



# Evaluation Summaries

## Promoting the employability and employment of people with disabilities through effective legislation (PEPDEL) & Promoting decent work for people with disabilities through a disability inclusion support service (INCLUDE)

### Quick Facts

**Countries:** - PEPDEL: China, Ethiopia, UR Tanzania, Uganda, Viet Nam, Thailand and Zambia

- INCLUDE: Ethiopia, UR Tanzania, Viet Nam and Zambia with outreach to other countries (including Cambodia, Lao PDR, Kenya and Uganda)

**Final Evaluation:** July 2011

**Mode of Evaluation:** Independent

**Technical Area:** Skills development

**Evaluation Management:** Girma Agune

**Evaluation Team:** Dr. Emily S. Andrews

**Project End:** July 2011

**Project Code:** INT/08/69/IRL & INT/098/70/IRL

**Donor:** Ireland

**Keywords:** Skills development, disabled worker, equal opportunity; non-discrimination; rights of persons with disabilities; employment creation; entrepreneurship; poverty reduction

### Background & Context

This report provides an independent evaluation of disability programs funded through Phase III of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme. Phase III activities represent a continuation and expansion of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership's focus on disability. Two

disability programs were funded: the INCLUDE program (Promoting Decent Work for People with Disabilities through a Disability Inclusion Support Service) and the PEPDEL program (Promoting the Employability and Employment of People with Disabilities through Effective Legislation).

The objective of the INCLUDE program is to promote greater inclusion of women and men with disabilities in mainstream small enterprise development, micro-finance, vocational training, employment promotion, poverty reduction and rural development programs. The objectives of PEPDEL are threefold: (i) enhanced government capacity to collaborate with social partners in planning the implementation of legislation, policies and programs addressing employability and employment of persons with disabilities (with particular attention to women and persons living with HIV/AIDs, (ii) strengthened implementation and enforcement of employment-related laws and policies, and (iii) attention to disability perspective in laws and policies through greater involvement of universities in sensitizing existing and future generations of lawyers.

The programs were implemented in each of five countries in two geographic regions. INCLUDE was active in four countries with

outreach to a further four (in Asia, Viet Nam with outreach to Laos and Cambodia; and in Africa, Ethiopia, Tanzania and Zambia, with outreach to Kenya and Uganda). PEPDEL was active in three countries in Asia (China, Thailand and Viet Nam) and four countries in Africa (Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanzania and Zambia).

The evaluation is intended to provide a qualitative assessment of program performance based on well-recognized elements for evaluating project design and implementation. These include:

- **Relevance:** The extent to which the program is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor;
- **Efficiency:** The extent to which the program uses the least costly resources to achieve its results;
- **Design Validity:** The extent to which the intervention logic is coherent and realistic;
- **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the program attains its outcomes;
- **Impact:** The extent to which the activity objectives and development indicators are met;
- **Sustainability:** The extent to which the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.

It is based on a desk review of documents, with the exception of a field trip to Vietnam where a series of interviews was conducted with key participants in the program. The backbone of the evaluation uses responses to a set of questionnaires sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators, which are:

- a. Survey instruments sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators requesting information on output and objective indicators from the Logframe analysis in the Project Documents;
- b. Survey instruments sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators on

key questions related to the five project effectiveness areas discussed above;

- c. A Survey instrument sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators on the degree to which risks indicated in the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Agreement obtained, and if so, what mitigation measures were taken.

## Main Findings & Conclusions

### Findings

The evaluation findings related to the five recognized elements of a qualitative evaluation: relevance, efficiency, design validity, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Relevance and efficiency rate highly. In terms of effectiveness, the projects effected outputs in most countries as anticipated, although the logical framework could have been improved. Because of the difficult nature of changing the disability paradigm, in many countries greater efforts are needed to fully achieve anticipated impacts and ensure sustainability.

#### 1. Relevance

INCLUDE and PEPDEL's focus is highly relevant with regard to Irish Aid funding, as the funding addresses key issues related to persons with disability, who experience greater poverty, exclusion, and fewer economic opportunities. Both INCLUDE and PEPDEL support and promote the guiding principles of the UN Convention, as clearly indicated in the Program Objectives. Further, the activities are clearly relevant to ILO Convention 159. ILO's objectives implemented through Decent Work Country Programs have four strategic objectives: creating jobs, guaranteeing rights at work, extending social protection and promoting social dialogue that are all related to an inclusive disability strategy. INCLUDE and PEPDEL were designed to be attuned to the ILOs Program and Budget Strategic Framework Objectives for 2008-2009.

## **2. Efficiency**

The ILO is attempting to do a great deal with very limited resources. Funds were spent expeditiously with little apparent shortfall for the third year. Nonetheless, many countries indicated that they could not achieve their objectives due to lack of funding. Consequently, it would appear that a more generous budget would be more efficient in meeting program objectives.

## **3. Design Validity**

Individual indicators generally are, in and of themselves important to the development of an inclusive nation-wide disability policy, although the logical framework itself could be improved. Further, there are issues of attribution. It would be useful to have some interim outcome indicators in-between the outputs and the objectives. The Logframe Matrices for INCLUDE and PEPDEL were well documented by the ILO in progress reports to Irish Aid and Geneva.

## **4. Effectiveness**

The ILO-Irish Aid Program document spelled out four country risks that could reduce the effectiveness of the project. Except for political risk, many countries indicated that one or more risks occurred. These were generally lack of effectiveness of constituent participation and often related to lack of resources, be it in the form of a Country Disability Coordinator or financial means.

In general, all of *the INCLUDE output* indicators were met. The ILO provided the training, support, materials and guidance as intended. The Disability Equality Training approach developed in the project was refined and DET facilitations were trained in participating countries. Disability inclusion support agencies were established and operational, with the exception of Tanzania, which fell seriously behind with the death of a director. In terms of INCLUDE Knowledge Development, all countries indicated that the

program assisted greatly in the spread of information, although only some countries provided examples improved understanding or advances in rights. INCLUDE Capacity Building was reported to be strong but the reporting of specific accomplishments stemming from capacity building was more limited.

*PEPDEL output indicators* were more complicated to assess. Implementation and action plans were developed generally, with the exceptions of Tanzania and Uganda. PEPDEL provided support to university legal faculties, developing disability curricula and sponsored the establishment of the Centre for Disability Law and Policy at the University of the Western Cape, South Africa. Progress with regard to other indicators was varied. Ethiopia demonstrated strong achievements in vocational education, while Tanzania and Uganda had none. Some, but by no means all, employer and workers organizations have undertaken new initiatives. Most PEPDEL developed disability courses in university settings, particularly through law faculties. Constituents in all countries received some training on the drafting and implementation of legislation, but whether this has been or will be used to influence the legislative process still appears to be an open question.

In terms of PEPDEL Knowledge Development, all countries indicated that the program assisted greatly in the spread of information, although only some countries provided examples improved understanding or advances in rights. In terms of Capacity Building, a number of countries, including China, Zambia and Uganda, indicate that PEPDEL has led to positive actions to influence legislation and policy.

## **5. Impact:**

Many INCLUDE countries reported progress with regard to the objectives in the ILO Logframe analysis, but the progress is not uniform. Further attribution is difficult as there are many other influences on these

achievements, e.g. from donors, government, social partners and/or civil society. The strengthening of disability inclusion agencies was clearly a result of ILO activities (but likely should have been listed as an output or outcome). Some INCLUDE countries indicated that there were existing government inclusion policies within the country, but none on policy implementation.

In general, PEPDEL has been extremely active in all countries on disability policy and legislation, with a more inclusive focus than only that of young women and men with disabilities, including support to review existing laws, draft new laws, and hold consultative meetings with social partners and civil society. In addition, support was provided to civil society for advocacy in favor of ratification of the UN CRPD. The problem is that it is very difficult to move from training constituents, to encouraging them to take specific actions, to actually changing the environment in which persons with disabilities live. Some countries have placed a strong emphasis on modifying national training policies. For example, Zambia has made progress in promoting inclusive vocational education and training. In other countries, however, discussions have been held on the issue of training policies, but no changes have been implemented. While a variety of training and media initiatives have been undertaken with regard to HIV/AIDS programs, these are not specifically for an HIV/AIDS education. Inclusion in public and private employment services is another area where more work is needed. The improvement of statistical data on persons with disabilities should also be a priority.

## Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Overall, the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme has been extremely satisfactory in its steps to develop and encourage inclusion in the mainstream of society for persons with disabilities. The program has done a great deal with scarce resources in an area where negative attitudes towards an inclusive society

are prevalent around the world. Nonetheless, the following are some suggestions in terms of general program design and specific activities that I believe would strengthen a continuation of INCLUDE and PEPDEL to strengthen impact and ensure sustainability.

### General Program Design:

**1. Choice of Countries** The selection of countries is extremely important as some countries have made greater progress than others. There needs to be an assessment of which countries should be funded in any future phase of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme related to disability. This assessment would require discussions on-the-ground and cannot be made with only a document audit.

**2. Funding** Another area for additional assessment is the amount of funding provided per country. The one factor consistently raised in the Risk Analysis was that risks related to constituent participation and action could be mitigated by additional resources. Additional funding might be best used for Country Disability Coordinators, in the first instance, and for a more realistic assessment of the costs of international experts.

**3. Project Management** The use of Implementation Plans detailing program activities and submission of progress reports are extremely important tools used by the ILO program management to conduct a continuing evaluation of whether and how countries are meeting output indicators and objectives. A simple utilization of MS Project might be one way to go to better appreciate whether or not activities were meeting their targets on time.

**4. Monitoring and Evaluation** The basic monitoring and evaluation framework for the ILO-Irish Aid Programme is excellent in so far as it uses a Logframe analysis that takes each program from activities to outputs to objective indicators to objectives. However, the outputs and objective indicators for both INCLUDE and PEPDEL need to be revisited. In particular, all output indicators ought to be ones that are directly attributable to the program and not any that need to have a next step taken by program participants that is out of control of the project.

**5. Program Expansion** Many INCLUDE and PEPDEL activities have been focused at the national level with less regional or local participation, despite wishes for expansion. A potential Phase IV program might provide greater regional focus for program expansion, particularly to countries that have already had positive results in terms of objective indicators.

**6. Specific Program Activity Focus - Media Campaigns** - The most obvious route to awakening civil society is through the media. In general, while media training has been provided, actual media campaigns resulting from training and the provision of good media tools have been limited. I would suggest using some funding to arrange for technical assistance for a media campaign engaging country media specialists, and perhaps partnering with a specific organization or organizations, as has been done in China, focusing on the most effective media -- be they print, radio, television or other means, to reach civil society.

**7. Specific Program Activity Focus - Regulation and Implementation** - PEPDEL has improved the ability of ILO constituents to develop and implement effective legislation and policies, including concepts of disability rights, non-discrimination and inclusion. But the legislative process is only the first step in changing behavior. It may be the right time to add training and capacity building for the next step in the process – regulation and implementation of disability laws, labor codes, and other legislation related to accessibility and accommodation.

**8. Specific Program Activity Focus - Disability Statistics** - Very little has been done in the area of disability statistics at the national level with statistical agencies. Further, different measures and concepts of disability are actually appropriate for specific policies and programs. Another benefit of including disability questions in labor force surveys would be to measure the labor force participation of persons with disabilities and compare that figure to the population overall – a way to measure the ultimate objective of improved disability policies.

**9. Specific Program Activity Focus - Additional Guidance and Guidelines** - There is virtually nothing but praise for the guides and tools that the ILO has prepared and used in training and for capacity building within country. But there may be some areas where additional guidance and tools may be appropriate. Aside from guidance on measurement issues (see above), another potential area would be to document guidance on accommodation for specific conditions.