenges of the 2-level approach in the FGDs, almost all groups agreed that the Speak Up radio course was useful, but that some of the content (particularly the grammar and vocabulary) was too advanced or difficult. Most also commented that the learning period was too short for both courses. Others reported that REFLECT needs more learning materials and a higher focus placed on writing and reading skills, not only listening and speaking. Some of their testimonies include:
Our opinion of the quality and usefulness of the 2-level English programme is good. It is useful because it teaches us to read, speak and write English [...] however, one of the challenges is that some of the words in the second level book (i.e. the radio course) are hard to understand.

— FEMALE BENEFICIARY FGD, JUBEK

All in all, beneficiaries agree that there is a great need for English, particularly for education and work, and that the 2-level approach was useful to learn English. They felt that the 2 approaches were compatible, but that some adjustments are required to ensure these are suitable for the context and to their needs.

Quality and Complementarity of the 2-level English approach

While REFLECT has been effective at building basic literacy and numeracy skills, these skills do not appear to be an appropriate foundation for learners to participate meaningfully in the Speak Up radio course. The facilitators interviewed for this final evaluation mentioned that some of the lower level learners could not transition to Speak Up because of an existing gap between the two courses:

Those who did not get education before REFLECT could not transition, because Speak Up was too hard for them, the learner’s workbook is an English grammar book, and they only know how to read and write simple things (they all agree) [...] Speak Up is good for dropouts from primary Level 5.

— MALE FACILITATOR FGD, WESTERN LAKES

REFLECT was introduced to Speak Up II in order to bridge the gap for the most educationally marginalised to an intensive English course or to further education, by providing them with literacy and numeracy skills. Given that the radio course has a defined set of knowledge that learners need to master before they join (vocabulary and grammar in particular), the flexible approach of REFLECT can be a disadvantage for some learners. REFLECT could benefit from having a core curriculum of literacy and numeracy skills that all facilitators teach, irrespective of the social issues discussed. For example, introducing more basic English grammar, such as the present simple or adjectives, could ease the transition to the radio course.

Evaluating the complementarity of the two approaches is made difficult by the fact that many REFLECT learners did not transition to Speak Up. The learners who joined in their place had a higher level of English than those who had just finished REFLECT, which introduced a positive bias to the measurement of attainment.

This is also partly because, as one of the outreach officers in Juba stated, ‘REFLECT is many things’. It is not clear from the data collected for this evaluation how much time was allocated to literacy and numeracy, but the mid-term review expressed some concern that some learners viewed the REFLECT circles as a community forum rather than for literacy learning. Learners felt that it was more urgent to learn how to address pressing community needs than to acquire numeracy and literacy skills and were less interested in learning the vocabulary around the social issue they were discussing.

13 According to the mid-term review, the transition rate from REFLECT to Speak Up was considerably lower than anticipated, at only 27.5%.
To conclude, future interventions should ensure that all learners have the opportunity to gather the skills they need to succeed in the Speak Up radio course, and that the material and structure of the two approaches are closely aligned.

### Outcome 2 - Enhanced capacity of facilitators to deliver literacy and numeracy training using participatory approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Indicators</th>
<th>% Target (no.)</th>
<th>End of Programme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of facilitators who attended training reporting increased skills and confidence in using participatory methodologies</td>
<td>100% (127)</td>
<td>100% (127) 120 7</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of facilitators generating maps and matrices from learners' contributions and opinions</td>
<td>75% (112)</td>
<td>105% (117) 112 5</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of facilitators developing new REFLECT modules through peer review meetings</td>
<td>80% (120)</td>
<td>106% (127) 120 7</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of facilitators running Speak Up classes where teacher talking time is less than learner talking time</td>
<td>60% (90)</td>
<td>118% (106) 97 9</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 127 out of the initial target of 150 facilitators received REFLECT training, refresher REFLECT training on developing learning units, attended regular peer-to-peer support meetings and Speak Up radio training. Reaching the target of 150 facilitators was not possible because of insecurity in Jubek state, starting in 2016 and continuing throughout the duration of the project. In the interest of capturing impact effectively, the consultancy team adjusted these indicators to the final number of facilitators who took part in the training, i.e. 127.

The outcome monitoring data gathered by AET indicates that the project has successfully enhanced the capacity of facilitators to deliver literacy and numeracy training using participatory approaches. It is worth noting, none the less, that the low number of female facilitators most probably indicates that there are fewer educated women in these communities who can take up the role of facilitators.

#### Confidence levels of facilitators to deliver REFLECT circles and Speak Up classes

According to the mid-term review and annual reports, facilitators indicated that they were either confident or very confident about their role as facilitators. These self-reported data are triangulated by lesson observations which indicate that all facilitators were able to create visual tools/graphics based on learners’ contributions and opinions. As a result, in over 80% of the classes observed, teacher talking time was less than student talking time.

Similarly, all facilitators interviewed for this final evaluation reported that they were confident in their capacity to deliver the REFLECT circles and Speak Up radio classes, and that their teaching has changed since they received the Speak Up training. Almost all facilitators mentioned adopting a learner-centred teaching approach by actively engaging their learners and encouraging them to participate in the discussion. Other positive impacts of the facilitator training include lesson planning, positive discipline methods, time
management, and improved English skills. Some relevant examples of these changes are noted in the quotes below:

"I used to teach instinctively [...] After the training, I learnt how to motivate and engage them, because I cannot insult or cane adult learners, you can only correct them by saying ‘thank you’, ‘well done’, ‘you are almost done’, you need to be polite."

— MALE FACILITATOR FGD, WESTERN LAKES

"It taught me how to use local materials available within my environment (like stones, leaves, sticks) and how to improvise. I also developed my English speaking and presentation skills, and through teaching them how to write I improved my own writing etc. [...] Apart from what they’ve said, I was able to pair learners efficiently, so they learn from one another."

— MALE FACILITATOR FGD, GBUDUE

The majority of facilitators reported using participatory methods and mentioned the problem tree (the most commonly mentioned method), mobility map, and calendar. However, two of the FGD groups in Juba could not name any participatory methods and one group in Rumbek confessed that they have only used them once. Those who reported using these methods in class, explained that they were useful because they aided the learners to participate in the lessons’ discussions. Facilitators particularly noted that these visual methods are better suited to an adult audience, because adults learn better through conversation:

"They understand the subjects better when the visuals are there (the others agree). These are also good because they are not young learners, adults need to be sociable with others, that’s how they learn best."

— MALE AND FEMALE FACILITATOR FGD, GBUDUE

None the less, while these data suggest that the facilitators are able to use participatory tools, it is not clear how often they used these tools and whether they were adapted to different learning contexts. Most facilitators were vague about their specific use of participatory methods. What is more, as previous sections have highlighted, facilitators have faced a number of challenges when teaching REFLECT and Speak Up, including a lack of teaching materials, technical issues with the radio battery, or multi-level classes. These are likely to have impacted on their confidence and teaching performance.

All in all, observation, and self-reported data seem to indicate that facilitators have confidence to deliver the REFLECT circles and Speak Up classes. However, more robust monitoring data collected throughout the duration of the project, particularly lesson observations, would be necessary to evaluate this qualitative indicator effectively.
It seems that the project managed to increase the capacity of ROLE staff and local MoEST to deliver and monitor literacy and numeracy training using participatory approaches. However, the low number of MoEST staff visiting classes on a monthly basis and giving feedback to ROLE staff indicates an area of improvement. The long-term strategy is for the government to take over the project activities, therefore increasing their capacity and engagement during implementation should be key for future projects.

Perceptions of facilitators on the quality of mentoring support provided by ROLE staff

During data collection for this final evaluation, facilitators were asked what their opinion was of the mentoring support provided by ROLE staff. All of the facilitators interviewed agreed that the mentoring support was of good or excellent quality, and that they have close working relationships with the ROLE outreach officers. Facilitators mentioned being visited by outreach officers, project managers, project officer and also MoE inspectors. However, 3 out of the ten 10 FGD groups (two from Yambio, and one from Juba) did not remember if or when they were visited by MoE inspectors.

Facilitators were also consulted on the strengths and weaknesses of this mentoring support, and whether it has impacted their teaching or not. While their responses were generally positive, only 4 out of the 10 FGD groups were able to give concrete examples of the advice they had received. Those who gave examples mentioned that the support had helped them with (in order of frequency):

- Lesson planning (all 3 states);
- Assessment and Differentiation (Jubek and Gbudue);
- Positive discipline methods (Gbudue);
- Time management (Gbudue and Western Lakes);
- Less teacher talk (Gbudue);
- Punctuality (all 3 states); and
- Learner motivation (Western Lakes).

---

14 Only 127 out of the initial target of 150 facilitators received REFLECT training, refresher REFLECT training on developing learning units, attended regular peer-to-peer support meetings and Speak Up radio training. In the interest of capturing impact effectively, the consultancy team adjusted these indicators to the final number of facilitators who took part in the training, i.e. 127.
Additionally, the facilitators in Gbudue and Jubek reported that the outreach officers were very supportive and that they always encourage and compliment them:

> The outreach officers taught us how to differentiate between slow, medium, and fast learners, how to adjust our teaching to their needs. [...] The monitors also appreciate our work when we do well, that’s good, we’re happy with that. And they also always encourage us.

– MALE AND FEMALE FACILITATOR FGD, GBUDUE

The facilitator FGD groups in Yambio and Rumbek also mentioned one weakness: they highlighted that the monitoring support was sometimes postponed or cancelled:

> They cannot always come to monitor us, because they are far from us, they don’t have motorbikes or cars. Or when they come there are delays.

– MALE FACILITATOR FGD, WESTERN LAKE

Lastly, it is worth noting that none of the facilitators mentioned receiving help with community mobilisation or action points planning. According to the mid-term review and annual reports, both ROLE staff and education officials focused more on support with the delivery of the literacy and numeracy teaching rather than community development (the second component of REFLECT). However, as this is an area in which few of them have experience, future capacity building and mentoring should focus more on helping facilitators design and implement community action points.

### Outcome 4 - Communities define and lead their own development through the REFLECT groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>End of Programme</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of communities with practical action undertaken as a result of REFLECT classes (with or without micro grants)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100% (127)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of communities identifying and reporting positive outcomes from the practical action undertaken as a result of REFLECT classes</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100% (127)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial design of the REFLECT circles included microgrants for all circles to implement their community development actions. However, this was not possible for the first cohort due to banks closure in Yambio and Rumbek and security concerns over travelling and distributing cash in rural areas. While this aspect was not captured during the final evaluation, the mid-term review argues that the lack of micro-grants could have been a factor which discouraged some REFLECT circles from developing community activities.
action plans or it could have limited the scale of these plans as beneficiaries had to rely on local resources only.

Views of the wider community on the process of working together for community development

The community members and key stakeholders engaged for this final evaluation were positive and supportive of the REFLECT process of working together for community development. The themes emerging from the interviews and surveys with learners, local chiefs, facilitators, and outreach officers note the following positive outcomes of the community development action points:

- supported adults to start their own business or farming;
- encouraged more parents to send their children to school;
- made community members engage in positive behaviour (less crime and fighting, especially among youth) and use peaceful conflict resolution;
- improved communication between community members;
- increased awareness on key issues such as alcoholism, early marriage, etc.

Opening a small business was the most common theme identified. According to the facilitators in Western Lakes, the topic of livelihoods was usually discussed during REFLECT circles when they looked at poverty, farming and food insecurity. Here, REFLECT encouraged learners to organise communal gardens or start their own small business. The local chiefs and outreach officers in Rumbek city mentioned that learners from three communities (40 people, 6 men and 34 women, some REFLECT learners and some community members) started a communal garden and cultivated groundnuts, green grams, lentils, and maze. As a group they all contribute with labour and hire oxen for grazing, while some women sell the produce at the market and share the profit with other members. This is an unexpected positive outcome, one which highlights the need for future projects to integrate more livelihoods programming. There was very strong support from the beneficiaries surveyed for the project to have a larger component on livelihoods.

The promotion of positive behaviour and peace-building was another frequent theme, particularly amongst beneficiaries and facilitators. For instance, the facilitators in Yambio mentioned that community members have become ambassadors for positive change:

> They are now like ambassadors, they take the knowledge back to their community, and we can see changes happening; one example is domestic violence and early marriage, these issues have improved since the start of the programme in our community.
In addition to these responses, female beneficiaries in Juba reported that they (i) organised two community awareness campaigns (one on hygiene and sanitation, and one on school enrolment for girls), and (ii) that they started small-scale business:

“We organised an awareness campaign on hygiene and sanitation for the community. We also organised one to encourage parents to send their daughters to school, and it was successful. We want to know if programme will continue so that more girls can join them take programme [...] Other action points, small-scale businesses from selling local thing like sweet, onion etc to selling clothes in the market [...] These helped us lot, and we would like to improve the programme to have better livelihood support.”

—FEMALE BENEFICIARY FGD, JUBEK

All in all, it seems that the communities targeted by Speak Up were able to define and lead their own development through the REFLECT groups, and that these brought a series of positive impacts to their community.

### Outcome 5 - Improved access to quality English language lessons through radio broadcasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>End of Programme Total</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of facilitators effectively structuring lessons around the radio</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100% (127)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions of learners (in Speak Up classes and wider public) and facilitators on the usefulness and quality of the Speak Up radio lessons

The perceptions of Speak Up learners and radio listeners on the usefulness and quality of the radio classes were generally positive, with some challenges identified concerning the difficulty of the content.

The AET monitoring data shows that, overall, the learners report to be pleased with the Speak Up radio classes. They commented that the topics were interesting and highly relevant to their lives and that the course strengthened their listening and speaking skills. During this final evaluation, learners were also asked for their opinion on the usefulness and quality of the Speak Up radio course:

*Figure 7: What is your opinion of the usefulness of the Speak Up radio course? (Beneficiary Survey)*
Almost all respondents agreed that Speak Up was either ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’ and that the quality was ‘excellent’ or ‘good’. Beneficiaries mentioned that the course is useful because it had helped them improve their English skills (listening, reading, writing, and, speaking; some also mentioned grammar and vocabulary) or continue their education (secondary and primary education). The facilitators interviewed also noted that the course was useful to improve the learners’ English skills.

A similar question was asked to radio listeners for the survey. 98% of them reported that the radio lessons were either ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’, and 93% mentioned that the quality was ‘excellent’ or ‘good’. Listeners named the following as the strengths of the radio lessons:

Table 7: What were the strengths of the AET Speak Up radio lessons? (Radio Survey; top 5 responses by frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gbudue</th>
<th>Western Lake</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helps improve English skills</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased employability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to the radio more often</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better community relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The radio lessons help community members improve their English skills (grammar and pronunciation in particular), especially because the content matter was relevant to their daily lives and because the message was clear and appropriate to their level. Some also said that it has encouraged them and other community members to listen to the radio more often and pay attention to the news. Some examples of these answers include:

Speak Up empowers people to speak good English, especially those who are shy.

– FEMALE BENEFICIARY (35), GBUDUE

The lesson covered a lot of useful content, and it used good, basic English covering the common uses of English grammar.

– FEMALE BENEFICIARY (29), WESTERN LAKE

15 All open responses were coded into relevant categories.
When asked about the weaknesses of the radio lessons, the majority of listeners reported that the course duration was too short and that they would like the programme to be broadcasted daily. Some also asked AET to provide the community with radios so more people can enjoy these lessons.

Some of the challenges related to the Speak Up radio lessons have already been mentioned in the section which discusses the complementarity of the 2-level English approach and the attainment of learners. Learners reported that even if the course was useful, at times the content was challenging:

> The radio course was good but too difficult to understand and read. We could do it because we had another textbook from our teachers, [...] We want to continue with level 3 or 4 and it needs to increase the days of learning.

— MALE BENEFICIARY FGD, GBUDUE

This concern was also voiced by project officers and facilitators. Additionally, one of the facilitator FGD groups in Jubek mentioned that sequencing 3 recordings consecutively makes it difficult for the learners to follow the interviews; they suggested scheduling breaks between the 3 interviews and allowing for discussion and questions. Most of the facilitator groups in Yambio and Rumbek suggested that future iterations should include numeracy as a continuation of REFLECT; they argued that these skills would facilitate transition to further education.

Impact

The majority of learners engaged for this final evaluation reported that Speak Up has impacted positively on their personal lives and communities. Beneficiaries noted that they have acquired or improved their English, literacy, and numeracy skills, that they continued their education, that they listen to the radio more often and they are able to understand the news. At community level, beneficiaries and stakeholders report Speak Up has encouraged positive behavior in the community, raised awareness on key issues such as alcoholism, early marriage, supported adults to start their own business or farming and made more parents send their children to school.

Individual Level

The REFLECT learners surveyed reported a number of positive impacts as a result of the course:

*Table 8: How has the REFLECT course impacted your life? (Beneficiary Survey; top 5 responses by frequency)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jubek</th>
<th>Gbudue</th>
<th>Western Lake</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquired literacy and numeracy skills</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued education/more interested to learn</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased employability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All open responses were coded into relevant categories.
Most respondents indicated that they acquired literacy and numeracy skills or that they are ‘literate’/‘educated’ as a result of the course. Being able to budget or save money was a related theme that some beneficiaries mentioned as a result of improved numeracy skills. Some stated that REFLECT encouraged and helped them transition to primary or secondary school, or that they are generally more aware of the importance of education. Another minority of respondents mentioned increased employability, noting that they are running their own businesses or achieving employment because they speak English. The respondents who mentioned solving problems in their communities stated that they are no longer short-tempered and have better familial communication; they have stopped drinking alcohol; or they know how to be polite and interact with others. As the male and female beneficiaries in Gbudue and Jubek states agreed during the FGD and survey:

“We can read and communicate in English now, and we can count and write the numbers. As a result, we can talk in English with our household members (most mention their spouses). It also helps us share these skills with our children at home, we can teach our sons and daughters […] We also communicate more in English among the community members.

—FEMALE AND MALE BENEFICIARY FGD, GBUDUE

REFLECT created better understanding between us, and it taught me how to lead my business and how to keep the records of my business.

—FEMALE BENEFICIARY (39), JUBEK

Similar positive impacts were reported by Speak Up radio course beneficiaries:

Table 9: How has the Speak Up radio course impacted your life? (Beneficiary Survey; top 5 responses by frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jubek</th>
<th>Gbudue</th>
<th>Western Lake</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved English skills</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to listen to the radio news</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving problems in the community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great impact (general)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued education/more interested to learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All open responses were coded into relevant categories.
Improved English skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary) was the most commonly identified theme for the Speak Up radio course. Some learners also mentioned acquiring literacy skills (such as writing the alphabet), which mostly likely indicate they confused the two courses. A corollary of improved listening skills was that learners reported being able to listen to the radio more for important government announcement or health information. Learners also reported that Speak Up was relevant to some of the problems they face in their communities such as:

- it encouraged parents to enrol their children in school (especially girls; 6 responses);
- it addressed the beliefs and attitudes towards early marriage (5 responses); and
- it has improved communication in the community (3 responses).

There was also a small minority which mentioned they have only seen a small change, either because the course was too short to master the skills, or because it was too difficult. The learners also highlighted these benefits during FGDs:

> I improved my listening, reading, writing, and speaking English skills. The Speak Up programme also impacted on my household because I was able to share what I had learnt with them, and now I try to communicate mostly in English with my household to build our skills in English.

— FEMALE BENEFICIARY FGD, GBUDUE

These findings are corroborated by interview and FGD interactions with facilitators and key stakeholders, who, as mentioned above, report their learners can count, do simple addition or subtraction. These skills help them use their phones and save numbers, or manage their budgets etc. Findings show that learners know the alphabet and can write and read a few words in English or say a few short sentences in English.

Community Level

There is some indication that the benefits received by the target group had a wider overall effect on larger numbers of people in the communities or regions as a whole. However, it might be too early after the end of the programme to measure or track the changes the programme has generated at community level.

The majority of learners engaged for the final evaluation survey were positive towards the impact Speak Up has had on their community:
The high rates of ‘I don’t know’ were somewhat expected, given that impact at community level is generally more challenging to measure and evaluate for individuals. When asked to give examples of these changes, the beneficiaries named the following changes:

- encouraged positive behavior in the community (general; less violence, peaceful resolution, open to communication; 42 responses);
- people are educated (27 responses);
- discouraged early marriage (19 responses);
- more children are sent to school (18 responses);
- parents can help their children with homework (9 responses); and
- discouraged domestic violence (5 responses).

Below are some relevant answer examples of these changes:

"My brothers are now sent to school since age does not matter with education so in this community we have allowed our children to go to school."

— FEMALE BENEFICIARY (29), WESTERN LAKES

"Speak Up bought unity and togetherness in our community."

— FEMALE BENEFICIARY (35), GBUDUE

All in all, while these impacts might also be conjunctural, it is possible that Speak Up also played an important role. Most of all, it is very likely that these changes will continue after the end of the project.
Organisational Level

Overall, the data collected for this final evaluation suggests that the project’s structure has enabled it to meet its objectives and the needs of the target groups. A number of factors have contributed to this achievement: the retention of staff and institutional knowledge, the monitoring and evaluation systems, and the support outreach officers provided the facilitators. None the less, some challenges do remain in these areas.

Retention of staff and institutional knowledge

One of the strengths of the programme is the capacity to retain staff and institutional knowledge. The AET and ROLE staff interviewed for the evaluation reported that they are mission-driven and committed to the work AET is undertaking in their communities. Also, much programming appears to be well aligned to needs of beneficiaries, and builds on well-established approaches to achieving desired outcomes. These are some of the key factors that contributed to the programme running smoothly, which increased the staff’s effectiveness at the field level in implementing the second iteration of Speak Up.

Monitoring Data and Iterative Improvement

Monitoring data, when recorded and used effectively, has the potential to strengthen programming. Effective monitoring should be linked both to key log-frame indicators, as well as to broader questions of programmatic effectiveness and quality.

The monitoring, evaluation, and learning systems of the project were one of the most active parts, with over 10 tools employed by project staff to track the achievements of the programme. These were used by field staff for on-going adjustment and iterative improvement of programming, as one the programme manager in Juba noted:

> We had many tools at the same time – monthly attendance registers, facilitator monthly reports, monitoring visit checklists, lesson observations, and many others […] They were useful, we knew what was happening on the ground at all times and we could adapt.

— PROGRAMME MANAGER, JUBEK

As mentioned elsewhere in this report, because of the challenges REFLECT facilitators faced developing learning units and using participatory methods effectively, facilitator support was increased from twice a month to five times a month. This change was implemented early on during the lifetime of the project and came about in response to monitoring feedback from outreach officers. This feedback also led AET and ROLE staff in some states to increase the number of lessons from 2 to 3 a week to support the facilitators reach their targets.

At the same time, these monitoring systems overloaded the staff and generated a high amount of data that required significant resources to be reviewed, analysed, and stored. This challenge became apparent to the consultancy team during the field-work document review stage. Moreover, the mid-term review highlighted that some project staff did not capture all key data, such as transition of learners from...
REFLECT to Speak Up or the number of learners transitioning to further study and employment after Speak Up.

Two approaches would be beneficial here: digitisation of monitoring tools where possible (using platforms such as SurveyCTO, Commcare ODK, etc), and restricting the content to the most important log-frame indicators and evaluation questions. In addition to these, just like the mid-term review suggested, capacity building should prioritise data management and analysis, to ensure that staff and outreach officers have the skills and technical knowledge to deliver and monitor the implementation of the programme. Lastly, the review of MEL systems could be organised in a workshop format in each state to ensure all project staff contribute to the improvement of monitoring tools. One such exercise was organised in March 2018, and according to the Year 3 annual report, it resulted in amendments to the monitoring tools and databases which increased the efficiency of data management and analysis.

Outreach officers’ support

Speak Up spans across three states and reaches a number of remote or isolated locations. To ensure the smooth running of all centres, these were visited monthly and sometimes weekly by ROLE outreach officers who provided support and training to facilitators. These weekly visits were followed by monthly catch-ups and reviews. However, the facilitators have sometimes achieved this under difficult conditions. All of the outreach officers interviewed for this evaluation agreed that the lack of adequate road infrastructure, especially during the rainy season, has impacted on their capacity to undertake these visits. Some mentioned that they could not monitor all of their centres in one month, and that instead they called the facilitators and ran a short assessment over the phone. As one of the outreach officers reported:

“We move with motorbikes, and when it rains, it’s hard to reach the centres. Once, my motorbike spoiled, and I had to push it to the city to get it fixed, it was not easy. We need more support to cover fuel, and repairs.”

– OUTREACH OFFICER, WESTERN LAKES
Partnership Level

Overall, the education officials, local chiefs, and radio staff engaged by the consultant for this final evaluation reported having a close or productive working relationship with AET and ROLE staff. There were no complaints or negative feedback, and all stakeholders expressed their desire to continue the collaboration with AET in the future. However, there is room for improvement in the involvement of education officials in programme implementation and monitoring.

AET and Government

The education officials interviewed for this evaluation in Gbudue and Jubek states all agreed that they value their interactions with AET and that they have a strong work collaboration. AET monitoring data supports these findings; according to the mid-term review, ROLE have a good working relationship with the state and national level MoE in all of their programmes.

While MoE officials have been involved in some monitoring in all states, the interviews with these stakeholders revealed that, by and large, they are not familiar with the structure or impact of the programme. For instance, two of the county education directors in Gbudue state, who are responsible for monitoring all education activities in the area, reported having only very limited knowledge of the materials used, the Speak Up methodology or the impact of the project. This limited engagement is also partly due to a lack of budget allocation to cover the additional travel costs of education officials.

The Senior Inspector for intensive courses in Juba reported that there needs to be a stronger collaboration with the MoE, and government staff to have a more active presence on the field. This is important especially because community members do not know that Speak Up is implemented in collaboration with the government. Lastly, since the long-term exit strategy is for the government to take over the course, increasing their capacity and involvement during implementation should be key for future iterations.

AET and Local Chiefs

The local chiefs interviewed in Nzara and Rumbek East report having a close and productive working relationship with AET, particularly with the outreach officers. It also became apparent during the FGDs that they were familiar with the structure, methodology, and impact of the project. When asked if they were consulted during implementation, the local chiefs reported they were constantly updated on the achievements and challenges of the project by the facilitators and outreach officers. Most of them also mentioned that they acted as liaisons to mobilise and motivate learners and other community members:

> We monitored the teachers and the learners to see if they are committed. We encouraged them to leave other duties and take part in the programme. I visit the centres sometimes, and I saw that even if they didn’t understand it [radio content], the facilitator translated, and they could enjoy it.

— LOCAL CHIEFS FGD, WESTERN STATE

AET and Radio

Only the director of the Radio Good News Station in Rumbek city was engaged for this final evaluation. He reported that ever since they started the collaboration with AET in 2012, their interactions have been positive, and they did not face any challenges. The director suggested strengthening this partnership by engaging a radio presenter to lead a 15-minute Q&A follow-up with the listeners. He argued that this is necessary to make the listeners more engaged and to track their achievement.
**Recommendations**

### Extended Facilitator Training

The effectiveness of the 2-level English approach is closely linked to the capacity and motivation of facilitators. Future interventions would benefit from extended technical training (including mentoring and peer-to-peer support) complemented by an intensive English course.

Technical training should focus on the following areas of improvement: lesson planning, using participatory methods effectively, teaching multi-level classes, and alternating between the one-way radio listening and active teaching for Speak Up. Most importantly, increased emphasis should be put on assessment for learning. Work has to be directed to the appropriate level for pupils, and differentiated approaches used to learning and teaching.

Facilitators expressed support for the peer-to-peer training, as they reported these sessions were not only informative, but they also inspired a collaborative and supportive environment. Given the security and infrastructure challenges, it is not simple for the facilitators themselves to organise these sessions regularly; alternatively, these could be organised with the support of AET and ROLE staff once every quarter or even more often.

### Teaching and learning materials for REFLECT circles

REFLECT is particularly challenging because it teaches literacy and numeracy in a language that the learners do not speak, and thus it combines teaching English as a foreign language and using English as medium of instruction. Facilitators would benefit from more structured guidance on how to introduce material on language, literacy, and numeracy, and from teaching materials such as boards, stationary or books. For instance, when asked what can be done to improve the effectiveness of REFLECT, some of the facilitators asked for a more structured or standardised approach to the teaching methodology.

It would, therefore, be useful for REFLECT to develop a teaching manual with a common core for language, literacy, and numeracy skills, while the vocabulary remains locally situated. The manual/guide should focus first on subject knowledge, and then on participatory methods and lesson planning and community mobilisation (templates for action plans). Also, learners could benefit from a workbook to practice these skills.

### Targeting and selection

Enrolment on the programme should prioritise the most educationally marginalised community members, specially, those with no English or literacy skills. Therefore, the REFLECT circles and Speak Up classes should start with a LAMP or similar assessments to identify the level of learners. This measure was implemented successfully for the second cohort and it should be replicated in future iterations. The learners who are more advanced could be referred to other services or facilities in the area or provided with support to transition to further education. However, this might not be possible in all cases. As an alternative, facilitators could encourage peer teaching and support the higher-level learners teach the beginners. This will reduce the pressure on the facilitators to reach a diverse group of learners and will maximise the effectiveness and impact of the courses.
Contextualise support to each location

As mentioned elsewhere in this report, the three states have different cultures and economies. To ensure that all target locations have the same opportunity to succeed, support should be adapted to each location to level out as much as possible facilitator capacity and resources. For instance, while in Juba facilities for the courses are more accessible (generally schools), in other locations, the courses were held under trees and lessons were sometimes cancelled during the rainy season. Moreover, even if facilitators mentioned their desire to utilise local resources, the lack of stationery and teaching materials (such as boards) in some of the centres made teaching literacy and numeracy challenging.

Long term strategy for impact

The programme design would benefit from a more targeted impact strategy that supports learners maximise the skills and knowledge they gain from the course. As Speak Up targets two different age groups (youth and adults), AET could consider supporting two trajectories for those who complete the course: (i) further education or (ii) TVET/employment.

Learners who wish to pursue employment or advance to more lucrative jobs, could be referred to other actors in the field, such as UNESCO or FAO, for vocational training or apprenticeships. Vocational training could focus on tailoring, mechanics, animal rearing, agriculture, etc. depending on location. This recommendation was endorsed by some of the AET Staff interviewed for this evaluation, and there was clear interest from beneficiaries to learn how to run their own business or farming.

Stronger collaborations and coordination with other actors

Education issues are complex and sometimes interact with myriad other factors and needs. Adult and youth could require not only literacy support, but also protection, medical treatment or vocational training. While it would be challenging for AET to respond directly to all of the vital needs of populations in the targeted areas, future programming could focus more on strengthening collaborations with other actors and integrating services in currently available networks. Relatedly, having a strengthened referral system would also be beneficial in this context, particularly for people with disabilities.

Lastly, after having reviewed the achievements the project has brought about, the following approaches have been singled out as particularly successful:

- **Peer-to-peer review sessions** – especially for centres which were close, these created a collaborative and supportive environment.

- **Workshops with ROLE and AET staff to revise and streamline MEL systems** – these increased the efficiency of the data management and analysis.
Mentoring and facilitator support – these increased the capacity of facilitators to develop learning units and use participatory methods efficiently; there is, none the less, still room for improvement in this area.

Cross-cutting and locally-relevant content – particularly for REFLECT, beneficiaries could relate to the material taught, which increased lesson participation and most likely attainment.

Radio broadcasts in addition to the radio course – while stronger monitoring is required to track the success of the radio lessons, it appears that these helped community members improve their language skills or revise knowledge they had forgotten.