



# **COMPETENCIES OF ECCD FACILITATORS FOR HOLISTIC DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN:**

A Study of Surkhet and Parsa Districts





# **COMPETENCIES OF ECCD FACILITATORS FOR HOLISTIC DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN:**

A Study of Surkhet and Parsa Districts



**National Campaign for Education-Nepal**

## **THE RESEARCH TEAM**

**Team Leader** : Prof. Basu Dev Kafle, PhD

**Research Coordinator:** Mr. Indra Mani Rai (Yamphu)

**Team Member** : Mr. Basu Prasad Subedi  
Ms. Meenakshi Dahal

**Field Assistant** : Mr. Upendra Kumar Rai  
Mr. Raj Kumar Baral

**Edited By** : Dr Narayan Kafle  
Mr. Dilliram Subedi  
Mr. Kumar Bhattarai  
Mr. Rajendra Pahadi  
Mr. Ram Gaire

**First Edition** : August 2015 (...Copies)

**Lay out** : Dream Graphic Press, Thapathali, Ph.: 977 1 4102087/88

**Published by** : National Campaign for Education Nepal (NCE-Nepal)

**Supported by** : Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO)  
**Coordinated by** : Ms. Mahima Pradhan

**Printed at** : Variety Printers, Kuleshwor

© 2015, National Campaign for Education Nepal

# FOREWORD

National Campaign for Education Nepal (NCE Nepal) is a civil society movement in Nepal with mandates to lobby and advocacy for ensuring Right to Education for all. It has been coordinating roles among civil society, media, public sectors, academia and grassroots level people and institutions within the education system in Nepal. It critically engages with Government for ensuring equitable inclusive quality education and lifelong learning and monitors the status of implementation of Government's commitments to education. As a signatory of Incheon Declaration, Nepal has committed to provide equitable inclusive quality and lifelong learning opportunities for all by 2030. Out of the goals and targets of Incheon declaration, one of the goal concentrates on expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children.

Even within Education for All timeline, the government has made various efforts to achieve the indicators set by EFA and MDGs through National Plan of Action (2001 – 2015) and SSRP (2009 – 2016). As a result, Nepal has made remarkable achievement on participation of children in Early Childhood Development (ECD) program expanding the ECD centers in more accessible areas for the marginalized and deprived communities. However, the qualities of services of the ECD facilitators for meaningful learning of the children are often questioned. Basically the capacity and motivation of ECCD facilitators have been debated. In this context, NCE Nepal conducted a research which has made an effort to explore the competencies of ECD facilitators in the given environment along with their expectations in Parsa and Surkhet districts of Nepal.

The research has came up with findings that the capacity of ECD facilitators need to be enhanced so as to motivate them towards their role and responsibilities and to bring improvement in the quality of ECD centers. In accomplishment of this study, the contribution from everyone involved directly or indirectly in the study is adorable and need to be acknowledged. First of all, I would like to express my gratitude towards all the ECD facilitators, Head Teachers, parents, Resource Persons and I/NGO representatives for providing their views and opinions to build on the study. My sincere thank goes to Professor Basu Dev Kafle who successfully led the competitive team towards accomplishment of the given task. Similarly, Mr Indra Mani Rai (Yamphu) is another key person to be thanked for his efforts in coordinating the overall research process effectively. I would like to take this opportunity to appreciate the contribution of Mr Basu Prasad Subedi and Ms Meenakshi Dahal in this study as team members.

Besides, I am grateful towards the Research team of NCE Nepal for their remarkable support for editing this report and bringing it in this form. I would also like to express my thanks to Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO) for its technical and financial support to conduct this study. NCE Nepal's Board members and coalition members also deserve to be praised for their contribution to publish this report. Last but not the least; I would like to appreciate NCE Nepal's secretariat staffs for their tireless effort.

Thank You

Raj Kumar Gandharba  
President  
National Campaign for Education Nepal (NCE Nepal)



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to National Campaign for Education, Nepal (NCE-Nepal) for entrusting us to conduct this research study. We are equally grateful to the Program Manager, Mr. Ram Gaire and other staff of NCE-Nepal who frequently provided the feedback on overall research process and logistic support to the research team. The reviewers of the research report provided us with their perspectives for which we acknowledge their contribution to reshape this study.

Special thanks are due to those participants of this research with whom we discussed, interacted, interviewed in matters and issues of this report. The information provided to us with their ideas and perceptions were quite important for us to build up the report in the present form. We specifically express our gratitude to the ECCD facilitators of Surkhet and Parsa who were engaged with us in generating both quantitative and qualitative data. Our arguments, analysis and interpretations are based upon their interaction with the study team.

Mr. Tika Ram Acharya, Executive Director, and Mr. Tej Sonam, Program Officer of Social Awareness Center (SAC) Nepal, and Mr. Lanka Yogi, Vice Chairperson, ECCD facilitator Network, Surkhet helped us in running interactions with research participants. Likewise, Mr. Ram Naresh Shah, General Secretary of NGOCC, Mr. Brij Kishor Patel, Member of NGOCC, and Mr. Jaya Kant Upadhyay of Parsa facilitated our work in the field. We would therefore like to acknowledge them for their contribution.

Mr. Raj Kumar Baral and Mr. Upendra Kumar Rai, helped us in the capacity of field researchers and Mr Binish Subedi and Mr. Upendra Kumar Rai supported us in data entry. Their contribution to the study is therefore sincerely documented. Further, we thank all the enumerators for their sincere work in collecting the quantitative data from the field.



## ABSTRACT

Nepal has made remarkable achievement on participation of children in Early Childhood Development (ECCD) program expanding the ECCD centers in more accessible areas for the marginalized and deprived communities. However, the qualities of services of the ECCD facilitators for meaningful learning of the children are often questioned. In this context, this research has made an effort to explore the competencies of ECCD facilitators in the given environment along with their expectations in Parsa and Surkhet districts.

The research used mixed method approach. Both numeric and text data were analyzed and interpreted to generate specific findings. The numeric data were collected through the structured questionnaires and observation checklists administered by the trained field team and text data were generated through multiple sources such as interviews, focus group discussions, and ECCD center observations. The numeric data were analyzed through SPSS package and text data were analyzed manually by coding, categorizing and generating the themes as per the nature of the data matching the objectives of the study.

The research has noticed that the government is in the process of merging community based ECCD centers in schools because of managerial difficulties.

The facilitators were found to be aware on child growth and development. Their efforts in the use of play way methods by engaging the children meaningfully in and outdoor games and sports were visible. However, the facilitators could demonstrate little their knowledge and skills practically because of a number of adversities faced by them at the ECCD centers. Inadequate learning materials and infrastructures, less motivation because of low payment, indignity and less respect combined with undefined roles and responsibilities were the key causative factors associated with poor demonstration of their knowledge and skills at the ECCD centers. The children, however, demonstrated some positive changes in their behaviors despite these adverse conditions.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Background</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Purpose</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Research Questions</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Significance of the Study</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Analytical Framework</b>	<b>2</b>
Competencies of ECCD Facilitators	2
International Legal Provisions	2
National Legal Provisions	2
<b>Methodology</b>	<b>3</b>
Study Area, Population and Sampling Procedures	3
Access to Respondents and Research Participants	4
Tools and Pilot Testing	4
Data Collection/Generation Procedure	5
Approaches of Data Analysis and Interpretation	5
Transformative Approach to Generating Action Agenda	5
<b>ECCD Facilitators: Demography</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Government and Non-Government Interventions to Improving Access to and Quality of ECCD Services</b>	<b>6</b>
Training and Qualification	7
<b>Competencies of ECCD Facilitators</b>	<b>8</b>
Engaging Children in Learning	8
Knowledge about Characteristics of Child Development	9
Observation and Assessment of Child Development	10
Condition of Using Curriculum and Maintaining Learning Environment	10
Promoting Social and Emotional Development	11
Nutritional Promotion of the Children	11
Interactions with Individual Children	11
Condition of Learning Environment in the Center	12
<b>Problems/Challenges of ECCD Facilitators</b>	<b>12</b>
Remuneration and Duration of Engagement	12
Dilemma, Uncertain Future and Less Motivation	13
Undefined Duties and Responsibilities	14
Lack of Monitoring and Professional Support	14
Poor Infrastructure	15
Lack of Instructional/Playing Materials	16
<b>Child Development</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Stakeholders' Expectations</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>18</b>
ECCD Facilitators' Demography	18
Interventions Made through Government and I/NGOs	18
Problems/Challenges of Facilitators	19
<b>Child Development</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>20</b>

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>20</b>
Recommendations to the Government	20
Recommendations to the Civil Society Organizations	20
<b>References</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Annexes</b>	<b>22</b>

## ACRONYMS

CRC	Convention on the Rights of Child
CFLG	Child Friendly Local Governance
ECCD	Early Childhood Development
EFA	Education for All
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
ILO	International Labor Organization
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organization
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PPCs	Pre Primary Classes
RC	Resource Center
SLC	School Leaving Certificate
SMC	School Management Committee
SSRP	School Sector Reform Plan



## BACKGROUND

Nepal has made international commitment to achieve the goals of Education for All (EFA) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015. Efforts have been made through the EFA National Plan of Action 2001-2015 and School Sector Reform Program (SSRP 2009-15/16) to achieve the EFA goals and the MDGs. Nepal has demonstrated remarkable progress in some of the indicators related to children's participation in Early Childhood Development (ECCD) centers and Pre-Primary Classes (PPCs) of schools over the last few years. One of the goals of EFA concentrates on expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education (ECCD), especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children (National Plan of Action, 2002). The government of Nepal has been establishing ECCD centers in collaboration with international or national non-governmental organizations with a view to provide early learning opportunities for 3-5 years age group children to develop their physical, cognitive, emotional, and language skills. The ECCD program focuses on health, nutrition, care, early stimulation and education of children.

Flash I Report (2014) of Department of Education shows that there are 30,034 (85.5%) ECCD centers which are running as community-based ECCD centers and community schools based ECCD/PPCs. The rest 5,087 (14.5%) of the ECCD/PPCs are operating under institutional schools. Of these, 647 ECCD centers were established within fiscal year 2013/14 only. The trend shows that there has been continuous increase in the ECCD/PPCs facilities with a corresponding increase in the enrollment of children.

As the focus is there on the participation of children in ECCD centers from marginalized and vulnerable communities like Dalits and Janajatis, 18.0% Dalit and 38.6% Janajati children (out of total enrolment of 1,014,339 children) were found to have been enrolled in 2014-015 in ECCDs/PPCs (Department of Education [DoE], 2014). Among the Dalit children enrolled, 18.8% are girls and 17.4% boys; in Janajati children, 38.8% are girls and 38.5% boys in the same year (DoE, 2014). The Gender Parity Index (GPI) for ECCD/PPC in total shows the Dalit and Janajati enrolment being 0.93, 1.0 and 0.94 indicating a higher level of participation of Dalit girls in comparison to the total and Janajati girls (DoE, 2014). This suggests that gender situation is approaching to parity among the Dalit children but enrolment gap among the Janajati children continues to be there.

The quantitative achievement in the expansion of ECCD centers and enrollment of children has, however, little been matched with the quality of services to the children from ECCD facilitators. The progress of children in terms of their physical, social, emotional and cognitive development is hardly found to take place

in a desired way in both the community and school based ECCD centers (<http://www.nationalsetogurans.org.np/>). Aptitude and motivation to work with young children, academic background and knowledge about ECCD and child development are crucial factors for the delivery of quality services (Shrestha, 2002).

The ECCD facilitators alone are not the deciding factors to maintaining quality in ECCD centers, there are other factors such as curriculum, physical facility, instructional materials, health and nutrition that contribute to quality improvement of these centers. However, the role of ECCD facilitator among these factors is the most striking one to bring change inside ECCD centers by improving the classroom situation for all-round development of children. The ECCD facilitators have dynamic roles to manage the other components of the ECCD program so as to ensure the quality of early childhood development program.

## PURPOSE

In this context, this research aims to explore the competencies of ECCD facilitators for the desired holistic development of children. Further, this research makes an attempt to visualize the adversities that the ECCD facilitators are facing as the hindering factors to promote the quality of services meant for the children. The study makes some key recommendations based on the views of the stakeholders and findings derived from the research.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What efforts have been made to improve the roles of ECCD facilitators?
2. What competencies (knowledge and skills) do ECCD facilitators possess for the holistic development of the children? How do they demonstrate their competencies?
3. To what extent these competencies of the facilitators are contributory to holistic development of children?
4. What problems/challenges have they been facing in their professional milieu?
5. What recommendations can be made to improve the role of facilitators to ensure holistic development of the children?

## SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This research is an attempt to juxtapose and highlight the existing adversities, competencies of ECCD facilitators, and holistic development of children of

Surkhet and Parsa districts. The issues it has brought to the fore are expected to contribute to Ministry of Education (MoE) for developing or revisiting educational policies, programs and strategies. In addition, the specific findings of this research help to review the existing school sector reform plan and programs. This study bears significance to the civil society organizations to formulate better advocacy plans and programs in favour of ECCD facilitators.

## ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

### Competencies of ECCD Facilitators

Department of Education (DoE) has formulated National Minimum Standard for ECCD Centers-2010 defining minimum competencies of the ECCD facilitators (qualification, quality, behavior, and skills). The minimum standard has stipulated that the facilitators should have minimum qualification of grade-10 with 90 hours of basic training. It envisages the need of having 1 facilitator in an ECCD center. The facilitators need to love and behave equally to the children and be ready to support them according to their needs. Further, the facilitators have to make the students feel safe and demonstrate lovely behavior and interaction. They should take care of deprived and physically disabled children according to their need, interest and capacity. According to this DoE (2010) defined standard, the facilitators are required to check the neatness and cleanliness of children and engage them actively in activities. They need to prepare for the class, adopt the activities and create the environment in tune to the purpose of the curriculum.

DoE (2010) has made it clear that the facilitators need to have ability of using materials of the center appropriately by storing, replacing and preserving the materials in an appropriate way. According to the standard, the facilitators have to interact with the children attractively so that they could face them easily. They need to have competencies of keeping records of the children through observation of each of their activities. They have to make the children familiar with local stories, songs, and other resources.

Moreover, the DoE (2010) standard has mentioned specifically the works of ECCD facilitators as to bring coordination with the parents, making provision of necessary books and toys to the children, and ensuring cooperation to the children for their physical, emotional development through the use of locally available materials.

### International Legal Provisions

Nepal has ratified about two dozens of international human rights instruments. The Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations 1990) emphasizes the availability and accessibility of free education for every child. It calls for measures to encourage regular school attendance and to reduce dropout rates, and stipulates the right of all children to receive education without discrimination on any grounds. It further states that children have the right to be cared by their parents (Article 7) and to maintain family relations (Article 8). It addresses parents' responsibility for the upbringing and development of the child (Article 18). Other relevant Articles include: (i) the right to enjoy the highest attainable standard of health facilities for the treatment of illness and the provision of adequate nutritious foods (Article, 24) and (ii) the right to a standard of living adequate for their physical, mental, spiritual, moral and social development (Article, 27.1).

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966 has clearly envisaged the just and favorable conditions of work. It has ensured the fair wages and equal remuneration for work of equal value and equal pay for equal work. Further, the Convention has ensured decent living, safe and healthy working conditions. It has equally focused on rest, leisure and reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay, as well as remuneration for public holidays.

### National Legal Provisions

The Interim Constitution 2007 has ensured children's right to development such as nurturing, achieving basic health, and social security (Article, 22.2). Education Act, 1971 has identified ECCD with the term "Pre-Primary School" defining it as the schools that provide one year's pre-primary education to the children completing four years of their age. Education Rules, 2002 has clearly stipulated to have wide, open, peaceful and safe building and at least 254 square meter<sup>1</sup> of land except the building. Further, it has envisaged a children park and clean and healthy drinking water and toilet. The rule has focused on having at least two caretakers and the use of curriculum approved by Curriculum Development Center (CDC). According to the rules, the government has to provide grant aid to a Child Development Center. Though the Education Regulations 2002 requires "at least two helpers" as a prerequisite for the establishment of an ECCD centre, most of the government supported ECCD centers, in practice, are run by one facilitator (Pande, 2009). This is because National Minimum Standard of ECCD Centers-2010 has envisaged the management of 20-25 children in a class of school based ECCD center by a single trained facilitator.

<sup>1</sup> Half Ropani in Nepali customary measurement units

School Sector Reform Plan (SSRP 2009-2015) has stated that the government will fund one year ECCD program for children of four years of age and the communities may offer ECCD services for children below the specified age, mobilizing their own resources. It has focused on qualitative improvement and maintaining an equitable balance between the needs and demands. This has ensured the access of ECCD program to marginalized and disadvantaged children by expanding the centers in their pocket areas. According to the SSRP, the state supports through local government(s) for the establishment, operation and sustenance of ECCD centers so as to provide fully equipped and conducive environment for learning and development of children fulfilling the minimum standards. The main responsibility for creating demand, identifying needs, planning, implementing and ensuring quality standards of the ECCD program will lie with the local government. Thus the SSRP has expected to meet the minimum standards by all ECCD centers.

There are two forms of ECCD centers such as school and community based both aiming at holistic development of children. Local bodies are responsible for managing and operating ECCD centers in collaboration with I/NGOs. Preference to local females with special focus on disadvantaged groups, wherever possible, is given to work as the facilitators for the ECCD program. Education for All National Plan of Action (EFA/NPA-2001-2015) has stipulated that all pre-primary children are provided at least one year of special care service that addresses both pre-school preparation needs as well as overall needs of children. In so doing, the government provides support for the establishment and development of ECCD program. It adopts demand driven approach with partial government support for urban and accessible areas and full government support and facilitation for the establishment and operation of ECCD centers in the deprived and disadvantaged areas of the communities. Local Self-Governance Act (LSGA, 1999) stipulates that the local bodies can establish pre-primary schools/centers with their own resources and grant permission to establish, implement and organize such schools/centers.

The Interim Constitution, 2007 has ensured every individual the right to live with dignity (Article, 13.1), right to employment (Article, 18.1), and the right against physical, mental or any other form of exploitation (Article, 22.3). The constitution has ensured the right against any forms of exploitation (Article, 28.1) with also the right to appropriate labor exercise (Article, 30.1). In line with the Interim Constitution, Labor Act, 1992 has guaranteed the working hours for workers normally from six in the morning till six in the evening (Clause 5.2) not exceeding 8 hours a day with one day weekly holiday

(Clause 16). Further, it has stated clearly that no worker shall be deployed in work for more than five hours continuously without providing an interval of half an hour for tiffin (Clause 18). It has also managed the overtime wages to those who work more than eight hours a day (Clause 19.1). As per this act, the workers get annual increment of half day's remuneration (Clause 21) with provident fund and facilities related to medical expenses (Clause 39). Similarly, Clause 40 of this act has ensured public holidays, sick leave, annual leave, maternity leave; obsequies leave, special leave, and leave with or without remuneration to be enjoyed by the workers.

## METHODOLOGY

In this research, we adopted mixed method design. We used both quantitative and qualitative approaches of research to capture the existing situation. In so doing, we collected both numeric data and textual data through the views or perspectives of the stakeholders to validate the findings. We adopted survey design and general qualitative inquiry to collect both qualitative and quantitative data at the same time and equal priority was given to these approaches. The information (quantitative and qualitative) were analyzed either separately or integrated to the extent possible. Moreover, we adopted a strategy of transformative research approach in that we went back to the stakeholders to inform (Mertens, 2010) and validate the findings (Terrell, 2012).

### Study Area, Population and Sampling Procedures

Parsa-a Terai district and Surkhet-a Hill district were two distinct research areas. We selected these areas to compare the situations based on the geographical features. The ECCD facilitators and children of those ECCD centers were our population. In other words, the total number of ECCD centers (including both school and community based), that is 425 in Parsa and 464 in Surkhet, would be the population of this study. We also brought the voices or perspectives of parents, head teachers, ECCD management committee members, representatives of I/NGOs, and policy makers/implementers to the theme of this study through the tools developed for them.

From the population, we calculated statistically representative sample using formula  $n = \frac{NZ^2p(1-p)}{d^2 + Z^2p(1-p)}$ , Where, n- required sample, N - Total population, p- Probability = 0.5, d- Allowable error = 0.1, Z- Z score = 1.96. In so doing, we got a sample size of 79 (N = 425; P = 0.5; 1-p = 0.5; Z = 1.96; d = 0.1; n = 78.77 = 79) ECCD centers in Parsa and 80 (N = 464; P = 0.5; 1-p = 0.5; Z = 1.96; d = 0.1; n = 79.57 = 80) in

Surkhet. We believed that large sample "is generally considered a positive aspect of surveys, because inferences based on large and representative samples are known to be more reliable than inferences based on small or non-representative samples" (Kish, 1965, as cited in Axinn, & Pearce, 2006, p. 25).

We assumed the Resource Center (RC) areas as the strata in both the districts. We randomly selected six strata (Resource Centers) from each district. As mentioned earlier, statistically, the sample size reached to be 79 in Parsa and 80 in Surkhet. However, we selected 84 ECCD centers (14 from each randomly selected Resource Center strata) from Parsa and 94 ECCD centers (16 from each randomly selected 4 Resource Center strata and 15 from 2 Resource Center strata) from Surkhet. Further, we selected the samples from urban and rural locations and according to the types of ECCD centers as depicted in the table below.

**Table I: Distribution of Sample ECCD Centers**

Name of District		Types of ECCD Centers		Total
		Community Based	School Based	
Parsa	Urban	27 (15.5)	4(10.0)	84(47)
	Rural	57(32.0)	46(33.0)	
Surkhet	Urban	37(20.5)	12(30.5)	94(53)
	Rural	57(32.0)	45(32.5)	
Total		178 (100)	139(100)	178(100)

Field Survey, 2015

As depicted in the table, we selected 27 ECCD centers (4 community based and 23 school based) in urban areas and 57 ECCD centers (11 community based and 46 school based) in rural areas of Parsa district. Likewise, we selected 37 ECCD centers (12 community based and 25 school based) in urban areas and 57 ECCD centers (12 community based and 45 school based) in rural areas of Surkhet district. The selection of the ECCD centers- community and school based- from urban and rural locations was to make comparative analysis of the competencies of the ECCD facilitators for the holistic development of children by locations and ECCD types.

**Table II: Distribution of Sample Children from the Districts**

Districts	Gender		Total	Social Status	
	Boys	Girls		Upper caste including Janjati	Lower Caste
Parsa	1203 (48.6)	1273 (51.4)	2476 (100.0)	1587 (64.1)	889 (35.9)
Surkhet	996 (46.6)	1143 (53.4)	2139 (100.0)	1426 (66.6)	713 (33.3)
Total	2199 (47.7)	2416 (52.3)	4615 (100.0)	3013 (65.3)	1602 (34.7)

Field Survey, 2015

The table shows that we selected 2476 (1203 boys and 1273 girls) in Parsa and 1426 (996 boys and 1143 girls) in Surkhet. In Parsa, there were 1587 upper caste and janajati children and 889 low caste children. Similarly, there were 1426 upper caste and janajati children and 713 low caste children in Surkhet.

Moreover, for qualitative data, we selected purposefully (Sullivan, 2001) the interviewees and Focus Group Discussion (FGDs) participants. We interviewed 3 head teachers, 10 parents, 10 ECCD facilitators, 2 I/ NGO representatives, 1 resource person, and 1 District Education Officer of each district. We conducted two Focus Group Discussions FGDs (each one in urban and rural locations) in each district. We included 2 ECCD facilitators, 2 parents, 1 I/NGO representative, and 1 resource person in each FGD. In addition, we observed 4 community based ECCD centers in the rural areas and 2 community based ECCD centers in urban areas of Parsa district during the field visit. Likewise, we observed 6 community based ECCD centers in rural areas and 3 community based ECCD centers in urban areas of Surkhet district.

## Access to Respondents and Research Participants

We used community mapping technique with a view to identify the research sites, ECCD centers in rural and urban areas, and ECCD centers in marginalized and deprived communities discussing with the stakeholders and representatives of member organizations of NCE-Nepal. Further, the representatives of partner NGOs of NCE-Nepal played the role of the gatekeepers to access the information rich participants for interviews and FGDs for qualitative data. Thus member organizations of NCE-Nepal facilitated the field investigation work in the field.

## Tools and Pilot Testing

A survey questionnaire and an observation checklist were developed to capture the competencies of ECCD facilitators. Likewise, an observation check list was developed to capture different areas of holistic development of children. The contents of the check list for children were based on learning behaviors and abilities indicators developed by the government of Nepal. The tools were appropriate to get information within a limited period of observation by the enumerators. The first two different types of tools were developed with a view to triangulate the information reported by the facilitators and competencies demonstrated by them. We developed the third observation checklist with a view to correlate the development of children with the competencies of ECCD facilitators.

Before commencing the full survey, a small pilot survey was undertaken for the purpose of pre-testing

the questionnaire in particular rural (in three ECCD centers of Siddhipur Village Development Committee) and urban areas (in three ECCD centers of Lalitpur Sub-Metropolitan city) of Lalitpur district. After evaluating the appropriateness and effectiveness of the questionnaire, necessary corrections were made by the research team in a collaborative way. Particularly, we revisited the ambiguous language structures and difficult questions.

Moreover, for generating qualitative data, we developed guidelines of in-depth interviews and Focused Group Discussions (FGDs) by including possible themes with a view to facilitate our research participants. Our discussion with the research participants was based on the themes developed in the guidelines. However, we did not deny the emerged themes generated during our field work. The interviews and FGDs were more open-ended and allowed the participants to express their views or perspectives openly.

### **Data Collection/Generation Procedure**

After piloting and restructuring the tools, we used a structured questionnaire to collect numeric information through face-to-face interviewing (Simon, 2006). In so doing, we trained enumerators on methods of data collection including ethical issues in data collection. We deployed one enumerator in each RC stratum to collect the quantitative data. However, in qualitative inquiry, we involved ourselves for the in-depth interviews and FGDs with the stakeholders as mentioned above. We generated information on public perceptions and view points on the issues/problems faced by the ECCD facilitators. This act of generating information provided fuller understanding of collective social action and assessing group beliefs, understanding, and attitudes. The FGDs were appropriate methods for discussing the social phenomena of those whose lives were influenced by the same issues/problems (Laws et al., 2003, as cited in Lloyd-Evans, 2006).

Further, we observed the ECCD centers and classes of teaching/treating the children and their engagement in learning in their context. We engaged ourselves in children talking or conversing with them in the ECCD centers and at homes also by observing their behaviors or learning impacts (physical, cognitive, emotional, and language skills). We believed that the involvement of researchers themselves in the field could help them to be reflexive and maintain the intent as well as the rigor of the research. For generating qualitative data, we also maintained field notes and reflective and descriptive journals or memos of the field. Similarly, we have also collected the photographs.

## **Approaches of Data Analysis and Interpretation**

First of all, numeric data was managed by editing, coding, and decoding them manually. Secondly, the data was entered in the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) program. Then the data was tabulated and presented using descriptive statistics and correlation. Interpretation was made attaching meaning to the tabular analyses. For the qualitative data, transcription of interviews and FGDs (Lloyd-Evans, 2006) was done with the help of field notes and recordings. The views or perspectives of primary stakeholders (ECCD facilitators) and other secondary and tertiary level stakeholders were triangulated. Then, a sequential process of coding, categorizing, and thematizing (InSites, 2007) was employed to analyze the qualitative data. The themes identified were grouped and sub-grouped under the respective headings. After analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, the information was corroborated with meaning for deriving the findings.

## **Transformative Approach to Generating Action Agenda**

After generating preliminary findings of the research, we went back to the stakeholders. This secondary field visit had three specific purposes: to inform them the research findings, to validate the findings or cross-check their interpretations and to get their collective views or perspectives for action agendas. To generate the action agenda for the intended reform or improvement in the expected and performed competencies of the ECCD facilitators, this research findings sharing program was conducted in each of the districts with the participation of ECCD facilitators, parents, I/NGO representatives, local political leaders, and representatives of District Education Office (DEO). We named this approach transformative approach because of the finding sharing meeting through second visit enabled us to re-interact with the stakeholders to cross check and validate the preliminary findings and explore the action agenda (reform strategies) with their opinion for the intended reform. All together there were 35 participants in Surkhet and 27 participants in Parsa.

For the first purpose, we shared the research findings among the participants with a view to inform them about the situation of ECCD center facilitators in terms of the adversities they are facing and their competencies needed for children's development. For the second purpose, we tried to validate the findings when we asked them whether the findings represented the realities they outlined before. For the third purpose, we made an attempt to collect their

further views (second thought) for improving the situation.

## ECCD FACILITATORS: DEMOGRAPHY

As mentioned in the earlier section, Education Rules, 2002 has clearly stipulated to have at least two caretakers for one ECCD center. However, in practice most of the government supported ECCD centers are run by one facilitator as stipulated by another policy document: National Minimum Standard of ECCD Centers-2010, to engage 20-25 children in an ECCD center. Further, the National Minimum Standard of ECCD Centers-2010 has stated that the facilitator should have minimum of grade 10 academic qualifications with 90 hours of basic training and the local females especially from the disadvantaged groups, wherever possible, should be recruited as facilitators for the ECCD program.

Majority (77.4%) of ECCD facilitators in Parsa were local females and about one fifth (22.6%) of them were the outsiders/non-locals. Almost all (97%) facilitators were from local communities in Surkhet and only 3% were the non-locals (Table 2). All ECCD facilitators (100%) were females in Surkhet and Parsa (Table 2). Almost all facilitators (96.4% in Parsa and 94.7% in Surkhet) were married and only 3.6% in Parsa and 5.3% in Surkhet were unmarried (Table 2).

Maximum ECCD facilitators (28.5% in Parsa and 36.2% in Surkhet) were of age group 30 – 35 years followed by the age group of 25 -30 years (27.5% in Parsa and 23.5% in Surkhet). This age group was of 35 – 40 years in Parsa (15%) and 17% in Surkhet (Table 3). However, the number of facilitators in the age group of 45 – 50 years was 5% in Parsa and 3% in Surkhet. There were no facilitators of age group 15 – 20 years in Parsa but only 1% of the facilitators in Surkhet belonged to this age group (Table 3).

Majority (51.2%) of ECCD facilitators in Parsa district were from Madhesi community but majority (68%) of them were from Bahun/Chhetri community in Surkhet (Table 4). This was followed by the facilitators (27.4%) from Bahun/Chhetri community in Parsa and Janajati facilitators (15%) in Surkhet district (Table 4). Only one percent of ECCD facilitators was from Muslim community in each of the districts and there were no facilitators from Dalits in Parsa against 12% of the ECCD facilitators from Dalit community in Surkhet (Table 4). Thus, there was a considerable number of ECCD facilitators from Janajati and Dalits in Surkhet, but very little number of facilitators from such marginalized and deprived communities was found in Parsa. This indicates that priority was given to recruiting ECCD facilitators

from marginalized and deprived communities such as Janajatis and Dalits in Surkhet but not necessarily in Parsa.

Likewise, majority of the facilitators (69%) were Bhojpuri language speakers and the rest was Nepali speaking (31%) in Parsa (Table 5). However, almost all facilitators (96%) spoke Nepali and very minimum spoke the other local languages (Tharu - 3% and Tamang -1%) (Table 5) in Surkhet. It seems that Bhojpuri in Parsa and Nepali in Surkhet stood as the dominant languages that may do some sort of linguistic injustice to other local language speaking children in the ECCD centers.

## GOVERNMENT AND NON- GOVERNMENT INTERVENTIONS TO IMPROVING ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF ECCD SERVICES

As discussed earlier, Education for All National Plan of Action (EFA/NPA-2001-2015) stipulated that the government provides partial or full support for the establishment and development of ECCD centers in the areas of deprived and disadvantaged communities to provide at least one year of special care service to address both pre-school preparation needs as well as overall needs of children. In contrast to expanding ECCD centers to the accessible areas of marginalized and deprived communities in the walking distance of 10 to 15 minutes (as stipulated in National Minimum Standard for ECCD Centers-2010), the government or District Education Offices (DEOs), in both the districts, were in the process of merging the community based ECCD centers in schools gradually (due to management difficulty in the community).

The major reasons behind this merger of ECCD centers were due to the lack of resources for management and less number of children due to their dropout or their attraction towards private schools or day care centers. This is because the National Minimum Standard for ECCD Centers-2010 has mandated the presence of 20 – 25 children in each ECCD center to be facilitated by one facilitator. In this regard, District Education Officer of one of the districts said:

*“Community based ECCD centers are uncontrolled and unmanaged so we have integrated most of them in to school. This year we have plan to add 20 school based ECCD centers. We have planned to establish ECCD center at least one in a school. Communities are facing difficulties to manage the centers due to lack of resources. There are ECCD centers with only 4-5 children though there are 20-25 children in records” (Field Notes, 2015).*

**One of the facilitators of Parsa remarked:**

*"District Education Office has merged community based ECCD centers in the schools. In some schools, there are at most 3 sections of ECCD classes in one school. It is being difficult to manage those classes. I do not think that the schools are better to manage the community based ECCD centers as schools themselves are unmanaged" (Field Notes, 2015).*

It is observed that the number of children is decreasing in community based ECCD centers because of their tendency to go to private schools or day care centers. We understood it to be related with parental awareness on the value of education of their children under the expectation that they will get good education in these private institutions. We observed this situation mostly in urban areas of both the districts. In this regard, one of the parents said,

*"We are ready not to wear good clothes; we are ready to eat half for our stomach, but we want to educate our children in good schools. Private schools are better than public schools for education. So, I prefer to send my children to private schools."*

Despite their low income, parental concern and commitment for good education of their children is on the increase and hence their preference for private schools or day care centers. That is why the government is in the process of merging community based ECCD centers in school based ECCD centers.

Our classroom observation indicated that these ECCD centers were not in conditions of meeting the minimum standards as envisaged by the National Minimum Standard for ECCD Centers-2010 in terms of learning environment such as classroom management and infrastructure-building, toilet facility, leaning corners, instructional materials, and so on. As mentioned earlier, the support of government and role of local bodies seemed to be growing weaker for managing community based ECCD centers causing integration of the community based ECCD centers into the schools.

The integration of community based ECCD centers in schools has become unmanageable on the other hand. We observed high number of children (more than 30) handled by a single ECCD facilitator though the National Minimum Standard for ECCD Centers-2010 stipulates it to be 20-25 children. In some cases there were also multiple classes of ECCD because of this high number of children. One of the head teachers in Radhemai/urban area of Parsa district said,

*"Government provides only one thousand rupees in the name of managing ECCD center, what can we do with this little money?"*

Thus, integration of the centers has created further difficulties of managing and regulating them effectively.

Some I/NGOs, however, were found to have been supporting limited ECCD centers (both community based and school based) in line with government policies and programs. Such supports have been more on providing basic training and toy making training to ECCD facilitators in both the districts. The I/NGOs seem to have been supporting infrastructure development of the centers on temporary basis and distribution of learning materials. One of the participants of FGD in Birendranagar, Surkhet, said:

*"The Center was established in 2001. Community people selected the public land, but there is no certificate of land ownership. Local NGO supported for one room temporary type of home; in the beginning it was run by the NGO but later, was handed over to the community. Community then collected money and made one room permanent type building with toilet facility" (Field Note, 2015).*

**One of the community based ECCD participants of FGD in Surkhet said;**

"The Centre has its own one room building with toilet support by the community and local donors. ECCD facilitator of this school had received toys making training last year under the initiation of networks financed by district development committee. The Resource person was from an NGO" (Field Note, 2015). The local I/NGOs are providing capacity development training to the ECCD facilitators, to some extent, focusing on toy making and basic level short term trainings. The ECCD centers in Parsa were provided the learning materials like puzzles and dominos by an I/NGOs. In some cases, they have supported for building the infrastructure such as toilets and classrooms. They have also supported classroom management in terms of painting the walls and providing sitting mats or carpeting and developing learning corners. However, these supports were extended to the limited ECCD centers. According to an I/NGO representative, in Parsa, they were supporting only 40 ECCD centers. The ECCD centers supported by I/NGOs were comparatively better in terms of management of physical infrastructure and learning environment.

**Training and Qualification**

As indicated above, the government and local I/NGO networks have been providing short term basic training to the ECCD facilitators. The facilitators had not attended any pre-service training as such. However, about 15% facilitators had qualification of 10 + 2 with education background (Table, 6). Training

of below 5 days duration was basically related to refresher training focusing on instructional materials and developing common foundation of ECCD.

From the interviews and FGDs, we understood that the facilitators were either little trained or untrained in many cases. The trained facilitators did not receive refresher training and follow up support for many years (see the text data below). One of the head teachers of Surkhnet said:

*"We have noticed that government organizes refresher training once a year in ECCD facilitators' gathering. Many 8 class passed ECCD facilitators are there without any knowledge of child psychology. No chance of professional development for ECCD facilitators. No meetings, trainings, workshops or some other kind of gatherings of ECCD facilitators for the last 2 years from the side of the government. But one NGO has been supporting the training throughout" (Field Note, 2015).*

**One of the participants in a FGD of facilitators and parents in Parsa said;**

*"Old ECCD facilitators are SLC passed, but with no training than the basic orientation during the appointment period; there is no any training attained by the newly appointed ECCD facilitators" (Field Note, 2015).*

These quotes indicate that the facilitators were either little trained or untrained. Further, the trained facilitators also did not receive refresher training on a timely basis. Inadequate training was there to maximum ECCD facilitators (48.8%) in Parsa and Surkhnet (43.6%) with School Leaving Certificate (SLC) and grade 8 and +2 qualifications (Table 6). This minimum qualification of maximum number of ECCD facilitators was as per the tone of the National Minimum Standard for ECCD Centers-2010. In addition, maximum (50%) ECCD facilitators had 5 to 10 years of experience in Parsa whereas there were 39% of ECCD facilitators with 10 to 15 years of experience in Surkhnet district (Table 8). This shows that the ECCD facilitators were well experienced.

## COMPETENCIES OF ECCD FACILITATORS

### Engaging Children in Learning

Majority (74%) of rural ECCD facilitators and 56% of urban facilitators of Parsa district were observed to have employed good child centered activities where as maximum (41%) rural facilitators and majority (67%) of urban facilitators of Surkhnet had demonstrated

satisfactory level of child centered activities while engaging the children in learning (Table 34). Likewise, 71% of rural facilitators and maximum number of (56%) urban ones demonstrated good caring of individual child whereas maximum (47%) rural ECCD facilitators and overwhelming majority (81%) of urban facilitators of Surkhnet demonstrated average/satisfactory level of competency in caring each child (Table 34).

Majority (77%) of rural facilitators were found employing good age specific activities in the classroom and maximum (50%) urban facilitators satisfactorily adopted this practice in the classroom in Parsa (Table 34). In Surkhnet, maximum (41%) rural facilitators and maximum (39%) of urban facilitators performed satisfactorily to adopt the age specific activities (Table 34). Moreover, majority (68%) of rural facilitators were good in preparation and implementation of daily schedule whereas 50% of urban facilitators did so (Table 34). A maximum of ECCD facilitators (34% of rural facilitators and 43% of urban facilitators) in Surkhnet demonstrated well in preparing and following daily schedule (Table 34).

Moreover, 50% of rural and 50% of urban facilitators demonstrated satisfactorily their ability to engage the children with good conversation respectively whereas 41% of rural facilitators and 71% of urban facilitators did so in Surkhnet (Table 34). More importantly, maximum number of (53% of rural and 44% of urban facilitators) ECCD facilitators in Parsa demonstrated well to engage the children in physical activities whereas 38% rural and 57% urban facilitators engaged their children in physical activities in a satisfactory manner (Table 34).

Majority (59%) of rural facilitators were good to provide age appropriate books and writing materials for children's use whereas majority (56%) of urban facilitators performed this satisfactorily in Parsa (Table 34). It was 35% rural facilitators of Surkhnet who demonstrated satisfactorily the competency of providing age appropriate books and writing materials followed by 25% of them not demonstrating this satisfactorily in the same area (Table 34). This number was 43% in Surkhnet for the urban facilitators who demonstrated this competency poorly (Table 34). Overwhelming majority (82%) of rural facilitators and a considerable number (39%) of urban facilitators demonstrated the competency of actively listening to the children's comments and responding them at satisfactory level in Parsa (Table 34). But this competency was demonstrated by 47% rural and 57% urban ECCD facilitators at satisfactory level in Surkhnet (Table 34). Majority (53%) of rural facilitators demonstrated well and 50% of urban facilitators demonstrated satisfactorily the competency of expanding children's vocabulary through conversation, materials and activities in Parsa (Table 34). But about

40% of facilitators both in rural and urban areas of Surkhet demonstrated this competency satisfactorily. A considerable number of facilitators (19% rural and 14% urban) performed poorly in demonstrating this competency in Surkhet (Table 34).

Majority of ECCD facilitators (65% of rural and 50% of urban) were good in talking with children both individually and in groups in Parsa whereas the number of the facilitators performing satisfactorily was 41% (rural) and 67% (urban) in Surkhet (Table 34). The reported performance of the facilitators and the one observed by us differed slightly in that the reported one was more ritualistic and formal. We sensed that they focused less on play way methods of engaging children in and outside the class. What was found that the teaching learning materials provided by I/NGOs to the school based and community based ECCD centers were used occasionally. The learning materials like reference books and puzzles were given to children to use sometimes. The facilitators however engaged the children with some rhymes or songs repeatedly letting them to follow by themselves. In this connection, one of the facilitators said:

*"10 am-1 pm is the center's time. Routine or activities are the same like in other centers. I) children come at 10, enter the class room in line, sit in round, sing the Aarati<sup>2</sup> songs; we let them try to read and write. Sometimes, I let them play some indoor games and let them go out. Parents do not like their children play outside" (Field Notes, 2015).*

**One of the representatives of Teacher Union, Surkhet, said:**

*"Even model ECCD centers are weak, main reasons of such weakness is due to weak management; parents have little interest in areas as sitting arrangement and classroom engagement. The management committee, facilitators are unable to convince the parents about the objectives and philosophy of the centers. They cannot blame parents in this regard. KA<sup>3</sup>, Kha<sup>4</sup>, ABCD, 123 modality of teaching has been applied everywhere. Parents also expect their children to memorize contents" (Field Notes, 2015).*

**One of the head teachers of Surkhet said:**

*"Our ECCD classes do not match the desire of the parents. Parents are right in their context that their children should learn reading, writing skill; philosophies of ECCD, general*

*concept of child psychology have not been conveyed properly to the parents. Parents visit the centers and argue with teachers to prepare their children to read and write fast as the children of their neighbor. As they go out and away from home for their job, schools' main job is to take care of their children as DHARALO<sup>5</sup>. Parent education is needed; the class cannot be managed only by facilitators. Parents do not allow their children to play outdoor games as they fear their children might get wounded" (Field Notes, 2015).*

**One of the participants of FGD in Birendranagar said:**

*"Parents should not have content based expectation, they should rather expect to develop school readiness skill, good personal and social habits etc. in their children from the ECCD centers. Parents, on the contrary, cherish the expectation of reading and writing skill development of their children like from private schools. Now, they are gradually being convinced about the true purpose of ECCD centers" (Field Notes, 2015).*

From the field, we observed that most of the parents of ECCD children were little aware of the role of ECCD centers for the overall development of their children through play way and artistic methods. It was rather expected by the parents that their children should read and write the alphabets and numbers. Thus parental expectation was a major factor pushing the facilitators to adopt rote memorizing of alphabets and numbers as pedagogical approaches. However, they have been demonstrating their competencies of caring the children, using meaningful and quality conversation, providing age specific learning materials, engaging them in physical activities, and scheduling engagement of the children in activities.

**Knowledge about Characteristics of Child Development**

Majority of facilitators (70% urban and 65% rural) claimed that they had some understanding of child growth and development in Parsa and in Surkhet, majority (73%) of the ECCD facilitators (of both urban and rural areas) reported to have the same level of understanding (Table 14). Likewise, 78% of urban facilitators and 68% of rural facilitators of Parsa district and about 60% facilitators of both urban and rural areas of Surkhet district had some knowledge on how children learn and develop through play way methods (Table 14).

<sup>2</sup> Pray song in the name of Hindu god

<sup>3</sup> First alphabet of Nepali

<sup>4</sup> Second alphabet of Nepali

<sup>5</sup> Children's care giver rather than facilitator

In the same manner, majority of the ECCD facilitators (52% urban and 72% rural) of Parsa claimed that they had some knowledge of developing caring relationship with each child and 51% urban and 77% rural facilitators of Surkhet claimed to have had high level of knowledge of the same competency (Table 14). Similarly, 48% urban and 56% rural facilitators of Parsa claimed to have competency of respecting each child's culture and nature/characteristics whereas it was 57% urban and 70% rural facilitators who claimed to have this competency at a high level in Surkhet (Table 14).

The ECCD facilitators of rural and urban areas of both Parsa and Surkhet districts claimed to have knowledge about children's growth and development through play way methods. According to them, they were aware on caring of children in a respectful manner to be responsive to their culture and characteristics. As per our observation, the facilitators were found to have engaged the children little in outdoor and indoor games; instead, they demonstrated the tendency of employing traditional approaches of rote memorization of alphabets and numbers. In the field, we sensed that the facilitators were more culture sensitive as most of the facilitators spoke the mother tongue of the children. They were aware of local practices and culture as demonstrated by one of the facilitators in rural area of Parsa who interacted with the children in Bhojpuri language in a respectful manner.

### Observation and Assessment of Child Development

An equal percentage of 44% ECCD facilitators from both rural and urban area reported to have kept the records of daily information about each child's routine activities (diapering, sleeping, and eating) in Parsa district; this was 40% in urban and 52% in rural areas of Surkhet (Table 15). The same tabular information indicates that 45% urban facilitators very often shared children's activities with their parents and 40% rural facilitators shared this with parents only sometimes in Parsa district. Likewise, 65% urban facilitators very often shared child's activities with parents and 37% rural facilitators always shared the activities with parents in Surkhet (Table 15).

About 50% urban and rural facilitators of Parsa very often treated individual child understanding his/her pace. It was 54% urban facilitators who very often handled this against 56% rural facilitators who did the same in Surkhet (Table 15).

The same table (15) indicates that 41% urban facilitators rarely kept assessment information confidential whereas 35% rural facilitators very often kept this information confidential in Parsa (Table 15). Likewise, 44% urban facilitators very often kept

assessment information of children confidential and the same percentage of rural facilitators always kept it confidential in Surkhet district (Table 15). However, there were few facilitators who reported 'Rarely' or 'Never' on this competency.

### Condition of Using Curriculum and



### Maintaining Learning Environment

The quantitative information indicates that majority (56 %) of ECCD facilitators of urban area of Parsa always followed daily schedule of specific activities for children whereas it was 53% of the ECCD facilitators of rural areas who very often did the same (Table 16). The same table indicates that 72% ECCD facilitators from both rural and urban areas of Surkhet always followed the daily schedule of specific activities for the children. Further, the same table indicates 53% of ECCD facilitators from both rural and urban areas of Surkhet provided choice of activities to the children.

Majority (55.5%) of ECCD facilitators of urban areas of Parsa reported that they were making daily, weekly, monthly, and long-range curriculum plans sometimes against 42.1% of rural ECCD facilitators who were making these plans very often (Table, 16). It was 46% urban ECCD facilitators of Surkhet who made such plans very often against 30% rural facilitators who always made the plans (Table, 16). Thus the ECCD facilitators of Surkhet, from regularity point of view, were better off in terms of making curriculum plans. There were no ECCD facilitators who never made such plans but about 9% ECCD facilitators from rural areas of Surkhet never made such plans (Table 16).

The ECCD facilitators of both rural and urban area of both Surkhet and Parsa districts were engaging the children based on the schedule of specific activities. As per our classroom observation, we found that the ECCD facilitators in both the districts were using daily

schedule of activities for engaging children in learning. However, we did not find the other weekly, monthly and long range curriculum plans as claimed by them. When we asked one of the facilitators in Parsa,

*“Do you have the other monthly and yearly plans and curriculum?” She said, “No, we have only Mero Kitab [Facilitator’s Guidelines developed by Department of Education] and daily schedule of activities developed in the training; we run the classes based on these.”*

Thus the ECCD facilitators were adopting daily schedule of activities in a structured way to engage the children but they seemed to be unaware of ECCD curriculum, its plans and planning strategies.

### **Promoting Social and Emotional Development**

A total of 41% ECCD facilitators of urban area of Parsa and 61% of rural areas always and very often were engaged in conversations on important things with children respectively (Table, 17). It was 49% ECCD facilitators from urban areas of Surkhet and 60% from rural areas were found always engaged in conversations on important things with children (Table, 17). There were no facilitators reporting rarely and never regarding their engagement in such activity in both the locations of both the districts (Table, 17).

In Parsa 48% ECCD facilitators from urban areas always helped children to develop friendship with each other and 49% from rural areas did it very often (Table, 17). It was 65% urban and 74% rural facilitators in Surkhet who always helped children to develop friendship with each other (Table, 17). There were no facilitators who rarely and never did this activity.

Likewise, 41% urban and 44% rural facilitators of Parsa very often helped children to label and express their feelings (Table, 17). The percentage of facilitators was 59% from urban and 72% from rural area of Surkhet who always helped children to label and express their feelings (Table, 17). There were no facilitators reporting rarely or never to help children do this activity (Table, 17).

Similarly, 55.5% urban facilitators of Parsa reported that they always showed and encouraged empathy and respect for children and other adults against 61% rural facilitators of Parsa who very often reported to have done this (Table, 17). In Surkhet, 43% urban and 68% rural facilitators always did this activity (Table, 17). No facilitators were reported to have done this activity rarely or never (Table, 17). The ECCD facilitators of Surkhet were found to be more competent in these different issues of promoting social and emotional development of children.

The ECCD facilitators of both rural and urban areas of Surkhet and Parsa districts were competent in conversing with the children on important matters and helping them to develop relationships with friends. They were also aware of helping the children to express their feelings. It was also reported that they helped children for learning positive behaviors such as greetings and respecting other children and adults.

### **Nutritional Promotion of Children**

The ECCD facilitators in rural (40%) and urban (48%) areas of Parsa were found to have very often supported their children for handling their food safely whereas this number was 84% in rural areas and 70% in urban areas in Surkhet to always support their children to do the same job of handling food safely (Table, 18). None of the facilitators reported that they rarely or never supported their children to do the same job (Table, 18).

A total of 46% ECCD facilitators of rural areas of Parsa always discouraged their children to have junk foods and 59% urban facilitators very often did so (Table, 18). Likewise, 75% rural and 46% urban facilitators of Surkhet district were always discouraging their children not to have junk food and they suggested to having home-made food (Table, 18).

There were about 45% of ECCD facilitators of both rural and urban areas of Parsa who were either always or very often creating a pleasant, clean environment for children to eat meals and snacks with their peers (Table, 18). This number was 70% and 54% of facilitators from rural and urban areas of Surkhet respectively who always created this environment for the children (Table, 18). But there were no facilitators who never created such environment (Table, 18).

The above information about the ECCD facilitators’ practice with the students indicate that they were competent on handling food safety of children such as discouraging junk foods and encouraging them to have home-prepared foods. They were also aware on creating a pleasant and clean environment for the children to eat snacks with their friends. However, as our observation suggests, the practices of maintaining food safety seemed to have been less demonstrated in the centers of both Surkhet and Parsa districts. We observed that the children generally did not bring their snacks to the centers in Parsa. Instead, they went back to their homes to have their snacks/tiffin. In Surkhet, the children generally brought to the center their snacks/tiffin from home. No clean and separate space for eating was however observed.

## Interactions with Individual Children

Majority (53%) of rural ECCD facilitators were always positive, respectful, consistent and calm with each child in Parsa and 59% urban facilitators very often demonstrated these characteristics. There were 81% rural facilitators and 65% urban facilitators in Surkhet who were always or very often perceived to be positive, respectful, consistent and calm with each child (Table, 19). Likewise, about 50% of rural and urban facilitators of Parsa were perceived to have demonstrated appropriate expectations from each child whereas this was 58% in rural and 57% in urban areas of Surkhet (Table, 19).

About 50% ECCD facilitators both in rural and urban areas of Parsa were perceived to have always and very often helped children to understand rules and limits whereas, in Surkhet, it was 67% in rural areas and 54% in urban areas who always did so (Table 19). There were almost no facilitators who were perceived not to have this competency in them (Table, 19).

## Condition of Learning Environment in the Center

Management of learning corners was satisfactory in 38% ECCD centers of rural areas of Parsa and it was poor in 55.5% ECCD centers of urban areas (Table 33). It was poor in 47% rural and 43% urban ECCD centers of Surkhet district (Table 33). There was satisfactory condition of appropriate learning materials in 28 % ECCD centers of rural areas and poor in 39% ECCD centers of urban locations of Parsa district (Table 33). However, majority (52%) of ECCD centers did not have appropriate learning materials in satisfactory condition in the urban areas of Surkhet. The condition was poor in 38% ECCD centers of the same district (Table 33).

A total of 29% ECCD centers of rural areas of Parsa had average management of interactive materials placed on the walls of the classroom whereas 50% ECCD centers of urban areas of the same district had poor management of such materials displayed on the walls of the classroom (Table, 33). Likewise, 38% ECCD centers in rural and 48% in urban areas had below average management of interactive learning materials placed on the walls (Table, 33).

There were sufficient age specific books, and writing materials and other related reference materials in majority (53%) of ECCD centers of rural areas of Parsa but sufficiency of such materials was lacking in 44% ECCD centers of urban areas of the same district (Table, 33). Likewise, 38% ECCD centers in rural and 48% in urban areas had not enough of these materials in Surkhet (Table, 33).

The availability of outdoor playing materials such as swing, sliding, water play, sand play and so on was



poor in 60% rural and 85% urban ECCD centers of Parsa district (Table 33). But this availability was satisfactory in 81% rural and 76% urban ECCD centers of Surkhet district (Table, 33). Similarly, the observation revealed that management of student information was satisfactory (child's individual file) in 50% rural and 44% urban ECCD centers of Parsa district (Table 33). But this was poor in 37% rural and 33% urban centers of Surkhet district (Table, 33).

The quantitative information confirms our observation of poor management of learning corners of ECCD centers in both rural and urban locations of both the districts. We observed that there were poorly managed learning corners and there were less appropriate learning materials in the centers. There were poorly managed interactive materials on the wall of ECCD centers and there were no sufficient age specific books, writing materials and other related reference materials in most of the centers. We found that the walls were not colored and the hand-made interactive learning materials were hanging on the walls which seemed to have remained unused for months. Further, we observed insufficient outdoor playing materials in both rural and urban ECCD centers of both the districts.

## PROBLEMS/CHALLENGES OF ECCD FACILITATORS

### Remuneration and Duration of Engagement

Most of the ECCD facilitators (94%) in Parsa and Surkhet districts were found to have been receiving a remuneration of Rs. 3000 provided by the government (Table, 10). A total of 5% of facilitators in Parsa were receiving Rs. 2000 remuneration but there were no facilitators receiving this amount in Surkhet. Interestingly, 5% ECCD facilitators in Surkhet and 1% in Parsa were receiving Rs. 4000 remuneration (Table, 10). The school based ECCD facilitator who was taking

additional classes at upper grades was getting this additional one thousand rupees as remuneration from the school resource. Very few (11% in Parsa and 15% in Surkhet) facilitators were found to be extremely happy in their profession. In in-depth interview and focus group discussions, most of the facilitators freely vented out their unhappiness about the poor remuneration. The major causes of their unhappiness were low remuneration, domination from the other senior colleagues (school based ECCD centers) and indignity of the profession.

Majority of ECCD facilitators (54% in Parsa and 64% in Surkhet) were found engaged for four hours a day in ECCD centers (Table 9). There were few facilitators in Parsa (4%) who were engaged in ECCD centers for three hours; on an average there were one fourth of the ECCD facilitators (26%) who were engaged in the centers for three hours (Table 9). There were 25% and 18% facilitators who were found engaged for 5 hours and 6 hours respectively in Parsa but there were only 8% and 2% of them who were engaged for 5 hours and 6 hours respectively in Surkhet (Table 9).

There were more facilitators engaged for more hours in schools in Parsa but there were less number of facilitators engaged for more hours in Surkhet. In Parsa district, 17 % of the facilitators were taking additional one class at upper level and 19% of them were taking two classes. In the case of Surkhet, 6% facilitators were taking one and 8% were taking two classes at upper grades. A total of 14 facilitators were taking one additional upper class in Parsa and only 6 facilitators were taking one additional class in Surkhet (Table 11). Likewise, 16 facilitators were taking 2 classes in upper grades in Parsa and only 8 facilitators were taking 2 classes in upper grades in Surkhet (Table 11) beyond the ECCD classes.

There were 4 facilitators in Parsa and 3 facilitators in Surkhet who were receiving Rs.500 to Rs. 1000 remuneration for extra work load (Table 12). There were 3 facilitators in Parsa and 2 facilitators in Surkhet who received Rs. 1000 to Rs. 2000 remuneration for extra work load (Table 12). There were no facilitators receiving more than this amount in Parsa but there were 3 facilitators receiving Rs. 2000 to Rs. 3000 remuneration for extra work burden in Surkhet (Table 12).

During our field visit, we understood that many facilitators of school based ECCD centers were engaged by school administration for extra hours for teaching in upper grades. They were engaged for more other hours during the absence of other teachers as the substitute for the classes. In some cases, they were not paid for their additional engagement. In this regard,

**one of the facilitators in the rural areas of Parsa district said,**

*"I am not paid any extra amount except Rs 3000 as paid by the government though I have been taking classes in upper grades for two years. I also would like to gain experiences of teaching in upper grades."*

We realized that the ECCD facilitators have been quietly bearing the exploitation with pathetic plight and uncertain future. One of the facilitators of Surkhet said:

*"Salary of facilitators is too low (NRs. 3000) than the ILO recommendation (Rs 6500). Government should assure the ECCD facilitators for their job security with increment of their salary and better working condition. Government can manage the quotas if it wants, but it is not giving due importance to ECCD centers" (Field Notes, 2015).*

**One of the representatives of NGO in Parsa said:**

*"Some of the ECCD facilitators send the children home at 1 pm and teach the upper classes; some schools might have given Rs. 200- Rs. 500 extra money for their extra load" (Field Notes, 2015).*

They have been working for the remuneration which is far below the minimum wage. Further, as discussed earlier, the cases of no payment for the overtime work performed was against their right as envisaged by the Labor Act, 1992. The remuneration of facilitators was below the statutory minimum wage (International Labor Office [ILO], 2010). Therefore, the ECCD facilitators have been facing injustice in terms of their labor contribution not matching their remuneration. Further, the ECCD facilitators had no any other incentives and allowances. This was against the provision of ensuring the provident fund and facilities related to medical expenses (Clause 39) of ECCD facilitators as envisaged by the Labor Act, 1992.

**Dilemma, Uncertain Future and Less Motivation**

As discussed earlier, the ECCD facilitators were paid little for their work. In addition, they have felt that their jobs are less dignified and overloaded. In many cases, we understood that the ECCD facilitators themselves have been giving less importance or emphasis to their profession because of less pay. Many of them are hopeful that the government will consider improving the situation. One of the facilitators in Surkhet said:

*"It has been 13 years, no salary increment than Rs. 3000. I am in the mood to leaving this profession. Sometimes, I think that there*

*is no alternative for me. What to do after leaving this job as I spent many years in this profession. If I had been engaged in other jobs from the beginning, I think, it would have been much better for me" (Field Notes, 2015).*

**In this regard, one of the head teachers said:**

*"The ECCD facilitators frequently threaten me to leave their job. I have to frequently convince and let them do their work. They have not felt dignified in this job" (Field Notes, 2015).*

**One facilitator of Parsa said:**

*"The remuneration I get is only enough to have tiffin. Other teachers eat tiffin and they offer me to have tiffin. I cannot say 'No'. At the end of the month, I need to pay most of my remuneration for the tiffin. Sometimes I feel like leaving the job but what to do? There are no other alternatives" (Field Notes, 2015).*

ECCD facilitators are in a real dilemma of continuing or leaving the job because of low payment. The dilemma has caused little motivation in them for engaging themselves sincerely in their work. In addition, we sensed that this dilemma was further likely to impede their devotion or enthusiasm for engaging the children meaningfully for their holistic development. The facilitators felt demotivated and have low morale because of low remuneration and lack of dignity of their profession. They have perceived that they have achieved economically less for many years of their contribution to ECCD centers. There was no certainty of secure and prosperous future as there was no any arrangement for the financial security for their future life. One of the head teachers of Surkhet said:

*"Facilitators do not see their future secured, neither did they acquire the status of teacher with more salary. The facilitators who have options have taken the job as a short term platform. They have no present, also not the future" (Field Notes, 2015).*

**One of the representatives of Teacher Union said:**

*"Job and future of facilitators is unsure" (Field Notes, 2015).*

Uncertain future of the ECCD facilitators is likely to discourage them to be fully engaged in the overall development of children. Long years of engagement with such small payment have brought a kind of frustration among them. However, they have a hope of improvement in their job. They have no other alternatives either as they have already spent a significant part of their life (career) dwindling as the ECCD facilitators. In the case of recently employed ECCD facilitators, they are found seeking other

alternatives or they are in favor of changing their profession. Some of them were engaging themselves just to pass time till they find other alternative job.

### **Undefined Duties and Responsibilities**

ECCD facilitators have multiple works which are not limited to engaging children in learning only. They have to do all emergent works in the classrooms/ECCD centers. We understood that the diverse nature of works such as checking children's cleanliness, cleaning rooms, interaction with the guardians and so on is a matter of divergence. One of the ECCD facilitators of Surkhet said:

*"I have to do all the works of Aaya. Sometimes I have to call meeting of guardians and sometimes I conduct meeting with ECCD center management committee" (Field Notes, 2015).*

Undefined roles and responsibilities of ECCD facilitators have impeded their ability to engage meaningfully with children. They were unable to provide quality time for learning activities. They have to do other innumerable works successively as per the need of children. The long and unpredictable working roles and responsibilities of ECCD facilitators were likely to impose a high cost on their health and well-being and, in turn, they may have eroded their efficiency and the quality of service for the children (International Labor Office [ILO], 2012). Moreover, this continuous and undefined work burden is against the right of workers to rest and leisure (Article, 31.1).

### **Lack of Monitoring and Professional Support**

Through the interviews of multiple layers of stakeholders, we understood that proper monitoring of ECCD centers and professional support to ECCD facilitators were not available. The Resource Persons (RPs) who are expected to monitor and supervise ECCD centers were being unable to supervise the centers because of the work burden. In this regard, The District Education Officer of Surkhet said:

*"One school supervisor should supervise 100 programs, so there is challenge of well supervision of the ECCD center" (Field Notes, 2015).*

**One of the head teachers of Surkhet said:**

*"School cannot manage the supervision of ECCD centers; municipality, community, VDC should manage them. As the DEO provides the salary to ECCD facilitators, RPs should supervise the centers including the classes of private schools but they are not found doing so. School based centers are supervised by*

*the school administration but the community based ECCD centers are not possible" (Field Notes, 2015).*

**Another head teacher in Parsa expressed:**

*"All of us have roles to make the ECCD center better; it needs monitoring, evaluation and incentives. No effective roles have been played by the RPs and the resource centers. Sometimes we discuss about the center in head teacher meetings. The RC does not care about the ECCD centers and their work; I have not noticed that yet" (Field Notes, 2015).*

The above views of head teachers and District Education Officer suggest that monitoring and supervision of ECCD centers has not been a priority of the government. Further, the school administration plays the role of a supervisor and monitors school based ECCD centers. However, monitoring and supervision by the school administration is insufficient and less effective. There need to have clear roles and responsibilities about the monitoring mechanism of the ECCD centers is greatly felt. We understood that the roles of head teachers and resource persons need to be clear in monitoring effectively the activity of the centers.

**Poor Infrastructure**

We visited 52 ECCD centers in Parsa and 53 in Surkhet and observed minutely their infrastructure and learning environment. We observed 34 (65.3%) of ECCD centers in rural areas and 18 (34.7%) in Parsa district whereas we observed 32 (60.4%) centers in rural areas and 21 (39.6%) in urban areas of Surkhet district (Table 31). We found the infrastructure of 17% ECCD centers of Parsa and 31 % of Surkhet (analyzed from table 32) not meeting the minimum requirements of children centers. In most of the ECCD centers the children had no proper sitting arrangements. They were found sitting on the carpet or sacks of rice on the dusty floor. The rooms were not safe enough to protect them from cold and heat. There were no any decoration of the rooms and no subject corners managed. The children had no chance of sleeping and eating in the classrooms. One of the participants of a FGD in Birendranagar, Surkhet, said:

*"School building is very small and the room of ECCD center is also congested, sometimes ECCD facilitator manages them outside of the room. No playing space for outdoor games/ activities. No warm sitting arrangement for the children, only thin carpet has been managed" (Field Notes, 2015).*

**One of the head teachers in a FGD of rural area in Surkhet said:**

*"Facilitator says that if big room, open ground and resources are available, she would teach*

*and manage learning materials well as learned from the training. The ECCD Center does not have enough playing materials, it has not been able to apply the concept of 6 corners, and there isn't even drinking water facility" (Field Notes, 2015).*

Most of the ECCD centers were running under poor infrastructure without enough spaces for sitting and playing. A poorly managed sitting arrangement of the children was unlikely to protect them from the cold penetrated from below the cemented floor. Seventeen percentage of ECCD centers in Parsa and 26 % in Surkhet were facing the problem of safe drinking water (Table 32). There was enough area for the classrooms on the basis of the number of students in majority ECCD centers located in both rural and urban areas of both the districts (Table 32). However, the average classroom areas were better in rural locations than the urban areas of Parsa district and better in the urban areas of Surkhet (Table 32).

The sitting arrangement was good in majority ECCD classes in Parsa but it was below average in majority ECCD classes in Surkhet (Table 32). There were no enough eating, and playing spaces inside the classroom in both rural and urban areas of both the districts. Enough spaces for indoor as well as outdoor games and sports were not available in most of the ECCD centers in both rural and urban locations of both the districts. Thus poor infrastructural management was one of the key hurdles for promoting learning activities in most of the ECCD centers of both the districts.

Management of diapering, sleeping, eating in the classroom was of average nature in 47% classes of rural areas of Parsa but it was below average in majority classes (67%) of urban areas of Parsa (Table 32). This was below average in majority classes (56% in rural and 52% in urban) of both rural and urban areas of Surkhet (Table 32).

Moreover, management of indoor playing materials was of average nature in maximum ECCD centers (41% rural and 33% urban) of both rural and urban areas of Parsa whereas it was below average in majority (53% rural and 48% urban) of rural and urban areas of Surkhet district (Table 32). Safety of outdoor playing area was good in 50% of ECCD centers of rural areas of Parsa and it was very good in 61% ECCD centers of urban areas of the district (Table, 32). It was of average type in 34% rural and 48% urban ECCD classes of Surkhet (Table 32).

A total of 59% ECCD facilitators of rural areas of Parsa perceived that the ECCD centers have satisfactory



(average) drinking water facility but 39% facilitators of urban areas of the same district perceived that the centers have good drinking water facility (Table, 32). However, about 33% ECCD facilitators of each of rural and urban areas of Surkhhet district perceived that there were no satisfactory (below average) drinking water facilities (Table, 32).

Likewise, majority (65%) of ECCD facilitators from the rural areas of Parsa perceived that they had satisfactory (average) toilet facilities but 45% facilitators from the urban areas of the same district perceived the toilet facilities to be good (Table, 32). The case of Surkhhet was slightly different in that 34% rural ECCD facilitators perceived the centers to have satisfactory (average) toilet facilities against 43% urban facilitators who perceived them as having unsatisfactory (below average) toilet facilities (Table, 32). Parsa therefore had better toilet facilities than Surkhhet for the children.

### Lack of Instructional/Playing Materials

A large number of ECCD facilitators (67%) were found to have claimed that they have been facing challenges of poor or inadequate instructional materials (Table 30). The scarcity of the materials was of similar nature in both rural and urban areas of both the districts (Table 30). However, the number of ECCD facilitators facing the scarcity of playing materials in both the locations of both the districts was less (Table 30). This was because ECCD facilitators in both districts had received training on making basic playing materials through local NGOs. One of the participants of a FGD in Birendranagar, Surkhhet, said:

*"The center had received an ECCD tin box some years ago; the facilitator manages the children with some playing materials like ball, letter boxes etc. No audio tapes are available to play the rhymes, songs etc" (Field Notes, 2015).*

#### One of the participants of a FGD in Surkhhet said;

*"Only one ECCD box, no learning corners though the facilitator had received 7 days*

*material development training few years back. Training content was like i) introduction to child development ii) learning material development" (Field Notes, 2015).*

Through the interviews, observation, and FGDs, we understood that most of the ECCD facilitators were trained either by the local I/NGO networks or government for making playing materials for the children. They were provided with an ECCD box by an I/NGO in Parsa. However, scarcity of newly made playing materials was there. The ECCD facilitators were using old toys and puzzles and other learning materials which were made at the time of training. From the interviews with the facilitators, we understood that they were also facing the scarcity of resources and raw materials for making such playing materials for the children. Further, they were facing the lack of technology based instructional materials such as tape recorder.

## CHILD DEVELOPMENT

There were 29 children, on average, in each ECCD center of Parsa and 23 each in Surkhhet (Table 13). Majority of children in ECCD centers (51% in Parsa and 52% in Surkhhet) were girls. Majority (64% in Parsa and 67% in Surkhhet) of children was from upper caste and Janajatis and there were 36% low caste children in Parsa and 33% Surkhhet (Table 13). We interviewed 10 parents of ECCD children from each district and observed the behavior of children. Parents of both districts reported of experiencing positive changes in the behaviors of their children. The children's change was noticeable in their health and hygienic behaviors, greeting, singing particular songs. One of the participants (facilitator) of a FGD in Surkhhet Birendranagar said:

*"After completion of ECCD class, they understand language, have personal health consciousness, develop eating behavior, social behaviors, and also some school readiness skills like holding the paper, turning the page and recognizing the letters and digits etc. It has made them easy in grade one" (Field Notes, 2015).*

#### One other participant in the FGD of rural area of Parsa said:

*"Parents are happy from the center because their children are clever and disciplined; they have learned new things daily, and civilized behaviors; they also have learned reading and writing skills too. They need the center" (Field Notes, 2015).*

**Other participants said:**

“Children put off their shoes before getting into the classroom, go to toilet, put their water bottle in proper place, sing national anthem, can read and write alphabets” (Field Notes, 2015).

**One of the parents said:**

“Parents are happy in the progress of their kids. Children could read and write, draw picture, identify the parts of body. My child is changed after entering this center. He tells us that he has to do homework when he returns home and also quotes madam- ‘mummy madam has said this’, he has developed good manner, too. My child says that he has to cut nail, bath once in a week, as per the instruction of madam. Children eat food in time, wear dress, come to the center, remain busy, I have no any remarks on learning achievement, I am satisfied with the progress of my child” (Field Notes, 2015).

The children were found to have changed their behaviors. According to their parents and facilitators, the children have been demonstrating positive healthy habits and hygiene; reading, writing, greeting, and other positive changes along with singing and playing are visible changes. Nearly 50% of the children were able to tell their names in rural areas of Parsa but majority (62%) were able to tell their names clearly in urban area of the same district (Table 36). In Surkhet, only 37% children had this ability at average level (Table 36). Contrary to the perception (as shown by the text data above) of those particular parents or facilitators on the changes in the behaviors of children, 44 % children in Parsa and 34 % in Surkhet had this ability at average level or below average (21% in Parsa and 26% in Surkhet) in greeting their friends and elders (Table 36).

Similar situation could be observed on telling the names of seven days of a week, praying in group, and on the condition of hand, mouth, nose and nail in both the districts (Table 36). Interestingly, more rural children (54%) than urban (22%) in Parsa and more urban children (41%) than rural (26%) in Surkhet had developed these skills. A total of 43% children in Parsa and 28 % in Surkhet were of average skill or below average and poor (36% in Parsa and 55% in Surkhet) position in drawing pictures according to their own interest, matching picture and word cards, telling the names of games, playing friendly, and communicating two way with friends/ teachers (Table 36).

## STAKEHOLDERS’ EXPECTATIONS

As discussed earlier, most of the ECCD facilitators hold academic qualification required for primary

teachers. We have found that the foremost concern of ECCD facilitators was related to the raising of their remuneration including other incentives and allowances at par with primary level teachers. Thus many of them were in favor of generating quota for employing them in primary level. Some of them have been expecting the recruitment of assistant facilitator/ Aaya to help them fulfill their undefined multiple roles, responsibilities and work burdens. Further, they have expected to have specific number of children in a class so that they could manage them efficiently. The facilitators were also expecting to have provision of scholarships to the ECCD children in the form of dress, incentives, tiffin (day meal) and so on. We understood that the other stakeholders are in favor of increasing budget for ECCD center management. According to them, the budget needs to be allocated for building construction, learning materials, and other infrastructure development. Further, they have expected to be empowered like the head teachers, facilitators, and ECCD center management committee member. The other stakeholders are unaware of teaching and learning pedagogies such as the use of play way method for the ECCD children. In a FGD of facilitators and parents, one of the participants demanded:

“Facilitator demands more materials, audio-visual equipments for better development of the kids. Facilitator buys chocolates from their own money to somehow engage the children. Day meal provision is better to be introduced” (Field Notes, 2015).

The stakeholders were in favor of mainstreaming the remaining community based ECCD centers with proper management in schools. They have the express desire of making the job of ECCD facilitators more dignified and respectful so that they should be motivated towards their job. Some of them even focused on the need of forming separate management committee of ECCD centers and such committee should be made more functional and effective.

Another key aspect of their voice was the strong mechanisms of monitoring for the efficacy of ECCD centers. According to them, in so doing, the government has to employ human resource in the district level that can supervise and monitor the CED centers in an effective manner. Frequent effective monitoring can lead to the expected outcomes. The participants of FGD in Surkhet Birendranagar expected:

“Facilitator demands rooms, playing ground, salary increment, furniture and audio visual learning materials, and one assistant facilitator as well. There should be age based different sections in such ECCD

centers. Fast food/junk foods are bad for health of children. Some children come hungry, return at 2 and eat food at home; such practice is damaging their health. Parental awareness is necessary, including wider experience and visual presentation in parents' gatherings will do the job. Feeder school support system to ECCD center is to be introduced as a policy. Networking between ECCD centers should be strengthened. Children with low economic background mostly come to the centers but they do not get any scholarship in the ECCD centers. Big schools or mother schools should support the facilitators in teaching learning business" (Field Note, 2015).

**Another participant said:**

"Training is needed for both facilitators and management committee. Facilitator is satisfied with this job. She hopes better salary and working conditions and job security" (Field Notes, 2015).

**One of the NGO representatives in Surkhet said;**

"Parents and community should understand and be convinced with the purpose and philosophy of ECCD classes; their involvement in this campaign is necessary. Training on different areas like child psychology, class room management, and material development is required. Policies should be formulated for the facilitators and ECCDs with clarity on the functions of the ECCD centers, facilitators' role and their leave etc. Enough salary to maintain her basic family requirements should be provided (Field Notes, 2015).

**One of the NGO representatives in Parsa said:**

"Also, it is important to think about the qualification of the facilitators as there might be generation and qualification gaps in this job. There are five class passed facilitators, too. New generation is very forward and such little educated facilitators may not be able to respond to such demanding cases. Government should continue those who are capable, but for those who are not, good incentive should be given before sending them out: government should be clear and strong enough to make such decisions.. Government should merge ECCD centers in school system with a clear cut policy only" (Field Notes, 2015).

The stakeholders have expected to enhance the capabilities of ECCD facilitators through regular

training. Some of them were in favor of recognition and management of ECCD centers as one of the specific structures under effective monitoring and supervision of capable head teachers. Likewise, many of them demanded the adequate distribution of facilitator guidelines already developed by Department of Education. The above text data thus reveal that the stakeholders were in favor of formulating specific policies for ECCD including the provisions of ECCD facilitators' remuneration, incentives, allowances and other facilities like leaves. According to them, the policy has to address the provisions of overall child friendly management of the ECCD centers.

In addition, the ECCD facilitators who have been working for many years with under SLC qualification were fearful of being out of their job when the new policy is formulated. If so, they naturally expect their situation be addressed by the new policy on the basis of long experiences or they may opt out to leave the job under the scheme of golden handshake. Another pertinent version we heard was about their feeling of being undermined, and undignified in this job. Thus, they were in favor of making the job of ECCD facilitators more respectful and dignified.

## KEY FINDINGS

### Demography of ECCD Facilitators

- Almost all ECCD facilitators (more than 90%) were married and from local communities in both the districts falling in the age group category of 30 – 35 years (28.5% in Parsa and 36.2% in Surkhet).
- There were a considerable number of ECCD facilitators from marginalized and deprived communities (15% Janajati facilitators and 12 % Dalit facilitators in Surkhet).
- Bhojpuri language was spoken by majority of facilitators (69%) in Parsa and there were almost all facilitators (96%) who spoke Nepali.

### Interventions Made through Government and I/NGOs

- The government was in the process of integrating the community based ECCD centers in schools because of lack of resources for management and dropout of children with growing inclination toward private schools.
- The networks of I/NGOs were found to have been supporting the limited ECCD centers providing basic level of training to the facilitators and infrastructure improvement including the distribution of learning materials.

## DEMONSTRATION OF IN/COMPETENCIES

Most of the ECCD facilitators were found to have passed School Leaving Certificate (SLC) level that were either shortly trained and not refreshed for some years or untrained. However, maximum of them (76%) had more than 5 years of experience.

Most of the ECCD facilitators demonstrated little child friendly approaches of engaging children through play way methods rather the tendency was on traditional modes of teaching learning activities through rote memorization of alphabets and numbers. Parental expectation of making their children able to read and write alphabets and numerals was a major influencing factor to adopt rote memorizing of alphabets and numbers by the facilitators as pedagogical approaches.

Many ECCD facilitators were found to have made an attempt to adopting child centered activities preparing and following daily schedule. They were found to have engaged with the children meaningfully in games or sports, singing songs, alphabetical reading and writing.

The facilitators were found to have interacted with the children in group or with individual and instructed healthy habits and hygiene. They were found to have attempted to develop the social behaviors of children. They were found to have general understanding of child growth and development with knowledge about how children learn and develop through play way methods; they had, to some extent, a competency of developing caring relationship with each child, respecting each child's culture and nature/characteristics.

Maximum numbers of ECCD facilitators were found to have assessed children's development through collection of information on children's behaviors. They were found to have been supporting children to improve positive nutritional habits and sanitation or clean environment of eating.

The ECCD facilitators were building relationships with each child with positive, respectful, consistent and calm attitude. They were found to have helped children to demonstrate appropriate expectations and to understand rules and limits.

Learning corners, learning materials, interactive materials on the wall of the classroom, age specific books, and writing materials and other related reference materials, outdoor playing materials and student information were neither very poor nor they were properly managed.

## PROBLEMS/CHALLENGES OF FACILITATORS

The ECCD facilitators were under economic/labor exploitation as they have been engaged for longer hours a day with multiple duties and responsibilities with remuneration below the subsistence level. They were also found engaged in teaching upper classes with extra hours but without additional payment or little payment. They were facing a dilemma of continuing or discontinuing the job because of underpayment, less dignity, uncertainty and insecurity combined with overloads causing less motivation, frustration and discourage toward their profession. They have been working with a hope of improvement as most of them had no other alternatives. Some of them were found to have been seeking other alternatives or they were in mood of changing their profession. Thus the ECCD facilitators were less enthusiastic and devoted to the profession to provide quality time to the children.

ECCD facilitators were found to have undefined roles and responsibilities causing overload of works and handling the class without assistant. This situation may have led them to provide little quality time to engaging children meaningfully in learning.

Proper monitoring and supervision of ECCD centers from the head teachers and resource persons was nearly absent. The Resource Persons (RPs) were unable to supervise the centers because of their already overloaded work of supervising and monitoring many other programs.

The infrastructural facilities in most of the ECCD centers were sub-standard as most of them were running without enough spaces of sitting, sleeping and eating. Inadequate space for indoor as well as outdoor games and sports, unsafe drinking water and no or poor toilet facilities marked the centers.

In most of the cases, the facilitators were using old toys and puzzles made at the time of training. The materials provided by I/NGOs were found to have been used only occasionally.

## CHILD DEVELOPMENT

- ECCD children were found to have been changing their social behavior (greeting, obeying, and so on) positively. They were found to have changed their health habits and hygiene observed through practices as washing hands, using toilets, using soap and so on.
- Most of the children were able to read and write the alphabets and numerals to some extent. Further, they were able to say the names of self and friends and days of the week.
- The children demonstrated either little ability or inability in drawing pictures according to their own interest, matching pictures and word cards, telling the names of games, playing friendly, and communicating in two way with friends/ teachers.

## CONCLUSIONS

ECCD centers appear as the shadowed educational structures in terms of improving the adverse situation of learning for the children. The ECCD children are denied access to quality services from the facilitators because of a number of problems or challenges they are facing. The facilitators are aware on engaging children through play way methods though, to some extent. But insufficient learning materials and poor infrastructural management of ECCD centers are creating obstacles for demonstrating their knowledge and skills at the practice level.

The ECCD facilitators are facing dilemma of continuing or discontinuing their profession because of underpayment, less dignity, uncertain future or insecure future and overloaded works. This dilemma has further caused little encouragement, motivation, devotion and enthusiasm in the ECCD facilitators to work intently for providing quality services to the children on one hand and leaving them expecting such service for themselves on the other. It is despite a number of adversities faced by the facilitators, they have brought some positive changes in the behaviors of children though.

The ECCD facilitators have expectations of making their profession more dignified and respectful if they are treated as primary level teachers. They have expected more to improve the infrastructure of the centers in order to create child friendly environment in and out of the centers. Further, they are in expectation to improve their competencies through frequent refresher trainings. Availability of the needed resources as support strategy is expected to help them engage the children in a meaningful way.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Recommendations to the Government

The ECCD facilitators' remuneration and incentives need to be increased or equated with the level of primary school teachers; it is more so when the centers are in the process of merging in the schools.

- An assistant/Aaya needs to be employed to reduce the work burden of the facilitators so that they can engage themselves meaningfully for children's overall development.
- Provisions for scholarships and incentives to the ECCD children such as dress, tiffin, and stationery support will not only attract them to the centers but also motivate them to stay there.
- The government should allocate sufficient budget for the management of ECCD centers such as for building construction, learning materials, and creating child friendly environment in and out of the centers.
- The government in collaboration with I/NGOs should provide regularly trainings and refresher trainings to the facilitators in order to update their skills.
- There should be a strong inbuilt mechanism of monitoring and follow up support to the ECCD facilitators to maintain the efficacy of ECCD centers. Monitoring, follow up and supervision should be basically facilitated at the local level with the support from the DEO.

### Recommendations to the Civil Society Organizations

The stakeholders like head teachers, facilitators, and ECCD center management committee members as well as parents are to be empowered in matters of teaching pedagogies and learning strategies with a view to the needs of the ECCD children.

The support either from the government or from the I/NGOs needs to concentrate more on infrastructure development , learning materials, trainings, and development of child friendly environment in and out of the ECCD centers.

The ECCD center management committee should be made more functional, representative and effective by selecting candidates more on their devotion and professional strength rather than on their political affiliation.

The need of parental education is there to train them about their roles and responsibilities of parenthood so far as the education of their children is concerned.

## REFERENCES

- Axinn, W. G., & Pearce, L. D. (2006). *Mixed method data collection strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Children-Women In Social Service and Human Rights (2011). *Gharelu shrum: Sammanit shrum*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Children-Women In Social Service and Human Rights (n. d.). *Bal Samrakchhyan haate pustika*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Center for Victims of Torture (2004). *Violence against children in Nepal series 2: A study of the system of school discipline in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Department of Education (2010). *National minimum standard for ECCD Centers-2010*. Bhaktapur: Author.
- Department of Education (2014). *Flash report, 2014*. Kathmandu: Author.
- General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions (2011). *Isolated within the walls*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Government of Nepal (2007). *The interim constitution of Nepal, 2007*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Government of Nepal (1999). *Local self governance act, (2055) 1999*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Government of Nepal (1971). *Education act, 1971*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Government of Nepal (2002). *Education rules, 2002*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Government of Nepal (2009). *School sector reform plan, 2009-2015*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Government of Nepal (2000). *Child labor (prohibition and regulation) act, 2056 (2000)*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Government of Nepal (1992). *Labor act, 2048 (1992)*. Kathmandu: Author.
- International Labor Office (1999). *Worst forms of child labor convention, 1999 (No. 182)*. Geneva: Author.
- International Labor Office (1973). *Minimum age convention, 1973 (No. 138)*. Geneva: Author.
- International Labor Office (2012). *Working hours in domestic work*. Geneva: Author.
- International Labor Organization (2010). *Moving towards descent work of domestic workers: An overview of ILO's work. Working Paper 2/2010*.
- InSites (2007). *Tips for analyzing qualitative data*. Retrieved on November 28, 2012 from [http://www.insites.org/CLIP\\_v1\\_site/downloads/PDFs/TipsAnalzQualData.5D.8-07.pdf](http://www.insites.org/CLIP_v1_site/downloads/PDFs/TipsAnalzQualData.5D.8-07.pdf)
- InsightShare (n. d.). *Orientation to rights-based approach*. Retrieved on November 10, 2013 from [http://www.insites.org/CLIP\\_v1\\_site](http://www.insites.org/CLIP_v1_site)
- International Labor Organization (2001). *Nepal situation of domestic child labourers in Kathmandu: A rapid assessment. Investigating the Worst Forms of Child Labour No. 3*
- Lloyd-Evans, S. (2006). *Focus groups*. In V. Desai, & R. B. Potter (Eds.), *Doing development research*, (pp. 151-162). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Lalitpur Sub-Metropolitan (2013). *Lalitpur Sub-Metropolitan city: Budget, 2013*. Lalitpur: Author.
- Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Transformative mixed method research. Qualitative Inquiry*. DOI: 10.1177/1077800410364612, <http://qix.sagepub.com/content/16/6/469>
- Ministry of Local Development (2011). *Child friendly local governance (CFLG): Operational guideline*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Ministry of Local Development (2011). *Child friendly local governance (CFLG): National strategy*. Kathmandu: Author.
- Ministry of Education (2001). *Education for all national plan of action, 2001-15*. Kathmandu: Author.
- ITUC (2010). *Decent work, decent life for domestic workers*. Retrieved from <http://ituc.com.np/content/15/23.pdf>.
- Sullivan, T. J. (2001). *Methods of social research*. New York: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Simon, D. (2006). *Your questions answered? Conducting questionnaire surveys*. In V. Desai, & R. B. Potter (Eds.), *Doing development research*, (pp. 163-171), London: Sage Publications.
- United Nations (1990). *Convention on the rights of child, 1990*. Geneva: Author.
- United Nations (1966). *International covenant on economic, social and cultural rights 1966*. Geneva: Author.
- Axinn, W. G., & Pearce, L. D. (2006). *Mixed method data collection strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2010). *Mixed methods research: Merging theory with practice*. New York and London: Guilford Press:
- InSites (2007). *Tips for analyzing qualitative data*. Retrieved on November 28, 2012 from [http://www.insites.org/CLIP\\_v1\\_site/downloads/PDFs/TipsAnalzQualData.5D.8-07.pdf](http://www.insites.org/CLIP_v1_site/downloads/PDFs/TipsAnalzQualData.5D.8-07.pdf)
- Lloyd-Evans, S. (2006). *Focus groups*. In V. Desai, & R. B. Potter (Eds.), *Doing development research*, (pp. 151-162). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Philosophy of mixed methods teaching: The transformative paradigm as illustration. International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches* 4: 9-18.
- Meulen, E. (2011). *Participatory and action-oriented dissertations: The challenges and importance of community-engaged graduate research. The Qualitative Report*, 16(5) 1291-1303.
- Pande, B. D. (2009). *Improving quality of early childhood development programs in Nepal. Journal of Early Childhood Development*, 38-46
- Shrestha, K. (2002). *Early childhood development: What is it? What are the recent trends and what are the challenges confronting its development in Nepal? Journal of Early Childhood Development*, 1-8. Kathmandu: CERID
- Simon, D. (2006). *Your questions answered? Conducting questionnaire surveys*. In V. Desai, & R. B. Potter (Eds.), *Doing development research*, (pp. 163-171), London: Sage Publications.
- Terrell, S. R. (2012). *Mixed method research methodologies. The Qualitative Report*, 17 (1), 254-280, <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR17-1/terrell.pdf>

# ANNEXES

## Annex I: Quantitative Information

**Table 1: Distribution of Sampled ECCD Centers**

Name of District			Types of ECCD Centers		Total
			Community Based	School Based	
Parsa	Urban	27 (15.5)	4(10.0)	23(16.5)	84(47)
	Rural	57(32.0)	11(28.0)	46(33.0)	
Surkhet	Urban	37(20.5)	12(30.5)	25(18.0)	94(53)
	Rural	57(32.0)	12(30.5)	45(32.5)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>178 (100)</b>		<b>39(100)</b>	<b>139(100)</b>	<b>178(100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 2: Demographic Characteristic of ECCD Facilitators**

District	Sex			Marital Status			Permanency		
	M	F	T	Married	Unmarried	T	Resident	Outsider	T
Parsa	-	84 (100.0)	84	81	3	84	65	19	84
Surkhet	-	94 (100)	(100.0)	(96.4)	(3.6)	(100.0)	(77.4)	(22.6)	(100.0)
	-	178 (100.0)	9	89	5	94	91	3	94

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 3: Demographic Characteristic of ECCD Facilitators (Age)**

Age Group	Districts		Total
	Parsa	Surkhet	
15 -20	-	1(1.0)	1(0.6)
20 -25	15 (18.0)	7(7.4)	22(12.4)
25 – 30	23(27.5)	22(23.5)	45(25.3)
30 – 35	24(28.5)	34(36.2)	58(32.5)
35 -40	13(15.0)	16(17.0)	29(16.3)
40 -45	5(6.0)	11(11.7)	16(9.0)

45 – 50	4(5.0)	3(3.2)	7(3.9)
<b>Total</b>	<b>84(100.0)</b>	<b>94(100.0)</b>	<b>178(100.0)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 4: Demographic Characteristic of ECCD Facilitators (Ethnicity)**

Ethnicity	Districts		Total
	Parsa	Surkhet	
Brahman/ Chhetri Community	23 (27.4)	64(68.0)	87(48.8)
Madheshi community	43(51.2)	-	43(24.2)
Tharu/ Chaudhari Community	12(14.2)	4(4.2)	16(9.0)
Janjati Community	5(6.0)	14(15.0)	19(10.7)
Muslim community	1(1.2)	1(1.1)	2(1.1)
Dalit community	-	11(11.7)	11(6.2)
<b>Total</b>	<b>84(100.0)</b>	<b>94(100.0)</b>	<b>178(100.0)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 5: Demographic Characteristic of ECCD Facilitators (Language Spoken)**

Language Spoken	Districts		Total
	Parsa	Surkhet	
Nepali	26 (31.0)	90(95.7)	116(65.2)
Bhojpuri	58(69.0)	-	58(32.6)
Tharu	-	3(3.2)	3(1.6)
Tamang	-	1(1.1)	1(0.6)
<b>Total</b>	<b>84(100.0)</b>	<b>94(100.0)</b>	<b>178(100.0)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 6: Academic Qualification of ECCD Facilitators**

Academic Qualification	Districts		Total
	Parsa	Surkhet	
Grade 8	6 (7.1)	7(7.4)	13(7.3)
Test pass	9(10.7)	14(15.0)	23(13.0)
SLC	41(48.8)	41(43.6)	82(46.1)
10 +2 in education	15(17.9)	12(12.8)	27(15.1)
10 +2 other than education	8(9.5)	17(18.0)	25(14.0)
more than +2	5(6.0)	3(3.2)	8(4.5)
<b>Total</b>	<b>84(100.0)</b>	<b>94(100.0)</b>	<b>178(100.0)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 7: Condition of Training Obtained by the Facilitators**

Training period	Districts		Total
	Parsa	Surkhet	
Below 5 days ( refresher training)	31(37.0)	38(40.4)	69(38.7)
5 -10 days	77(91.6)	93(98.9)	170(95.5)
10 -15 days	18(21.4)	23(24.5)	42(23.6)
More than 15 days	12(15.0)	12(12.7)	24(12.5)

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 8: Years of Experience of the Facilitators**

Experience in Year	Districts		Total
	Parsa	Surkhet	
Below 5 days ( refresher training)	31(37.0)	38(40.4)	69(38.7)
5 -10 days	77(91.6)	93(98.9)	170(95.5)
10 -15 days	18(21.4)	23(24.5)	42(23.6)
More than 15 days	12(15.0)	12(12.7)	24(12.5)
<b>Total</b>	<b>84(100.0)</b>	<b>94(100.0)</b>	<b>178(100.0)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 9: Condition of Work Load for the Facilitators**

Working Hours per Day	Districts		Total
	Parsa	Surkhet	
3	3(3.6)	24(25.5)	27(15.1)
4	45(53.5)	60(63.8)	105(59.0)
5	21(25.0)	8(8.5)	29(16.3)
6	15(17.9)	2(2.2)	17(9.6)
<b>Total</b>	<b>84(100.0)</b>	<b>94(100.0)</b>	<b>178(100.0)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 10: Economic Support for the Facilitators**

Remuneration per Month	Districts		Total
	(In NPR)	Surkhet	
2000	4(4.8)	-	4(2.2)
3000	79(94.0)	88(93.6)	167(93.8)
4000	1(1.2)	5(5.3)	6(3.4)
More than 5000	-	1(1.1)	1(0.6)
<b>Total</b>	<b>84(100.0)</b>	<b>94(100.0)</b>	<b>178(100.0)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 11: Condition of Additional Work Load in School**

Additional Work	Districts		Total
	(In NPR)	Surkhet	
Additional 1 class in upper grade	14	6	20
Additional 2 classes in upper grade	16	8	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>44</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 12: Additional Economic Support for Extra Work**

Remuneration per Month (In NPR)	Districts		Total
	(In NPR)	Surkhet	
500 -1000	4	3	
1000- 2000	3	2	
2000 -3000	-	3	
More than 3000	-	2	
Total	7	10	

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 13: Gender and Social Status wise distribution of Children of Sampled ECCDC**

Districts	Gender		Total	Social Status	
	Boys	Girls		Upper caste including Janjati	Lower Caste
Parsa	1203(48.6)	1273(51.4)	2476(100.0)	1587(64.1)	889(35.9)
Surkhet	996(46.6)	1143(53.4)	2139(100.0)	1426(66.6)	713(33.3)
Total	2199(47.7)	2416(52.3)	4615(100.0)	3013(65.3)	1602(34.7)

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 14: Knowledge about Characteristics of Child Development**

Competencies	Districts	Location	Level of Competency			
			High	Moderate	Low	Total
General understanding of child growth and development of age 3 – 5 years.	Parsa	U	5 (18.5)	19(70.4)	3(11.1)	27 (100)
		R	18(31.6)	37(64.9)	2(3.5)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>23(27.3)</b>	<b>56 (66.7)</b>	<b>5 (6.0)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	10(27.0)	27(73.0)	-	37(100)
		R	14(24.6)	42(73.7)	1(1.7)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>24 (25.5)</b>	<b>69 (73.4)</b>	<b>1 (1.1)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Knowledge about how children learn and develop through play	Parsa	U	2 (7.4)	21(77.7)	4(14.9)	27(100)
		R	17(29.8)	39(68.4)	1(1.8)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>19(22.6)</b>	<b>60(71.4)</b>	<b>5(6.0)</b>	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	16(43.2)	21(56.8)	-	37(100)
		R	18(31.6)	34(59.6)	5(8.8)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>34(36.1)</b>	<b>55(58.5)</b>	<b>5(5.4)</b>	<b>94(100)</b>
Capacity of developing caring relationship with each child	Parsa	U	11(40.7)	14(51.8)	2(7.5)	27(100)
		R	15(26.3)	41(71.9)	1(1.8)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>26(31.0)</b>	<b>55(65.5)</b>	<b>3(3.5)</b>	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	19(51.4)	15(40.5)	3(8.1)	37(100)
		R	44(77.2)	13(22.8)	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>63(67.1)</b>	<b>28(29.8)</b>	<b>3(3.1)</b>	<b>94(100)</b>
Respect each child's culture.	Parsa	<b>U</b>	11(40.7)	13(48.1)	3(11.2)	27(100)
		<b>R</b>	23(40.4)	32(56.1)	2(3.5)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>34(40.5)</b>	<b>45(53.5)</b>	<b>5(6.0)</b>	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	21(56.7)	15(40.5)	1(1.8)	37(100)
		R	40(70.1)	15(26.3)	2(3.6)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>61(64.9)</b>	<b>30(30.0)</b>	<b>3(3.1)</b>	<b>94(100)</b>
Respect each child's nature/ characteristics	Parsa	U	10(37.0)	15(55.5)	2(7.4)	27(100)
		R	18(31.6)	36(63.1)	3(5.3)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>28(33.3)</b>	<b>51(60.7)</b>	<b>5(6.0)</b>	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	21(56.7)	16(43.3)	-	37(100)
		R	34(59.6)	19(33.3)	4(7.1)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>55(58.5)</b>	<b>35(37.2)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	<b>94(100)</b>

Table 15: Observation and Assessment of Child Development

Competencies	Districts	Location	Level of Competency					Total
			Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	
Records daily information about each child's routines (diapering, sleeping, and eating)	Parsa	U	9(33.3)	12(44.4)	6(22.3)	-	-	27 (100)
		R	17(29.8)	25(43.8)	12(21.1)	2(3.5)	1(1.8)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>26(31.0)</b>	<b>37(44.1)</b>	<b>18(21.4)</b>	<b>2(2.3)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	15(40.5)	16(43.2)	6(16.3)	-	-	37(100)
		R	30(52.6)	18(31.8)	6(10.5)	2(3.4)	1(1.7)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>45(47.8)</b>	<b>34(36.2)</b>	<b>12(12.8)</b>	<b>2(2.1)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Shares the child activities with his/her parents.	Parsa	U	4(14.8)	12(45.0)	10(37.0)	1(3.7)	-	27(100)
		R	13(22.8)	21(36.8)	23(40.4)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>17(20.2)</b>	<b>33(39.3)</b>	<b>33(39.3)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	8(21.6)	24(64.8)	5(13.6)	-	-	37(100)
		R	21(36.8)	20(35.1)	15(26.3)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>29(30.8)</b>	<b>44(46.8)</b>	<b>20(21.4)</b>	-	-	<b>94(100)</b>
Handles individual child understanding his/her pace.	Parsa	U	9(33.3)	13(48.2)	4(14.8)	1(3.7)	-	27(100)
		R	18(31.6)	26(45.6)	12(21.1)	1(1.7)	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>27(32.1)</b>	<b>39(46.4)</b>	<b>16(19.1)</b>	<b>2(2.4)</b>	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	16(43.2)	20(54.1)	1(2.7)	-	-	37(100)
		R	32(56.2)	17(29.8)	6(10.6)	1(1.7)	1(1.7)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>48(51.1)</b>	<b>37(39.4)</b>	<b>7(7.3)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>94(100)</b>
Keeps assessment information confidential	Parsa	U	6(22.2)	4(14.8)	6(22.2)	11(40.8)	-	27(100)
		R	11(19.3)	20(35.1)	4(7.0)	11(19.3)	11(19.3)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>17(20.2)</b>	<b>24(28.5)</b>	<b>10(11.9)</b>	<b>22(26.2)</b>	<b>11(13.2)</b>	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	15(40.5)	12(44.4)	5(18.5)	3(11.1)	2(7.5)	37(100)
		R	25(43.8)	15(26.3)	4(7.0)	5(8.8)	8(14.1)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>40(42.5)</b>	<b>27(28.7)</b>	<b>9(9.5)</b>	<b>8(8.6)</b>	<b>10(10.7)</b>	<b>94(100)</b>

**Table 16: Condition of Using Curriculum and Maintaining Learning Environment**

Competencies	Districts	Location	Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Follows daily schedule of specific activities for children	Parsa	U	15(55.5)	4(14.8)	8(29.7)	-	-	27 (100)
		R	26(45.6)	30(52.6)	-	1(1.8)	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>41(48.8)</b>	<b>34(40.5)</b>	<b>8(9.5)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	23(62.2)	13(35.1)	1(2.7)	-	-	37(100)
		R	45(79.0)	9(15.8)	2(3.4)	1(1.8)	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>68(72.3)</b>	<b>22(23.4)</b>	<b>3(3.2)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Gives children choices of activities	Parsa	U	11(40.7)	7(26.0)	8(29.6)	1(3.7)	-	27(100)
		R	20(35.1)	25(43.8)	12(21.1)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>31(37.0)</b>	<b>32(38.0)</b>	<b>20(23.8)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	19(51.3)	18(48.7)	-	-	-	37(100)
		R	31(54.4)	13(22.8)	12(21.0)	-	1(1.8)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>50(53.2)</b>	<b>31(33.0)</b>	<b>12(12.7)</b>	-	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>94(100)</b>
Makes daily, weekly, monthly, and long-range curriculum plans	Parsa	U	5(18.5)	4(14.8)	15(55.5)	3(5.2)	-	27(100)
		R	16(28.1)	24(42.1)	16(28.0)	1(1.8)	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>21(25.0)</b>	<b>28(33.3)</b>	<b>31(37.0)</b>	<b>4(4.7)</b>	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	9(24.3)	17(46.0)	8(21.6)	2(5.4)	1(1.7)	37(100)
		R	17(30.0)	14(24.5)	16(28.1)	5(8.7)	5(8.7)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>26(27.6)</b>	<b>31(33.0)</b>	<b>24(25.6)</b>	<b>7(7.4)</b>	<b>6(6.4)</b>	<b>94(100)</b>

Table 17: Promoting Social and Emotional Development

Competencies	Districts	Location	Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Engages in conversations on important thing with children	Parsa	U	11(40.7)	9(33.3)	7(26.0)	-	-	27(100)
		R	15(26.3)	35(61.4)	7(12.3)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>26(31.0)</b>	<b>44(52.4)</b>	<b>14(16.6)</b>	-	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	18(48.6)	15(40.6)	4(10.8)	-	-	37(100)
		R	34(59.6)	21(36.8)	2(3.6)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>52(55.3)</b>	<b>36(38.3)</b>	<b>6(6.4)</b>	-	-	<b>94(100)</b>
Helps children to develop friendship with each other	Parsa	U	13(48.1)	11(40.8)	3(11.1)	-	-	27(100)
		R	22(38.6)	28(49.1)	7(12.3)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>35(41.5)</b>	<b>39(46.3)</b>	<b>10(12.0)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	24(64.9)	10(27.0)	3(8.1)	-	-	37(100)
		R	42(73.7)	13(22.8)	2(3.5)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>66(70.2)</b>	<b>23(24.5)</b>	<b>5(5.3)</b>	-	-	<b>94(100)</b>
Helps children to label and express their feelings	Parsa	U	9(33.3)	11(40.7)	7(26.0)	-	-	27(100)
		R	20(35.1)	25(43.8)	12(21.0)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>29(34.5)</b>	<b>36(42.8)</b>	<b>19(22.7)</b>	-	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	22(59.4)	11(29.8)	4(10.8)	-	-	37(100)
		R	41(72.0)	11(19.3)	5(8.7)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>63(67.0)</b>	<b>22(23.4)</b>	<b>9(9.6)</b>	-	-	<b>94(100)</b>
Shows and encourage empathy and respect for children and other adults.	Parsa	U	15(55.5)	4(14.8)	7(26.0)	1(3.7)	-	27(100)
		R	17(29.8)	35(61.4)	2(3.5)	3(5.3)	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>32(38.1)</b>	<b>39(46.4)</b>	<b>9(10.7)</b>	<b>4(4.8)</b>	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	16(43.2)	1(2.7)	15(40.5)	5(13.6)	-	37(100)
		R	39(68.4)	-	9(15.8)	8(14.0)	1(1.8)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>55(58.5)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>24(25.5)</b>	<b>13(13.8)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>94(100)</b>

**Table 18: Nutritional Promotion of the Children**

Competencies	Districts	Location	Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Supports children to handle food safely	Parsa	R	22 (38.6)	23(40.3)	11(19.3)	1(1.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	11(40.7)	13(48.2)	3(11.1)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>33(39.3)</b>	<b>36(42.8)</b>	<b>14(16.7)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	48(84.2)	7(12.3)	-	2(3.5)	-	57 (100)
		U	26(70.3)	10(27.0)	1(2.7)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>74(78.6)</b>	<b>17(18.1)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Discourages junk food and encourage homemade healthy foods.	Parsa	R	26(45.6)	24(42.1)	6(10.5)	1(1.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	8(29.6)	16(59.3)	2(7.4)	1(3.7)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>34(40.8)</b>	<b>40(47.6)</b>	<b>8(8.3)</b>	<b>2(2.3)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	43(75.4)	11(19.3)	1(1.8)	2(3.5)	-	57 (100)
		U	17(46.0)	15(40.5)	5(13.5)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>60(63.8)</b>	<b>26(27.6)</b>	<b>6(6.4)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Creates a pleasant, clean environment for children to eat meals and snacks with their peers	Parsa	R	23(40.3)	24(42.1)	6(10.5)	4(7.0)	-	57 (100)
		U	13(48.1)	12(44.4)	2(7.5)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>36(42.8)</b>	<b>36(42.8)</b>	<b>8(9.5)</b>	<b>4(4.9)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	40(70.2)	13(22.8)	2(3.5)	2(3.5)	-	57 (100)
		U	20(54.0)	16(43.2)	1(2.8)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>60(63.8)</b>	<b>29(30.8)</b>	<b>3(3.2)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>

Table 19: Interactions with Individual Children

Competencies	Districts	Location	Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Positive, respectful, consistent and calm with each child	Parsa	R	30(52.6)	27(47.4)	-	-	-	57 (100)
		U	11(40.7)	16(59.3)	-	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>41(48.8)</b>	<b>43(51.2)</b>	-	-	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	46(80.7)	9(15.8)	2(3.5)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	24(64.9)	13(35.1)	-	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>70(74.5)</b>	<b>22(23.4)</b>	<b>3(3.1)</b>	-	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Demonstrates appropriate expectations of each child	Parsa	R	22(38.6)	28(49.1)	6(10.5)	1(1.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	8(29.6)	14(51.8)	3(11.1)	2(7.5)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>30(35.7)</b>	<b>42(50.0)</b>	<b>9(10.7)</b>	<b>3(3.6)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	33(57.9)	16(28.1)	8(14.0)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	21(56.7)	16(43.3)	-	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>54(57.4)</b>	<b>32(34.0)</b>	<b>8(8.6)</b>	-	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Helps children understand rules and limits	Parsa	R	28(49.1)	22(38.6)	6(10.5)	1(1.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	9(33.3)	13(48.1)	5(18.6)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>37(44.0)</b>	<b>35(41.7)</b>	<b>11(13.1)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	38(66.7)	16(28.1)	3(5.2)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	20(54.0)	15(40.5)	2(5.5)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>58(61.7)</b>	<b>31(33.0)</b>	<b>5(5.3)</b>	-	-	<b>94 (100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

Table 20: Promoting Physical and Cognitive Development

Competencies	Districts	Location	Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Provides physical activity to all the children during the day	Parsa	U	12(44.4)	10(37.0)	5(18.6)	-	-	27 (100)
		R	23(40.3)	29(50.9)	5(8.8)	-	-	57 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>35(41.7)</b>	<b>39(46.4)</b>	<b>10(12.0)</b>	-	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	19(51.4)	12(32.4)	6(16.2)	-	-	37 (100)
		R	40(70.2)	10(17.5)	2(3.5)	3(5.3)	2(3.5)	57 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>59(62.7)</b>	<b>22(23.4)</b>	<b>8(8.5)</b>	<b>3(3.2)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Takes part in children's indoors and outdoors activities	Parsa	U	12(44.4)	10(37.0)	5(13.6)	-	-	27(100)
		R	16(28.1)	36(63.2)	5(8.7)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>28(33.3)</b>	<b>46(54.7)</b>	<b>10(12.0)</b>	-	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	15(40.5)	17(46.0)	5(13.5)	-	-	37(100)
		R	25(43.8)	21(36.8)	11(19.4)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>40(42.5)</b>	<b>38(40.4)</b>	<b>16(17.0)</b>	-	-	<b>94(100)</b>
Provides opportunities for hands-on active learning throughout the day	Parsa	U	7(26.0)	14(52.0)	6(22.0)	-	-	27(100)
		R	20(35.1)	27(43.4)	10(17.5)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>27(32.2)</b>	<b>41(48.8)</b>	<b>16(19.0)</b>	-	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	15(40.5)	17(46.0)	3(8.1)	2(5.4)	-	37(100)
		R	32(56.1)	16(28.1)	5(8.8)	2(3.5)	2(3.5)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>47(50.0)</b>	<b>33(35.1)</b>	<b>8(8.5)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	<b>94(100)</b>
Encourages children to ask questions.	Parsa	U	14(51.8)	8(29.6)	5(18.6)	-	-	27(100)
		R	14(24.6)	31(54.4)	12(21.0)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>28(33.3)</b>	<b>39(46.4)</b>	<b>17(20.3)</b>	-	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	21(56.7)	15(40.5)	1(2.8)	-	-	37(100)
		R	30(52.6)	21(36.8)	4(7.0)	2(3.6)	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>51(54.2)</b>	<b>36(38.3)</b>	<b>5(5.3)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	-	<b>94(100)</b>
Asks children open-ended questions	Parsa	U	8(29.6)	11(40.7)	7(26.0)	1(3.7)	-	27(100)
		R	9(15.8)	30(52.6)	15(26.3)	-	3(5.3)	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>17(20.2)</b>	<b>41(48.8)</b>	<b>22(26.2)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	<b>3(3.6)</b>	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	13(35.1)	10(27.0)	13(35.1)	1(2.8)	-	37(100)
		R	19(33.3)	22(38.6)	14(24.6)	2(3.5)	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>32(34.0)</b>	<b>32(34.0)</b>	<b>27(28.7)</b>	<b>3(3.3)</b>	-	<b>94(100)</b>

Actively listens to children's comments and responds appropriately	Parsa	U	11(40.7)	7(26.0)	9(33.3)		-	27(100)
		R	19(33.3)	26(45.7)	12(21.0)		-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>30(35.7)</b>	<b>33(39.3)</b>	<b>21(25.0)</b>		-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	19(51.4)	14(37.8)	4(10.8)		-	37(100)
		R	44(77.2)	12(21.0)	1(1.8)		-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>63(67.0)</b>	<b>26(27.6)</b>	<b>5(5.4)</b>		-	<b>94(100)</b>
Extends children's ideas with questions or thoughts	Parsa	U	7(26.0)	12(44.4)	8(29.6)	-	-	27(100)
		R	9(15.8)	27(43.4)	19(33.3)	2(3.5)	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>16(19.0)</b>	<b>39(46.4)</b>	<b>27(32.1)</b>	<b>2(2.4)</b>	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	12(32.4)	14(37.8)	9(24.3)	2(5.5)	-	37(100)
		R	19(33.3)	26(45.6)	10(17.5)	2(3.5)	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>31(33.0)</b>	<b>40(42.5)</b>	<b>19(20.2)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	-	<b>94(100)</b>
Encourages playing	Parsa	U	13(48.1)	11(40.8)	3(11.1)	-	-	27(100)
		R	15(26.3)	24(42.1)	9(15.8)	9(15.8)	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>28(33.3)</b>	<b>35(41.7)</b>	<b>12(14.3)</b>	<b>9(10.7)</b>	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	U	20(54.0)	12(32.4)	5(13.6)	-	-	37(100)
		R	36(63.2)	16(28.1)	5(8.7)	-	-	57(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>56(59.6)</b>	<b>28(29.8)</b>	<b>10(10.6)</b>	-	-	<b>94(100)</b>
Understands children learn through play.	Parsa	<b>U</b>	<b>9(33.4)</b>	<b>15(55.5)</b>	<b>3(11.1)</b>	-	-	<b>27(100)</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>18(31.6)</b>	<b>38(66.7)</b>	<b>1(1.7)</b>	-	-	<b>57(100)</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>27(32.2)</b>	<b>53(63.1)</b>	<b>3(3.7)</b>	-	-	<b>84(100)</b>
	Surkhet	<b>U</b>	<b>19(51.4)</b>	<b>14(37.8)</b>	<b>4(10.8)</b>	-	-	<b>37(100)</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>45(79.0)</b>	<b>12(21.0)</b>	-	-	-	<b>57(100)</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>64(68.1)</b>	<b>26(27.6)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	-	-	<b>94(100)</b>

**Table 21: Promoting Language and Literacy Development**

Competencies	Districts	Location	Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Provides age appropriate book and writing materials for children's use.	Parsa	R	13 (22.8)	22(38.6)	20(35.1)	2(3.5)	-	57 (100)
		U	10(37.0)	12(44.4)	4(14.8)	1(3.8)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>23(27.4)</b>	<b>34(40.7)</b>	<b>24(28.5)</b>	<b>3(3.5)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	25(43.8)	21(36.8)	5(8.8)	3(5.3)	3(5.3)	57 (100)
		U	17(46.0)	14(37.8)	3(8.1)	3(8.1)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>42(44.7)</b>	<b>35(37.2)</b>	<b>8(8.5)</b>	<b>6(6.4)</b>	<b>3(3.2)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Talks with children both individually and in groups.	Parsa	R	15(26.3)	26(45.6)	12(21.0)	4(7.0)	-	57 (100)
		U	10(37.0)	11(40.7)	6(22.2)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>25(29.8)</b>	<b>37(44.0)</b>	<b>18(21.4)</b>	<b>4(4.8)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	28(49.2)	21(36.8)	8(14.0)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	11(29.7)	18(48.6)	8(14.0)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>39(41.5)</b>	<b>39(41.5)</b>	<b>16(17.0)</b>	-	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Encourages children to communicate with each other and with adults.	Parsa	R	10(17.5)	20(35.0)	22(38.7)	4(7.0)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	4(14.8)	15(55.5)	7(26.0)	1(3.7)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>14(16.6)</b>	<b>35(41.7)</b>	<b>29(35.5)</b>	<b>5(6.0)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	17(29.8)	24(42.1)	15(26.3)	1(1.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	8(21.6)	19(51.4)	10(27.0)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>25(26.6)</b>	<b>43(45.7)</b>	<b>25(26.6)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Uses appropriate varieties of books, songs, rhymes and games with individuals and groups	Parsa	R	14(24.6)	22(38.6)	17(29.8)	3(5.3)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	8(29.6)	11(40.7)	5(18.5)	3(11.1)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>22(26.2)</b>	<b>33(39.3)</b>	<b>22(26.2)</b>	<b>6(7.1)</b>	<b>11.2()</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	15(26.4)	19(33.3)	10(17.5)	5(8.8)	8(14.0)	57 (100)
		U	11(29.7)	13(35.1)	8(21.6)	5(8.8)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>26(27.6)</b>	<b>32(34.0)</b>	<b>18(19.2)</b>	<b>10(10.6)</b>	<b>8(8.6)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Expands children's vocabulary through conversation, materials, and activities	Parsa	R	10(17.5)	28(49.1)	16(28.1)	3(5.3)	-	57 (100)
		U	6(22.2)	12(44.5)	6(22.2)	3(11.1)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>16(19.0)</b>	<b>40(47.6)</b>	<b>22(26.2)</b>	<b>6(7.1)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	19(33.3)	25(43.9)	6(10.5)	6(10.5)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	14(37.9)	15(40.5)	6(16.2)	2(5.4)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>33(35.1)</b>	<b>40(42.5)</b>	<b>12(12.8)</b>	<b>8(8.5)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Asks children to point out written words in the classroom	Parsa	R	18(31.6)	19(33.3)	12(21.0)	7(12.3)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	12(44.4)	9(33.3)	3(11.1)	2(7.5)	1(3.7)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>30(35.7)</b>	<b>28(33.3)</b>	<b>15(17.8)</b>	<b>9(10.7)</b>	<b>2(2.5)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	36(63.2)	12(21.0)	6(10.5)	2(3.5)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	16(43.2)	16(43.3)	3(8.1)	2(5.4)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>52(55.2)</b>	<b>28(29.8)</b>	<b>9(9.6)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Tells story based on theme and let child retell the	Parsa	R	15(26.3)	17(29.8)	20(35.1)	5(8.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	10(37.0)	8(29.6)	9(33.3)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>25(29.7)</b>	<b>25(29.8)</b>	<b>29(34.5)</b>	<b>5(6.0)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	22(38.6)	13(22.8)	21(36.8)	1(1.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	8(21.6)	18(48.7)	9(24.3)	1(2.7)	1(2.7)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>30(32.0)</b>	<b>31(33.0)</b>	<b>30(32.0)</b>	<b>2(2.0)</b>	<b>1(1.0)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

Table 22: Health Promotion of the Children

Competencies	Districts	Location	Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Explains communicable diseases	Parsa	R	23 (40.3)	27(43.4)	5(8.8)	2(3.5)	-	57 (100)
		U	9(33.3)	15(55.6)	3(11.1)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>32(38.1)</b>	<b>42(51.2)</b>	<b>8(9.4)</b>	<b>2(2.3)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	20(35.4)	26(45.4)	11(19.2)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	14(37.8)	15(40.5)	8(21.7)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>34(36.1)</b>	<b>41(43.6)</b>	<b>19(20.3)</b>	-	-	<b>94 (100)</b>

Performs a daily general health check on each child	Parsa	R	25(43.8)	16(28.2)	8(14.0)	8(14.0)	-	57 (100)
		U	9(33.3)	16(59.3)	2(7.4)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>34(40.3)</b>	<b>32(38.1)</b>	<b>10(12.0)</b>	<b>8(9.4)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	29(50.8)	21(36.8)	5(8.8)	1(1.8)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	16(43.3)	11(29.7)	10(27.0)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>45(47.8)</b>	<b>32(34.0)</b>	<b>15(16.0)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Washes own hands appropriately with soap and running water.	Parsa	R	43(75.4)	12(21.0)	2(3.6)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	16(59.3)	10(37.0)	1(3.7)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>59(70.2)</b>	<b>22(26.2)</b>	<b>3(3.6)</b>	-	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	51(89.4)	5(8.8)	1(1.8)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	35(94.6)	1(2.7)	1(2.7)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>86(91.4)</b>	<b>6(6.4)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	-	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Teaches children how to wash their hands appropriately	Parsa	R	34(59.6)	21(25.0)	2(2.4)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	14(51.8)	12(44.4)	1(3.8)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>48(57.1)</b>	<b>33(39.3)</b>	<b>3(3.6)</b>	-	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	46(80.7)	8(14.0)	3(5.3)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	26(70.3)	10(27.0)	1(2.7)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>72(76.6)</b>	<b>18(19.1)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	-	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Sanitizes toys/ materials and diapers, toileting, and eating areas regularly	Parsa	R	19(33.3)	26(45.6)	10(17.5)	2(3.4)	-	57 (100)
		U	11(40.7)	10(37.0)	6(22.3)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>30(35.7)</b>	<b>36(42.8)</b>	<b>16(19.0)</b>	<b>2(2.4)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	38(66.7)	11(19.3)	2(3.5)	3(5.3)	3(5.3)	57 (100)
		U	20(54.0)	14(37.8)	3(8.2)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>58(61.7)</b>	<b>25(26.6)</b>	<b>5(5.3)</b>	<b>3(3.2)</b>	<b>3(3.2)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Table 23: Safety Promotion of the Children

Competencies	Districts	Location	Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Follows emergency and disaster procedures	Parsa	R	25(43.8)	17(29.8)	9(15.8)	5(6.8)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	6(22.2)	15(55.5)	2(7.4)	4(14.9)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>31(36.8)</b>	<b>32(38.1)</b>	<b>11(13.1)</b>	<b>9(10.7)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	35(61.4)	17(29.8)	4(7.0)	1(1.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	20(54.0)	13(35.1)	4(10.9)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>55(58.5)</b>	<b>30(32.0)</b>	<b>8(8.4)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Checks indoor and outdoor environments for safety hazards	Parsa	R	27(43.4)	23(40.3)	7(12.3)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	9(33.3)	14(51.9)	4(14.8)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>36(42.8)</b>	<b>37(44.0)</b>	<b>11(13.2)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	40(70.2)	12(21.0)	4(7.0)	1(1.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	20(54.0)	16(43.3)	1(2.7)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>60(63.8)</b>	<b>28(29.8)</b>	<b>5(5.3)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
maintains a clean and clutter free space for children to play	Parsa	R	17(29.8)	34(59.6)	6(10.6)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	5(18.5)	18(66.7)	4(14.8)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>22(26.0)</b>	<b>52(62.0)</b>	<b>10(12.0)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	35(61.3)	15(26.3)	3(5.3)	3(5.3)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	20(54.0)	14(37.8)	25(5.4)	-	1(1.8)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>55(58.5)</b>	<b>29(30.8)</b>	<b>5(5.3)</b>	<b>3(3.2)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Makes sure all children are safe at all times	Parsa	R	20(35.1)	32(56.1)	4(7.0)	1(1.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	10(37.0)	9(33.3)	5(18.6)	3(11.1)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>30(35.7)</b>	<b>41(48.8)</b>	<b>9(10.7)</b>	<b>4(4.8)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	27(43.3)	14(24.6)	9(15.8)	5(8.8)	2(3.5)	57 (100)
		U	14(37.9)	10(27.0)	10(27.0)	3(8.1)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>41(43.6)</b>	<b>24(24.5)</b>	<b>19(20.2)</b>	<b>8(8.5)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Demonstrates how to handle various materials like pencil cutter, fire extinguishers and other safety equipment	Parsa	R	21(36.8)	26(45.6)	10(17.5)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	9(33.3)	12(44.4)	5(18.5)	1(3.8)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>30(35.8)</b>	<b>38(45.2)</b>	<b>15(17.8)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	37(65.0)	17(29.8)	3(5.2)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	14(37.8)	15(40.5)	6(16.2)	2(5.3)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>51(54.2)</b>	<b>32(34.0)</b>	<b>9(9.6)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Capacity of doing first aid in common emergency such as bleeding, fracture, burning, electric shock, snake biting, dog biting, frost biting, poisoning etc.	Parsa	R	3(5.1)	24(42.2)	9(15.8)	5(8.8)	16(28.1)	57 (100)
		U	8(29.6)	8(29.6)	6(22.2)	4(14.8)	1(3.8)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>11(13.1)</b>	<b>32(38.1)</b>	<b>15(17.8)</b>	<b>9(10.7)</b>	<b>17(20.3)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	11(19.3)	10(17.5)	11(19.3)	12(21.0)	13(22.8)	57 (100)
		U	4(10.8)	8(21.6)	16(43.2)	7(19.0)	2(5.4)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>15(16.0)</b>	<b>18(19.1)</b>	<b>27(28.7)</b>	<b>19(20.2)</b>	<b>15(16.0)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

Table 24: Group Experiences

Competencies	Districts	Location	Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Helps children to be kind to each other.	Parsa	R	26(45.6)	26(45.6)	5(8.8)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	11(40.7)	16(59.3)	-	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>37(44.0)</b>	<b>42(50.0)</b>	<b>5(6.0)</b>	-	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	41(72.0)	14(24.6)	2(3.4)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	23(62.2)	14(37.8)	-	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>64(68.1)</b>	<b>28(29.8)</b>	<b>2(2.1)</b>	-	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Reacts quickly when disruptive behavior occurs.	Parsa	R	5(8.8)	19(33.3)	23(40.3)	7(12.3)	3(5.3)	57 (100)
		U	3(11.1)	10(37.0)	3(11.2)	10(37.0)	1(3.7)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>8(9.5)</b>	<b>29(34.5)</b>	<b>26(31.0)</b>	<b>17(20.2)</b>	<b>4(4.8)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	4(7.0)	5(8.8)	20(35.1)	13(22.8)	15(26.3)	57 (100)
		U	3(8.1)	9(24.3)	12(32.4)	9(24.3)	4(10.9)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>7(7.6)</b>	<b>14(14.9)</b>	<b>32(34.1)</b>	<b>22(23.1)</b>	<b>19(20.3)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Helps children follow rules and limits	Parsa	R	16(28.1)	29(50.9)	12(21.0)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	8(29.6)	15(55.5)	4(14.8)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>24(28.6)</b>	<b>44(52.4)</b>	<b>16(19.0)</b>	-	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	27(47.4)	24(42.1)	4(7.0)	2(3.5)	-	57 (100)
		U	11(29.7)	25(67.5)	1(2.8)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>38(40.4)</b>	<b>49(52.1)</b>	<b>5(5.3)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Demonstrates consistency and fairness with all children	Parsa	R	27(43.4)	29(50.9)	1(1.7)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	14(51.8)	13(48.2)	-	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>41(48.8)</b>	<b>42(50.0)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	-	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	51(89.5)	5(8.8)	1(1.7)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	30(81.1)	7(19.9)	-	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>81(86.2)</b>	<b>12(12.7)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	-	-	<b>94 (100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

Table 25: Family and Community Relationships

Competencies	Districts	Location	Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Develops good relationship with each child's family	Parsa	R	18 (31.6)	33(57.9)	2(3.5)	3(5.3)	1(1.7)	57 (100)
		U	5(18.5)	20(74.1)	-	2(7.4)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>23(27.4)</b>	<b>53(63.1)</b>	<b>2(2.4)</b>	<b>5(6.0)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	36(63.1)	19(33.3)	1(1.8)	1(1.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	21(56.7)	12(32.4)	3(8.1)	1(2.7)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>57(60.6)</b>	<b>31(33.0)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	<b>2(2.1)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Respects the culture and structure of each family	Parsa	R	21(36.8)	33(57.9)	3(5.3)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	7(26.0)	18(66.7)	2(7.3)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>28(33.3)</b>	<b>51(60.7)</b>	<b>5(6.0)</b>	-	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	37(65.0)	16(28.0)	3(5.2)	1(1.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	24(64.9)	12(32.4)	1(2.7)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>61(64.9)</b>	<b>28(29.7)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>

Respects each family as their child's first teacher	Parsa	R	26(45.6)	27(47.4)	3(5.3)	1(1.7)	-	57 (100)
		U	15(55.5)	8(29.7)	4(14.8)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>41(48.8)</b>	<b>35(41.7)</b>	<b>7(8.3)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	48(84.2)	5(8.8)	3(5.3)	1(1.7)	-	57 (100)
		U	23(62.2)	13(35.1)	1(1.7)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>71(75.5)</b>	<b>18(19.1)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Supports children's relationships with their families	Parsa	R	13(22.8)	34(59.6)	7(12.3)	3(5.3)	-	57 (100)
		U	7(26.0)	16(59.3)	4(14.7)	-	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>20(23.8)</b>	<b>50(59.5)</b>	<b>11(13.1)</b>	<b>3(3.6)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	34(59.6)	21(36.9)	2(3.5)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	15(40.5)	19(51.4)	3(8.1)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>49(52.1)</b>	<b>40(42.5)</b>	<b>5(5.4)</b>	-	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Respects confidentiality	Parsa	R	13(22.8)	29(50.9)	7(12.3)	8(14.0)	-	57 (100)
		U	9(33.3)	10(37.0)	5(18.6)	3(11.1)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>22(26.2)</b>	<b>39(46.4)</b>	<b>12(14.3)</b>	<b>11(13.1)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	31(54.4)	23(40.3)	3(5.3)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	11(29.7)	25(67.5)	1(2.8)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>42(44.7)</b>	<b>48(51.1)</b>	<b>4(4.2)</b>	-	-	<b>94 (100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

Table 26: Professionalism

Competencies	Districts	Location	Extremely	Highly	Moderately	Poorly	Total
Respects and advocates child rights	Parsa	R	14(24.5)	35(61.4)	6(10.5)	2(3.6)	57 (100)
		U	10(37.0)	7(26.0)	7(26.0)	3(11.1)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>24(28.4)</b>	<b>42(50.0)</b>	<b>13(15.6)</b>	<b>5 (6.0)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	32(56.1)	22(38.6)	1(1.8)	2(3.5)	57 (100)
		U	16(43.2)	18(48.7)	3(8.1)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>48(51.1)</b>	<b>40(42.4)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Has a positive attitude toward profession.	Parsa	R	19(33.3)	33(57.9)	3(5.3)	2(3.5)	57 (100)
		U	13(48.1)	5(18.5)	4(14.8)	5 (18.6)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>32(38.1)</b>	<b>38(45.3)</b>	<b>7(8.3)</b>	<b>7(8.3)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	45(79.0)	7(12.2)	-	5(8.8)	57 (100)
		U	22(59.4)	7(19.0)	4(5.3)	4(5.3)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>67(71.2)</b>	<b>14(14.9)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	<b>9 (9.6)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Honors program policies and procedures.	Parsa	R	18(31.6)	36(63.2)	3(3.5)	-	57 (100)
		U	11(40.7)	7(26.0)	3(11.1)	6(22.2)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>29(34.6)</b>	<b>43(51.2)</b>	<b>6(7.1)</b>	<b>6(7.1)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	38(66.7)	10(17.5)	6(10.5)	3(5.3)	57 (100)
		U	22(59.4)	11(29.7)	4(10.8)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>60(63.9)</b>	<b>21(22.3)</b>	<b>10(10.6)</b>	<b>3(3.2)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Good hygiene and appropriate dress	Parsa	R	41(72.0)	16(28.0)	-	-	57 (100)
		U	14(51.8)	9(33.3)	4(14.9)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>55(65.4)</b>	<b>25(29.8)</b>	<b>4(4.8)</b>	-	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	48(84.1)	5(8.8)	3(5.3)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	30(81.1)	6(16.2)	1(2.7)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>78(83.0)</b>	<b>11(11.6)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Respects to all families, children, and co-workers.	Parsa	R	24(42.0)	31(54.4)	1(1.8)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	12(44.4)	12(44.5)	2(7.4)	1(3.7)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>36(42.8)</b>	<b>43(51.2)</b>	<b>3(3.6)</b>	<b>2(2.4)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	49(86.0)	5(8.8)	3(5.2)	-	57 (100)
		U	24(64.9)	13(35.1)	-	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>73(77.7)</b>	<b>18(19.1)</b>	<b>3(3.2)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>
Happy in teamwork	Parsa	R	23(40.4)	25(43.8)	9(15.8)	-	57 (100)
		U	12(44.4)	12(44.4)	2(7.4)	1(3.8)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>35(41.7)</b>	<b>37(44.0)</b>	<b>11(13.1)</b>	<b>1(1.2)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	43(75.4)	11(19.3)	3(5.3)	-	57 (100)
		U	20(54.0)	14(37.8)	3(8.2)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>63(67.0)</b>	<b>25(26.6)</b>	<b>6(7.4)</b>	-	<b>94 (100)</b>

Accepts feedback and use it to improve practice.	Parsa	R	7(12.3)	27(47.4)	21(36.8)	2(3.5)	57 (100)
		U	10(37.0)	13(48.2)	4(14.8)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>17(20.2)</b>	<b>40(47.6)</b>	<b>25(29.8)</b>	<b>2(2.4)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	31(54.4)	23(40.3)	2(3.5)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	17(46.0)	16(43.2)	4(10.8)	-	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>48(51.0)</b>	<b>39(41.5)</b>	<b>6(6.4)</b>	<b>1(1.1)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Capacity to work with children who are disabilities or need special education	Parsa	R	13(22.8)	28(49.1)	13(22.8)	3(5.3)	57 (100)
		U	9(33.3)	13(48.1)	5(18.5)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>22(26.2)</b>	<b>41(48.8)</b>	<b>18(21.4)</b>	<b>3(3.6)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	26(45.7)	18(33.4)	7(12.3)	6 (10.6)	57 (100)
		U	14(37.8)	18(48.7)	2(5.4)	3 (8.1)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>40(42.5)</b>	<b>36(38.3)</b>	<b>9(9.6)</b>	<b>9 (9.6)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Provides more support for disadvantaged socially excluded or minority children	Parsa	R	13(22.8)	32(56.1)	10(17.5)	2(3.6)	57 (100)
		U	12(44.5)	11(40.7)	4(14.8)	-	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>25(29.7)</b>	<b>43(51.2)</b>	<b>14(16.7)</b>	<b>2(2.4)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	40(70.1)	15(40.3)	1(1.8)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	23(62.2)	12(32.3)	1(2.6)	1(2.6)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>63(67.0)</b>	<b>27(28.6)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Table 27: Financial and other Management

Competencies	Districts	Location	Always	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Total
Handles financial record of the center	Parsa	R	9(15.8)	22(38.6)	9(15.8)	17(30.0)	57 (100)
		U	8(29.7)	2(7.4)	5(18.5)	12(21.0)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>17(20.2)</b>	<b>24(28.6)</b>	<b>14(16.7)</b>	<b>29(34.5)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	18(31.6)	10(17.5)	6(10.5)	23(40.2)	57 (100)
		U	8(21.6)	6(16.2)	3(8.1)	20 (54.0)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>26(27.6)</b>	<b>16(17.0)</b>	<b>9(9.6)</b>	<b>43(46.0)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
follows bookkeeping procedures	Parsa	R	6(10.6)	16(28.1)	14(24.6)	21 (37.0)	57 (100)
		U	4(14.8)	4(14.8)	6(22.2)	13 (48.0)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>10(12.0)</b>	<b>20(23.8)</b>	<b>20(23.8)</b>	<b>34(40.5)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	14(24.6)	11(19.3)	4(7.0)	28 (49.1)	57 (100)
		U	5(13.5)	8(21.6)	3(8.1)	21(56.7)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>19(20.2)</b>	<b>19(20.2)</b>	<b>7(7.4)</b>	<b>49 (52.2)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Operates meeting and writes minute	Parsa	R	4(7.0)	23(40.3)	13(22.8)	17(29.9)	57 (100)
		U	3(11.1)	9(33.3)	2(7.4)	13(48.1)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>7(8.3)</b>	<b>32(34.0)</b>	<b>15(17.9)</b>	<b>30 (35.8)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	23(40.3)	11(19.3)	11(19.3)	12 (21.1)	57 (100)
		U	12(32.4)	8(21.6)	3(8.1)	14 (37.9)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>35(37.2)</b>	<b>19(20.3)</b>	<b>14(14.9)</b>	<b>26 (27.6)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Conducts parent meeting successfully	Parsa	R	7(12.3)	19(33.3)	17(29.8)	14 (24.6)	57 (100)
		U	2(7.3)	7(26.0)	8(29.6)	10 (37.1)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>9(10.7)</b>	<b>26(31.0)</b>	<b>25(29.8)</b>	<b>24 (28.5)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	25(43.8)	13(22.8)	10(17.5)	9 (15.9)	57 (100)
		U	10(27.0)	10(27.0)	2(5.5)	15 (40.5)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>35(37.2)</b>	<b>23(24.5)</b>	<b>12(12.8)</b>	<b>24 (25.5)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Keep s records of all materials of the center.	Parsa	R	18(31.6)	25(43.8)	9(15.8)	5 (8.8)	57 (100)
		U	6(22.2)	9(33.3)	3(11.1)	9 (33.4)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>24(28.5)</b>	<b>34(40.7)</b>	<b>12(14.2)</b>	<b>14 (16.6)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	29(50.9)	13(22.8)	6(10.5)	9 (15.8)	57 (100)
		U	14(37.8)	4(10.8)	5(13.5)	14 (37.9)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>43(45.7)</b>	<b>17(18.1)</b>	<b>11(11.7)</b>	<b>23 (24.5)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

Table 28: Policy Awareness

Competencies	Districts	Location	Extremely	Very	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all	Total
Knowledge of ECCD/PPC policy of Nepal	Parsa	R	7(12.3)	17(29.8)	17(29.8)	11(19.3)	5(8.8)	57 (100)
		U	3(11.1)	6(22.2)	8(29.7)	4(14.8)	6(22.2)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>10(12.0)</b>	<b>23(27.4)</b>	<b>25(29.8)</b>	<b>15(17.8)</b>	<b>11(13.0)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	6(10.5)	10(17.5)	27(47.4)	5(8.8)	9(24.3)	57 (100)
		U	5(13.5)	8(21.6)	19(51.4)	3(8.1)	2(5.4)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>11(11.7)</b>	<b>18(19.1)</b>	<b>46(48.9)</b>	<b>8(8.5)</b>	<b>11(11.7)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Knowledge of activities for 3 years and 4 years children separately	Parsa	R	4(7.0)	37(65.0)	14(24.6)	1(1.7)	1(1.7)	57 (100)
		U	6(22.3)	13(48.1)	3(11.1)	4(14.8)	1(3.7)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>10(12.0)</b>	<b>50(59.5)</b>	<b>17(20.2)</b>	<b>5(6.0)</b>	<b>2(2.3)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	17(29.8)	23(40.3)	10(17.6)	4(7.0)	3(5.3)	57 (100)
		U	10(27.0)	20(54.0)	5(13.6)	1(2.7)	1(2.7)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>27(28.7)</b>	<b>43(45.7)</b>	<b>15(16.0)</b>	<b>5(5.3)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
uses ECCD curriculum while managing activities in the ECCD class	Parsa	R	8(14.0)	32(56.1)	11(19.3)	5(8.8)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	6(22.2)	11(40.7)	5(18.5)	4(14.8)	1(3.8)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>14(16.7)</b>	<b>43(51.2)</b>	<b>16(19.0)</b>	<b>9(10.7)</b>	<b>2(2.4)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	17(29.8)	14(24.6)	12(21.0)	9(15.7)	5(8.7)	57 (100)
		U	10(27.0)	14(37.8)	11(29.6)	1(2.7)	1(2.7)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>27(28.7)</b>	<b>28(29.8)</b>	<b>23(24.5)</b>	<b>10(10.6)</b>	<b>6(6.4)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

Table 29: Job Satisfaction

Competencies	Districts	Location	Extremely	Very	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all	Total
Happy with current job	Parsa	R	5(8.8)	34(59.6)	6(10.5)	11(19.3)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	4(14.8)	9(33.3)	2(7.4)	2(7.4)	10(37.0)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>9(10.6)</b>	<b>43(51.2)</b>	<b>8(9.4)</b>	<b>13(15.7)</b>	<b>11(13.1)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	8(14.0)	13(22.8)	6(10.6)	11(19.3)	19(33.3)	57 (100)
		U	6(16.2)	2(5.4)	5(13.5)	13(35.1)	11(29.8)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>14(14.8)</b>	<b>15(16.0)</b>	<b>11(11.7)</b>	<b>24(25.5)</b>	<b>30(32.0)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Spending much time with respect to economic benefit	Parsa	R	10(17.5)	29(50.9)	14(24.6)	1(1.8)	3(5.2)	57 (100)
		U	7(26.0)	9(33.3)	3(11.1)	4(14.8)	4(14.8)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>17(20.2)</b>	<b>38(45.2)</b>	<b>17(20.2)</b>	<b>5(6.0)</b>	<b>7(8.4)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	24(42.2)	17(29.8)	4(7.0)	4(7.0)	8(14.0)	57 (100)
		U	19(51.4)	9(24.3)	2(5.4)	3(8.1)	4(10.8)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>43(45.8)</b>	<b>26(27.6)</b>	<b>6(6.4)</b>	<b>7(7.4)</b>	<b>12(12.8)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Low remuneration	Parsa	R	6(10.5)	19(33.3)	6(10.5)	17(29.8)	9(15.8)	57 (100)
		U	3(11.1)	5(18.5)	-	2(7.4)	17(63.0)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>9(10.7)</b>	<b>24(28.6)</b>	<b>6(7.1)</b>	<b>19(22.6)</b>	<b>26(27.6)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	42(73.5)	7(12.3)	5(8.8)	2(3.6)	1(1.8)	57 (100)
		U	18(48.6)	12(32.4)	4(10.8)	2(5.4)	1(2.8)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>60(63.7)</b>	<b>19(20.2)</b>	<b>9(9.6)</b>	<b>4(4.3)</b>	<b>2(2.2)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Happy with the behavior of senior coworker (for School based facilitator only)	Parsa	R	9(19.6)	32(69.7)	5(10.7)	-	-	46 (100)
		U	3(13.0)	11(47.8)	2(8.7)	2(8.7)	5(21.8)	23 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>12(17.4)</b>	<b>43(62.3)</b>	<b>7(10.1)</b>	<b>2(2.9)</b>	<b>5(7.3)</b>	<b>69 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	11(24.4)	13(28.9)	8(17.8)	8(17.8)	5(11.1)	45 (100)
		U	2(8.0)	12(48.0)	4(16.0)	6(24.0)	1(4.0)	25 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>13(18.6)</b>	<b>25(35.7)</b>	<b>12(17.1)</b>	<b>14(20.0)</b>	<b>6(8.6)</b>	<b>70 (100)</b>

Getting support from colleagues in work (for school based facilitator only)	Parsa	R	5(10.7)	34(74.0)	7(15.2)	-	-	46 (100)
		U	1(4.4)	15(65.2)	2(8.7)	2(8.7)	3(13.0)	23 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>6(8.7)</b>	<b>49(71.0)</b>	<b>9(13.0)</b>	<b>2(2.9)</b>	<b>3(4.4)</b>	<b>69 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	7(15.6)	12(26.7)	14(31.1)	6(13.3)	6(13.3)	45 (100)
		U	1(4.0)	10(40.0)	7(28.0)	4(16.0)	3(12.0)	25 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>8(11.4)</b>	<b>22(31.4)</b>	<b>21(30.0)</b>	<b>10(14.3)</b>	<b>9(12.9)</b>	<b>70 (100)</b>
Happy with the behavior of management committee members (for community based facilitator only)	Parsa	R	1(9.0)	3(27.3)	3(27.3)	2(18.2)	2(18.2)	11 (100)
		U	-	1(25.0)	2(50.0)	1(25.0)	-	4 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(6.7)</b>	<b>4(26.7)</b>	<b>5(33.3)</b>	<b>3(20.0)</b>	<b>2(13.3)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	3(25.0)	3(25.0)	4(33.3)	-	2(16.7)	12 (100)
		U	2(16.8)	4(33.3)	4(33.3)	1(8.3)	1(8.3)	12 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>5(20.8)</b>	<b>7(29.2)</b>	<b>8(33.3)</b>	<b>1(4.2)</b>	<b>3(12.5)</b>	<b>24 (100)</b>
Career advancement opportunity in current job	Parsa	R	7(12.3)	26(45.6)	5(8.8)	7(12.3)	12(21.0)	57 (100)
		U	1(3.7)	5(18.5)	4(14.8)	11(40.7)	6(22.3)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>8(9.5)</b>	<b>31(36.9)</b>	<b>9(10.8)</b>	<b>18(21.4)</b>	<b>18(21.4)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	7(12.3)	19(33.3)	11(19.3)	11(19.3)	9(15.8)	57 (100)
		U	3(8.1)	13(35.1)	5(13.5)	11(29.8)	5(13.5)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>10(10.6)</b>	<b>32(34.0)</b>	<b>16(17.0)</b>	<b>22(23.4)</b>	<b>14(15.0)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Encouragement from Head teacher/ management committee	Parsa	R	5(8.8)	44(77.2)	4(7.0)	-	4(7.0)	57 (100)
		U	4(14.8)	7(26.0)	6(22.2)	4(14.8)	6(22.2)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>9(10.6)</b>	<b>51(60.7)</b>	<b>10(12.0)</b>	<b>4(4.7)</b>	<b>10(12.0)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	15(26.3)	22(38.6)	10(17.5)	5(8.8)	5(8.8)	57 (100)
		U	10(27.0)	18(48.6)	6(16.2)	2(5.4)	1(2.8)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>25(26.7)</b>	<b>40(42.5)</b>	<b>16(17.0)</b>	<b>7(7.4)</b>	<b>6(6.4)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>
Has been getting job specific training regularly.	Parsa	R	13(22.8)	20(35.1)	8(14.0)	13(22.8)	3(5.3)	57 (100)
		U	-	5(18.5)	3(11.1)	14(51.8)	5(18.6)	27 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>13(15.7)</b>	<b>25(29.7)</b>	<b>11(13.1)</b>	<b>27(32.1)</b>	<b>8(9.4)</b>	<b>84 (100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	1(1.8)	3(5.3)	19(33.3)	18(31.7)	16(28.1)	57 (100)
		U	2(5.4)	2(5.4)	10(27.0)	15(40.5)	8(21.7)	37 (100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>3(3.2)</b>	<b>5(5.3)</b>	<b>29(30.8)</b>	<b>33(35.1)</b>	<b>24(25.6)</b>	<b>94 (100)</b>

**Table 30: Challenges Faced by the ECCDC Facilitators**

Challenges	Districts					
	Parsa			Surkhet		
	R	U	T	R	U	T
Instructional materials	27 (47.4)	23(85.2)	<b>50 (59.5)</b>	50 (87.7)	31(83.8)	<b>81(86.2)</b>
Child friendly Physical infrastructure	23 (40.3)	22(84.9)	<b>45(53.6)</b>	42(73.7)	30(81.1)	<b>72(76.6)</b>
Low salary	21 (36.8)	13(48.1)	<b>34(36.1)</b>	18(31.6)	12(44.4)	<b>30(32.0)</b>
Playing materials	9 (15.8)	9(33.3)	<b>18(21.4)</b>	19(33.3)	12(44.4)	<b>31(33.0)</b>
Lack of training	9 (15.8)	15(55.5)	<b>24(28.6)</b>	17(29.8)	12(44.4)	<b>29(30.8)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 31: Distribution of Observed ECCDC facilitator**

Districts	Location		Total
	Rural	Urban	
Parsa	34 (65.3)	18(34.7)	<b>52(100.0)</b>
Surkhet	32(60.4)	21(39.6)	<b>53(100.0)</b>
Total	66(62.8)	39(37.2)	<b>105(100.0)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 32: Physical Condition of Learning Centre**

Competencies	Districts	ocation	Very good	Good	Average	Below average	Poor	Total
Area of classroom on the basis of number of students	Parsa	R	3 (8.8)	7(20.6)	14(41.2)	10(29.4)	-	34(100)
		U	-	5(27.8)	6(33.3)	7(38.9)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>3(5.7)</b>	<b>12(23.1)</b>	<b>20(38.6)</b>	<b>17(32.6)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	3(9.5)	6(18.7)	14(43.5)	6(18.8)	3(9.5)	32(100)
		U	1(4.8)	3(14.3)	12(57.1)	3(14.3)	2(9.5)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>4(7.5)</b>	<b>9(17.1)</b>	<b>26(49.0)</b>	<b>9(16.9)</b>	<b>5(9.5)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>

Sitting arrangement of the class	Parsa	R	9(26.5)	16(47.0)	9(26.5)	-	-	34(100)
		U	3(16.7)	12(66.6)	3(16.7)	-	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>12(23.1)</b>	<b>28(53.8)</b>	<b>12(23.1)</b>	-	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	3(9.4)	4(12.5)	9(28.1)	13(40.6)	3(9.4)	32(100)
		U	3(14.3)	2(9.5)	7(33.3)	8(38.1)	1(4.8)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>6(11.3)</b>	<b>6(11.3)</b>	<b>16(30.2)</b>	<b>21(39.6)</b>	<b>4(7.6)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>
Management of diapering, sleeping, eating in the classroom	Parsa	R	1(3.0)	10(29.4)	16(47.0)	7(20.6)	-	34(100)
		U	-	2(11.1)	4(22.2)	12(66.7)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	<b>12(23.1)</b>	<b>20(38.5)</b>	<b>19(36.4)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	1(3.1)	5(15.6)	8(25.0)	18(56.3)	-	32(100)
		U	-	3(14.3)	7(33.3)	11(52.4)	-	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(1.9)</b>	<b>8(50.1)</b>	<b>15(28.3)</b>	<b>29(54.7)</b>	-	<b>53(100)</b>
Management of indoor playing material	Parsa	R	3(8.8)	14(41.2)	14(41.2)	3(8.8)	-	34(100)
		U	3(16.7)	3(18.7)	6(33.3)	6(33.3)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>6(11.5)</b>	<b>17(32.7)</b>	<b>20(38.5)</b>	<b>9(17.3)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	1(3.1)	1(3.1)	5(15.6)	17(53.2)	8(25.0)	32(100)
		U	-	-	5(23.8)	10(47.6)	6(28.6)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(1.9)</b>	<b>1(1.9)</b>	<b>10(18.9)</b>	<b>27(50.9)</b>	<b>14(26.4)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>
Safety of outdoor playing area	Parsa	R	1(3.0)	17(50.0)	12(35.3)	4(11.7)	-	34(100)
		U	11(61.1)	4(22.2)	3(16.7)	-	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>12(23.1)</b>	<b>21(40.4)</b>	<b>15(28.8)</b>	<b>4(7.7)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	3(9.4)	6(18.7)	11(34.4)	9(28.1)	3(9.4)	32(100)
		U	-	4(19.0)	10(47.6)	4(19.0)	3(9.4)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>3(5.7)</b>	<b>10(18.9)</b>	<b>21(39.6)</b>	<b>13(24.5)</b>	<b>6(11.3)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>

Safe drinking water facility	Parsa	R	-	1(3.0)	20(58.9)	9(26.5)	4(11.6)	34(100)
		U	2(11.1)	7(38.9)	5(27.8)	4(22.2)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>2(3.9)</b>	<b>8(15.4)</b>	<b>25(48.1)</b>	<b>13(25.0)</b>	<b>4(7.6)</b>	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	3(9.4)	6(18.7)	9(28.1)	10(31.2)	4(12.6)	32(100)
		U	2(9.5)	2(9.5)	5(23.8)	7(33.4)	5(23.8)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>5(9.4)</b>	<b>8(15.1)</b>	<b>14(26.4)</b>	<b>17(32.1)</b>	<b>9(17.0)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>
Toilet facilities	Parsa	R	-	2(5.9)	22(64.7)	5(14.7)	5(14.7)	34(100)
		U	2(11.1)	8(44.5)	4(22.2)	1(5.5)	3(16.7)	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>2(3.8)</b>	<b>10(19.2)</b>	<b>26(50.0)</b>	<b>6(11.5)</b>	<b>8(15.5)</b>	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	5(15.6)	2(6.25)	11(34.3)	10(31.1)	4(12.5)	32(100)
		U	2(9.5)	2(9.5)	5(23.8)	9(42.8)	3(14.3)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>7(13.2)</b>	<b>4(7.5)</b>	<b>16(30.3)</b>	<b>19(35.8)</b>	<b>7(13.2)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

Table 33: Condition of Learning Environment in the Center

Competencies	Districts	Location	Extremely	Very	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all	Total
Management of learning corner	Parsa	R	1(3.0)	9(26.4)	13(38.2)	6(17.6)	5(14.8)	34(100)
		U	-	3(16.7)	2(11.1)	3(16.7)	10(55.5)	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	<b>12(23.1)</b>	<b>15(28.8)</b>	<b>9(17.3)</b>	<b>15(28.8)</b>	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	1(3.1)	1(3.1)	7(21.8)	8(25.0)	15(47.0)	32(100)
		U	-	1(4.7)	3(14.3)	8(38.1)	9(42.9)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	<b>2(3.8)</b>	<b>10(18.9)</b>	<b>16(30.9)</b>	<b>24(45.4)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>
Condition of appropriate learning material in the class	Parsa	R	1(3.0)	9(26.5)	13(28.2)	9(26.5)	2(5.8)	34(100)
		U	-	2(11.1)	3(16.7)	6(33.3)	7(38.9)	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	<b>11(21.2)</b>	<b>16(30.7)</b>	<b>15(28.8)</b>	<b>9(17.3)</b>	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	1(3.1)	2(6.2)	6(18.7)	11(34.4)	12(37.6)	32(100)
		U	-	-	3(14.3)	11(52.4)	7(33.3)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	<b>2(3.8)</b>	<b>9(17.0)</b>	<b>22(41.5)</b>	<b>19(35.7)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>

Interactive material on the wall of the classroom	Parsa	R	1(3.0)	9(26.5)	10(29.4)	6(17.6)	8(23.5)	34(100)
		U	-	3(16.7)	2(11.1)	4(22.2)	9(50.0)	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	<b>12(23.1)</b>	<b>12(23.1)</b>	<b>10(19.2)</b>	<b>17(32.6)</b>	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	1(3.1)	2(6.3)	10(31.2)	12(37.5)	7(21.9)	32(100)
		U	1(4.8)	-	5(23.8)	10(47.6)	5(23.8)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>2(3.8)</b>	<b>2(3.8)</b>	<b>15(28.3)</b>	<b>22(41.5)</b>	<b>12(22.6)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>
Conditions of age specific books, and writing materials and other related reference materials	Parsa	R	3(8.8)	18(53.0)	10(29.4)	3(8.8)	-	34(100)
		U	3(16.7)	2(11.1)	5(27.8)	8(44.4)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>6(11.5)</b>	<b>20(38.5)</b>	<b>15(28.8)</b>	<b>11(21.2)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	1(3.2)	-	7(21.8)	12(37.5)	12(37.5)	32(100)
		U	-	2(9.5)	3(14.3)	10(47.6)	6(28.6)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	<b>2(3.7)</b>	<b>10(18.8)</b>	<b>22(41.5)</b>	<b>18(34.0)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>
Management of outdoor playing materials such as swing, sliding, water play, sand play etc	Parsa	R	1(3.0)	6(17.6)	7(20.5)	20(58.9)	-	34(100)
		U	1(5.5)	1(5.5)	1(5.5)	15(83.5)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>2(3.8)</b>	<b>7(13.4)</b>	<b>8(15.4)</b>	<b>35(67.4)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	1(3.1)	5(15.7)	26(81.2)	-	-	32(100)
		U	-	5(23.8)	16(76.2)	-	-	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	<b>10(18.9)</b>	<b>42(79.1)</b>	-	-	<b>53(100)</b>
Management of student information (child's individual file)	Parsa	R	3(8.8)	12(35.3)	17(50.0)	2(5.9)	-	34(100)
		U	3(16.7)	5(27.8)	8(44.4)	2(11.1)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>6(11.5)</b>	<b>17(32.7)</b>	<b>25(48.1)</b>	<b>4(7.7)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	2(6.2)	9(28.1)	9(28.1)	12(37.6)	-	32(100)
		U	3(14.3)	4(19.1)	7(33.3)	7(33.3)	-	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>5(9.5)</b>	<b>13(24.5)</b>	<b>16(30.2)</b>	<b>19(135.8)</b>	-	<b>53(100)</b>

Table 34: Observed Competencies and Characteristics of the ECCDC Facilitators

Competencies	Districts	Location	Extremely	Very	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all	Total
Child centered activities	Parsa	R	6(17.6)	25(73.5)	3(8.9)	-	-	34(100)
		U	3(16.7)	10(55.5)	4(22.2)	1(5.6)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>9(17.3)</b>	<b>35(67.3)</b>	<b>7(13.5)</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	3(9.4)	5(15.6)	13(40.6)	11(34.4)	-	32(100)
		U	-	3(14.3)	14(66.7)	4(19.0)	-	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>3(5.6)</b>	<b>8(15.1)</b>	<b>27(50.1)</b>	<b>15(28.2)</b>	-	<b>53(100)</b>
Caring of each children	Parsa	R	5(14.7)	24(70.6)	5(14.7)	-	-	34(100)
		U	7(38.9)	10(55.5)	1(5.6)	-	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>12(23.1)</b>	<b>34(65.4)</b>	<b>6(11.5)</b>	-	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	7(21.8)	5(15.6)	15(46.9)	5(15.7)	-	32(100)
		U	2(9.5)	2(9.5)	17(81.0)	-	-	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>9(17.0)</b>	<b>7(13.2)</b>	<b>32(60.4)</b>	<b>5(9.4)</b>	-	<b>53(100)</b>
Age specific activities in the classroom	Parsa	R	5(14.7)	26(76.5)	3(8.8)	-	-	34(100)
		U	3(16.7)	6(33.3)	9(50.0)	-	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>8(15.4)</b>	<b>32(61.5)</b>	<b>12(23.1)</b>	-	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	1(3.1)	5(15.6)	13(40.6)	6(18.8)	7(21.9)	32(100)
		U	-	4(19.0)	8(39.1)	7(33.3)	2(9.6)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	<b>9(17.0)</b>	<b>21(39.6)</b>	<b>13(24.5)</b>	<b>9(17.0)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>
Preparation and following daily schedule	Parsa	R	3(8.8)	23(67.6)	8(23.6)	-	-	34(100)
		U	2(11.1)	7(38.9)	9(50.0)	-	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>5(9.6)</b>	<b>30(57.6)</b>	<b>17(32.8)</b>	-	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	8(25.0)	11(34.4)	6(18.7)	7(21.9)	-	32(100)
		U	3(14.3)	9(42.8)	6(28.6)	3(14.3)	-	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>11(20.8)</b>	<b>20(37.7)</b>	<b>12(22.7)</b>	<b>10(18.8)</b>	-	<b>53(100)</b>

Conversation with the children	Parsa	R	2(5.9)	15(44.1)	17(50.0)	-	-	34(100)
		U	1(5.6)	9(50.0)	7(38.8)	1(5.6)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>3(5.8)</b>	<b>24(46.1)</b>	<b>24(46.1)</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	5(15.6)	4(12.5)	13(40.6)	9(28.1)	1(3.2)	32(100)
		U	3(14.3)	2(9.5)	15(71.4)	1(4.8)	-	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>8(15.1)</b>	<b>6(11.3)</b>	<b>28(52.8)</b>	<b>10(18.8)</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>
Engages children with physical activities	Parsa	R	3(8.8)	18(53.0)	11(32.2)	2(6.0)	-	34(100)
		U	3(16.7)	8(44.4)	7(38.9)	-	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>6(11.5)</b>	<b>26(50.0)</b>	<b>18(34.6)</b>	<b>2(3.9)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	4(12.5)	6(18.7)	12(37.5)	8(25.0)	2(6.3)	32(100)
		U	-	5(23.8)	12(57.2)	4(19.0)	-	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>4(7.5)</b>	<b>11(20.7)</b>	<b>24(45.3)</b>	<b>12(22.6)</b>	<b>2(3.9)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

Competencies	Districts	ocation	Very good	Good	Average	Below average	Poor	Total
Provides age appropriate book and writing materials for children's use	Parsa	R	3(8.8)	20(58.9)	11(32.3)	-	-	34(100)
		U	3(16.7)	3(16.7)	10(55.6)	2(11.0)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>6(11.5)</b>	<b>23(44.2)</b>	<b>21(40.4)</b>	<b>2(3.9)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	2(6.2)	3(9.3)	11(34.5)	8(25.0)	8(25.0)	32(100)
		U	-	4(19.0)	5(23.8)	9(42.8)	3(14.4)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>2(3.8)</b>	<b>7(13.2)</b>	<b>16(30.2)</b>	<b>17(32.1)</b>	<b>11(20.7)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>
Actively listens to their comments and responds appropriately	Parsa	R	1(3.0)	28(82.3)	5(14.7)	-	-	34(100)
		U	4(22.2)	5(27.8)	7(38.9)	2(11.1)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>5(9.6)</b>	<b>33(63.5)</b>	<b>12(23.1)</b>	<b>2(3.8)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	7(21.8)	3(9.4)	15(46.9)	4(12.5)	3(9.4)	32(100)
		U	4(19.0)	-	12(57.2)	5(23.8)	-	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>11(20.6)</b>	<b>3(5.7)</b>	<b>27(51.0)</b>	<b>9(17.0)</b>	<b>3(5.7)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>

		U	2(11.1)	3(16.7)	9(50.0)	4(22.2)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>3(5.8)</b>	<b>21(40.4)</b>	<b>23(44.2)</b>	<b>5(9.6)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	2(6.2)	3(9.4)	10(31.2)	11(34.4)	6(18.8)	32(100)
		U	-	1(4.7)	9(42.8)	8(38.1)	3(14.4)	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>2(3.8)</b>	<b>4(7.5)</b>	<b>19(35.8)</b>	<b>19(35.8)</b>	<b>9(17.1)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>
Talks with children both individually and in groups	Parsa	R	2(5.9)	22(64.7)	10(29.4)	-	-	34(100)
		U	4(22.2)	9(50.0)	4(22.2)	1(5.6)	-	18(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>6(11.5)</b>	<b>31(59.6)</b>	<b>14(26.9)</b>	<b>1(2.0)</b>	-	<b>52(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	4(12.5)	5(15.6)	13(40.6)	7(21.8)	3(9.5)	32(100)
		U	1(4.7)	2(9.6)	14(66.7)	4(19.0)	-	21(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>5(9.4)</b>	<b>7(13.2)</b>	<b>27(51.0)</b>	<b>11(20.7)</b>	<b>3(5.7)</b>	<b>53(100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 35: Sex wise distribution of Observed Children**

Districts	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
Parsa	168 (49.4)	172(50.6)	<b>340(100.0)</b>
Surkhet	187(45.5)	224(54.5)	<b>411(100.0)</b>
Total	355(47.3)	396(52.7)	<b>751(100.0)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

**Table 36: Condition of Overall Development of the Children**

Children's Capacities	Districts	Location	Very good	Good	Average	Below average	Poor	Total
To tell name	Parsa	R	7(3.0)	111(47.0)	117(49.6)	1(0.4)	-	236 (100)
		U	12(11.5)	53(51.0)	35(33.7)	3(2.9)	1(0.9)	104(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>19(5.6)</b>	<b>164(48.2)</b>	<b>152(44.7)</b>	<b>4(1.2)</b>	<b>1(0.3)</b>	<b>340(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	65(30.5)	42(19.7)	63(29.5)	23(10.7)	20(9.4)	213(100)
		U	48(24.2)	40(20.2)	87(44.0)	14(7.1)	9(4.5)	198(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>113(27.5)</b>	<b>82(20.0)</b>	<b>150(36.5)</b>	<b>37(9.0)</b>	<b>29(7.0)</b>	<b>411(100)</b>

To greet friends and elders	Parsa	R	1(0.4)	107(45.3)	127(53.9)	1(0.4)	-	236 (100)
		U	8(7.8)	50(48.0)	23(22.1)	20(19.2)	3(2.9)	104(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>9(2.6)</b>	<b>157(46.2)</b>	<b>150(44.1)</b>	<b>21(6.2)</b>	<b>3(0.9)</b>	<b>340(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	31(14.5)	37(17.4)	56(26.3)	56(26.3)	33(15.5)	213(100)
		U	5(2.5)	29(18.3)	82(41.4)	52(26.2)	30(15.1)	198(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>36(8.7)</b>	<b>66(16.0)</b>	<b>138(33.6)</b>	<b>108(26.3)</b>	<b>63(15.3)</b>	<b>411(100)</b>
To tells the name of seven days of a week	Parsa	R	1(0.4)	69(29.2)	150(63.5)	14(6.0)	2(0.9)	236 (100)
		U	2(2.0)	35(33.6)	17(16.3)	34(32.7)	16(15.4)	104(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>3(0.9)</b>	<b>104(30.5)</b>	<b>167(49.1)</b>	<b>48(14.1)</b>	<b>18(5.4)</b>	<b>340(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	15(7.0)	36(17.0)	65(30.5)	52(24.4)	45(21.1)	213(100)
		U	27(13.6)	23(11.6)	63(31.8)	55(27.8)	30(15.2)	198(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>42(10.2)</b>	<b>59(14.4)</b>	<b>128(31.1)</b>	<b>107(26.0)</b>	<b>75(18.3)</b>	<b>411(100)</b>
To pray in group	Parsa	R	1(0.4)	69(29.2)	150(63.5)	14(6.0)	2(0.9)	236 (100)
		U	2(2.0)	35(33.6)	17(16.3)	34(32.7)	16(15.4)	104(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>3(0.8)</b>	<b>104(30.6)</b>	<b>167(49.1)</b>	<b>48(14.1)</b>	<b>18(5.4)</b>	<b>340(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	26(12.2)	30(14.1)	84(39.4)	48(22.5)	25(11.8)	213(100)
		U	9(4.5)	41(20.7)	39(19.7)	85(43.0)	24(12.1)	198(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>35(8.5)</b>	<b>71(17.2)</b>	<b>123(30.0)</b>	<b>133(32.4)</b>	<b>49(11.9)</b>	<b>411(100)</b>
Condition of hand, mouth, nose and nail	Parsa	<b>R</b>	-	<b>54(22.8)</b>	<b>140(59.3)</b>	<b>16(6.8)</b>	<b>26(11.1)</b>	<b>236 (100)</b>
		<b>U</b>	<b>7(6.7)</b>	<b>28(27.0)</b>	<b>48(46.1)</b>	<b>21(20.2)</b>	-	<b>104(100)</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>7(2.0)</b>	<b>82(24.1)</b>	<b>188(55.3)</b>	<b>37(10.9)</b>	<b>26(7.7)</b>	<b>340(100)</b>
	Surkhet	<b>R</b>	<b>27(12.6)</b>	<b>37(17.3)</b>	<b>77(36.2)</b>	<b>55(25.8)</b>	<b>17(8.1)</b>	<b>213(100)</b>
		<b>U</b>	<b>1(0.5)</b>	<b>28(14.1)</b>	<b>113(57.0)</b>	<b>45(22.7)</b>	<b>11(5.7)</b>	<b>198(100)</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>28(6.8)</b>	<b>65(15.8)</b>	<b>190(46.2)</b>	<b>100(24.3)</b>	<b>28(6.9)</b>	<b>411(100)</b>

Children's Capacities	Districts	Location	Very good	Good	Average	Below average	Poor	Total
To draws picture according to own interest	Parsa	R	-	54(22.9)	123(52.1)	54(22.9)	5(2.1)	236 (100)
		U	4(3.8)	15(14.4)	22(21.2)	49(47.1)	14(13.5)	104(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>4(1.2)</b>	<b>69(20.3)</b>	<b>145(42.6)</b>	<b>103(30.3)</b>	<b>19(5.6)</b>	<b>340(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	36(17.0)	16(7.5)	63(29.5)	69(32.4)	29(13.6)	213(100)
		U	4(2.0)	13(6.5)	52(26.2)	115(58.2)	14(7.1)	198(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>40(9.7)</b>	<b>29(7.0)</b>	<b>115(28.0)</b>	<b>184(44.8)</b>	<b>43(10.5)</b>	<b>411(100)</b>
To matches picture and word cards	Parsa	R	-	38(16.1)	70(29.6)	102(43.2)	26(11.1)	236 (100)
		U	3(2.9)	12(11.5)	12(11.5)	61(58.6)	16(15.5)	104(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>3(0.9)</b>	<b>50(14.7)</b>	<b>82(24.1)</b>	<b>163(48.0)</b>	<b>42(12.3)</b>	<b>340(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	15(7.0)	16(7.6)	72(33.8)	55(25.8)	55(25.8)	213(100)
		U	4(2.0)	13(6.6)	85(42.9)	63(31.8)	33(16.7)	198(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>19(4.6)</b>	<b>29(7.1)</b>	<b>157(38.2)</b>	<b>118(28.7)</b>	<b>88(21.4)</b>	<b>411(100)</b>
To tells the name of games	Parsa	R	-	38(16.1)	171(72.4)	27(11.4)	-	236 (100)
		U	4(3.9)	8(7.7)	32(30.7)	52(50.0)	8(7.7)	104(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>4(1.2)</b>	<b>46(13.5)</b>	<b>203(59.7)</b>	<b>79(23.2)</b>	<b>8(2.3)</b>	<b>340(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	11(5.2)	42(19.7)	81(38.0)	52(24.4)	27(12.6)	213(100)
		U	7(3.5)	30(15.1)	43(21.7)	96(48.5)	22(11.2)	198(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>18(4.4)</b>	<b>72(17.5)</b>	<b>124(30.2)</b>	<b>148(36.0)</b>	<b>49(11.9)</b>	<b>411(100)</b>
To plays friendly	Parsa	R	-	57(24.1)	157(66.5)	20(8.5)	2(0.9)	236 (100)
		U	7(6.7)	18(17.3)	56(53.8)	23(22.2)	-	104(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>7(2.0)</b>	<b>75(22.0)</b>	<b>213(62.7)</b>	<b>43(12.6)</b>	<b>2(0.7)</b>	<b>340(100)</b>
	Surkhet	R	33(15.5)	43(20.2)	71(33.3)	52(24.4)	14(6.6)	213(100)
		U	1(0.5)	29(14.6)	113(57.0)	52(26.3)	3(1.6)	198(100)
		<b>T</b>	<b>34(8.3)</b>	<b>72(17.5)</b>	<b>184(44.7)</b>	<b>104(25.3)</b>	<b>17(4.2)</b>	<b>411(100)</b>

Two way communication with friends/ teachers	Parsa	<b>R</b>	-	<b>7(3.0)</b>	<b>89(37.7)</b>	<b>96(40.7)</b>	<b>44(18.6)</b>	<b>236 (100)</b>
		<b>U</b>	<b>3(2.9)</b>	<b>5(4.8)</b>	<b>10(9.6)</b>	<b>70(67.3)</b>	<b>16(15.4)</b>	<b>104(100)</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>3(0.9)</b>	<b>12(3.5)</b>	<b>99(29.1)</b>	<b>166(48.8)</b>	<b>60(17.7)</b>	<b>340(100)</b>
	Surkhet	<b>R</b>	<b>18(8.4)</b>	<b>15(7.0)</b>	<b>78(36.6)</b>	<b>70(32.8)</b>	<b>32(15.2)</b>	<b>213(100)</b>
		<b>U</b>	<b>1(0.5)</b>	<b>10(5.0)</b>	<b>94(47.5)</b>	<b>88(44.5)</b>	<b>5(2.5)</b>	<b>198(100)</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>19(4.6)</b>	<b>25(6.1)</b>	<b>172(41.8)</b>	<b>158(38.4)</b>	<b>37(9.1)</b>	<b>411(100)</b>

Field Survey, 2015

# ANNEXES

## Annex II: Study Tools

### 1. Survey Questionnaire for ECCD Facilitators

#### SECTION A: PERSONAL INFORMATION (PI)

- PI-1 : Name of the ECCD Center: .....
- PI-2 : Address: District ..... VDC/Municipality .....
- PI-3 : Type of ECCD Center:  Community Based  School Based
- PI-4 : Name of ECCD Facilitator: .....
- PI-5 : Sex:  Male  Female
- PI-6 : Age: ..... years
- PI-7 : Caste/Ethnicity: .....
- PI-8 : Language (spoken) a. b. c.
- PI-9 : Marital Status:  Married  Unmarried
- PI-10 : Permanency:  Local  Outsider
- PI-11 : Academic Qualification: .....
- PI-12 : Training

Name of the Training	Duration of Training	Training Agency	
		Government	NGO/INGO

- PI-13 : Years of Experiences:  (In years and month)
- PI-14 : Working hour per day:  hours
- PI-15 : Working week per year  weeks
- PI-16 : Exact remuneration drawn
- PI-17 : Child's Information:

Boys	Girls	Total	Upper Caste	Lower Caste

- PI-18 : Do you teach in upper grades as well?  
 (For school based facilitator only)  Yes  No  
 If yes, specify grades: ..... Subject/s: .....
- Extra remuneration for additional class

## SECTION B: ASSESSING COMPETENCIES (AC)

Here is a set of necessary competencies for a facilitator. Please, tick honestly in appropriate box of the corresponding number.

### A. Child Development

#### I. Characteristics of Development

1= High          2= Moderate          3 = Low          4= None

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4
ACAI-a	I have general understanding of child growth and development of age 3 – 5 years.				
ACAI-b	I know how children learn and develop through play.				
ACAI-c	I can easily develop caring relationship with each child.				
ACAI-d	I respect each child's culture.				
ACAI-e	I respect each child's nature/characteristics.				

#### II. Observation and Assessment

1= Always          2= Very often          3 = Sometimes          4= Rarely          5 = Never

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4
ACAII-a	I record daily information about each child's routines (diapering, sleeping, and eating).				
ACAII-b	I share the child activities with his/her parents.				
ACAII-c	I handle individual child understanding his/her pace.				
ACAII-e	I keep assessment information confidential.				

### B. Curriculum

#### I. Curriculum and Learning Environment

1= Always          2= Very often          3 = Sometimes          4= Rarely          5 = Never

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
ACBI-a	I follow daily schedule of specific activities for children.					
ACBI-b	I give children choices of activities.					
ACBI-c	I make daily, weekly, monthly, and long-range curriculum plans.					
ACAII-e	I keep assessment information confidential.					

## II. Promoting Social and Emotional Development

1= Always

2= Very often

3 = Sometimes

4= Rarely

5 = Never

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
ACBII-a	I am engaged in conversations on important thing with children.					
ACBII-b	I help children to develop friendship with each other.					
ACBII-c	I help children to label and express their feelings.					
ACBII-d	I show and encourage empathy and respect for children and other adults.					

## III. Promoting Physical and Cognitive Development

1= Always

2= Very often

3 = Sometimes

4= Rarely

5 = Never

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
ACBIII-a	I provide physical activity to all the children during the day.					
ACBIII-b	I take part in children's indoors and outdoors activities.					
ACBIII-c	I provide opportunities for hands-on active learning throughout the day.					
ACBIII-d	I encourage children to ask questions.					
ACBIII-e	I ask children open-ended questions.					
ACBIII-f	I actively listen to their comments and responds appropriately.					
ACBIII-g	I extend children's ideas with questions or thoughts.					
ACBIII-h	I encourage playing.					

## IV. Promoting Language and Literacy Development

1= Always

2= Very often

3 = Sometimes

4= Rarely

5 = Never

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
ACBIV-a	I provide age appropriate book and writing materials for children's use.					
ACBIV-b	I talk with children both individually and in groups.					
ACBIV-c	I encourage children to communicate with each other and with adults.					
ACBIV-d	I use appropriate varieties of books, songs, rhymes and games with individuals and groups					

ACBIV-e	I expand children's vocabulary through conversation, materials, and activities.					
ACBIV-f	I ask children to point out written words in the classroom.					
ACBIV-g	I tell story based on theme and let child retell the story.					

### C. Health, Safety and Nutrition

#### I. Health

1= Always

2= Very often

3 = Sometimes

4= Rarely

5 = Never

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
ACCI-a	I explain how germs and spread disease.					
ACCI-b	I perform a daily general health check on each child.					
ACCI-c	I wash my hands appropriately with soap and running water.					
ACCI-d	I teach children how to wash their hands appropriately.					
ACCI-e	I sanitize toys/materials and diapers, toileting, and eating areas regularly.					

#### II. Safety

1= Always

2= Very often

3 = Sometimes

4= Rarely

5 = Never

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
ACCII-a	I follow emergency and disaster procedures.					
ACCII-b	I check indoor and outdoor environments for safety hazards.					
ACCII-c	I maintain a clean and clutter free space for children to play.					
ACCII-d	I make sure all children are safe at all times.					
ACCII-e	I demonstrate how to handle various materials like pencil cutter, fire extinguishers and other safety equipment.					

## III. Nutrition

1= Always

2= Very often

3 = Sometimes

4= Rarely

5 = Never

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
ACCIII-a	I support children to handle food safely.					
ACCIII-c	I discourage junk food and encourage homemade healthy foods.					
ACCIII-d	I create a pleasant, clean environment for children to eat meals and snacks with their peers.					

## D. Guidance

## I. Interactions with Individual Children

1= Always

2= Very often

3 = Sometimes

4= Rarely

5 = Never

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
ACDI - a	I am positive, respectful, consistent and calm with each child.					
ACDI -b	I demonstrate appropriate expectations of each child.					
ACDI -c	I help children understand rules and limits.					
ACDI - d	I use positive guidance, like redirection, choices and problem solving.					

## II. Group Experiences

1= Always

2= Very often

3 = Sometimes

4= Rarely

5 = Never

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
ACDII - a	I help children to be kind to each other.					
ACDI I- b	I react quickly when disruptive behavior occurs.					
ACDII - c	I help children follow rules and limits.					
ACDII - d	I demonstrate consistency and fairness with all children.					

## E. Professional Development

## I. Family and Community Relationships

1= Always

2= Very often

3 = Sometimes

4= Rarely

5 = Never

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
ACEI - a	I develop good relationship with each child's family.					
ACEI - b	I respect the culture and structure of each family.					
ACEI - c	I respect each family as their child's first teacher.					

ACEI – d	I support children’s relationships with their families.					
ACEI – e	I respect confidentiality.					

## II. Professionalism

1= Extremely

2= Highly

3 = Moderately

4= Poorly

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4
ACEII-a	I respect and advocate child rights.				
ACEII-b	I have a positive attitude toward my profession.				
ACEII-c	I honor program policies and procedures.				
ACEII-d	I have good hygiene and I dress appropriately.				
ACEII-e	I respect to all families, children, and co-workers.				
ACEII-f	I am happy in teamwork.				
ACEII-g	I accept feedback and use it to improve practice.				
ACEII-h	I have capacity to work with children who are disabilities or need special education.				
ACEII-i	I always provide more support for disadvantaged, socially excluded or minority children.				

## IV. Financial and other Management

1= Extremely

2= Highly

3 = Moderately

4= Poorly

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4
ACEIII – a	I have capacity to handle financial record of my center.				
ACEIII – b	I follow bookkeeping procedures.				
ACEIII - c	I have meeting conducting and minute writing skills.				
ACEIII - d	I conduct parent meeting successfully.				
ACEIII - e	I keep records of all materials of the center.				

**SECTION C: POLICY AWARENESS AND JOB SATISFACTION (PAJS)**

## I. Policy Awareness

1= extremely

2= Very

3 = moderately

4= slightly

5 = Not at all

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
PAJSI -a	I have knowledge of ECCD/PPC policy of Nepal.					
PAJSI –c	I have the knowledge of ECCD curriculum, 2062 B.S.					

PAJSI –d	I have the knowledge of activities for 3 years and 4 years children separately.					
PAJSI –e	I use ECCD curriculum while managing activities in the ECCD class.					

## II. Job Satisfaction

1= extremely

2= Very

3 = moderately

4= slightly

5 = Not at all

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
PAJSI -a	I am happy with my current job.					
PAJSI –b	I am spending much time with respect to economic benefit.					
PAJSI –c	My remuneration is low.					
PAJSI –d	I am happy with the behavior of my senior coworker. ( for School based facilitator only)					
PAJSI –e	I have been getting support from my colleagues in my work. ( for school based facilitator only)					
PAJSI –f	I am happy with the behavior of management committee members. ( for community based facilitator only)					
PAJSI –g	There is career advancement opportunity in my job					
PAJSI –h	My head teacher/ management committee always encourage me to do better.					
PAJSI –i	I have been getting job specific training regularly.					

**SECTION D: FREE OPINION (FO)****FO-I:** What challenges have you been facing in your job for implementing your competencies in classroom situation.

Please mention five big challenges in bullet points.

.....

**FO-II:** According to your opinion how can the facilitators' role be made effective to ensure holistic development of the children? Please mention five crucial suggestions in bullet points.**2. OBSERVATION CHECKLIST****A. FACILITATORS COMPETENCIES****Section A: Personal Profile (PP)**

PP- 1 : Name of the ECCD Center: .....

.....

PP- 2 : Address: District ..... VDC/Municipality .....

PP- 3 : Type of ECCD Center:  Community Based  School Based

PP- 4 : Name of ECCD Facilitator: .....

.....  
 PP- 5 : Sex:  Male  Female  
 PP- 6 : Age: ..... years  
 PP- 7 : Caste/Ethnicity: .....  
 PP- 8 : Language (spoken) ..... 1 ..... 2 ..... 3 .....  
 PP- 9: Marital Status:  Married  Unmarried  
 PP- 10: Permanency:  Local  Outsider  
 PP- 11: Academic Qualification: .....  
 PP- 12: Training

Name of the Training	Duration of Training	Training Agency	
		Government	NGO/INGO

PP- 13 : Years of Experiences: ..... (in years and month)  
 PI- 14 : Working hour per day:  hours  
 PI-15 : Exact remuneration drawn   
 PP- 16 : Students Information:

Boys	Girls	Total	Upper cast	Lower cast

PP- 17 : Age of the students (at the time of enrolment)

Below 3 years		3 years		4 years		Above 4 years		Total
Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	

PP- 18 : Do you teach upper grades as well?

(For School based facilitator only)  Yes  No

If yes: Subject ..... Grade .....

Additional remuneration for additional class .....

**Section B: Learning Centre Management (LCM)**

1= Excellent      2=Very good      3= Good      4= Average      5- Below Average

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
LCM-1	Area of classroom on the basis of number of students					
LCM-2	Condition of ventilation in the class					
LCM-3	Sitting arrangement of the class					
LCM-4	Management of 6 learning areas in the class					
LCM-5	Management of learning materials according to learning areas in the class					
LCM-6	Condition of appropriate learning material in the class					
LCM-7	Interactive material on the wall of the classroom					
LCM-8	Management of student information (child's individual file)					
LCM-9	Record keeping and management					
LCM-10	Storage of materials					
LCM-11	Conditions of age specific books, and writing materials and other related reference materials					
LCM-12	Management of diapering, sleeping, eating in the classroom					
LCM-13	Management of indoor playing material					
LCM-14	Management of outdoor playing materials such as swing, sliding, water play, sand play etc.					
LCM-15	Sanitation of the classroom					
LCM-16	Sanitation of the outdoor area of the classroom					
LCM-17	Safety of outdoor playing area					
LCM-18	Safe drinking water facility					
LCM-19	Toilet facilities					

### Section C: Delivery Skill of Facilitator (DSF)

1= Excellent

2=Very good

3= Good

4= Average

5- Below Average

Code	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
DSF-1	Child centered activities					
DSF-2	Relationship with the children					
DSF-3	Caring of each children					

DSF-4	Special care for needy children					
DSF-5	Age specific activities in the classroom					
DSF-6	Handling of children					
DSF-7	Preparation and following daily schedule					
DSF-8	Supports each child's personality and temperament					
DSF-9	Involves children in their choice of activities					
DSF-10	Conversation with the children					
DSF-11	Encourages children as they discover their own sense of self					
DSF-12	Engages children with physical activities					
DSF-14	Encourages children to ask questions					
DSF-15	Asks children open-ended questions					
DSF-16	Actively listens to their comments and responds appropriately					
DSF-17	Provides age appropriate book and writing materials for children's use					
DSF-18	Expands children's vocabulary through conversation, materials, and activities.					
DSF-19	Talks with children both individually and in groups					

D. Overall Development of the Children (ODC)

1 = Very good

2 = Good

3 = Average

4 = Below Average

5 = Poor

	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
A	General Capabilities					
AODC-a	To tell name					
AODC-b	To greet friends and elders					
AODC-c	To tell the name of seven days of a week					
AODC-d	To tell like and dislike things					
B	Pray					
BODC-a	To pray in group					
BODC-b	To understand the meaning of the few words used in pray					

C.	Story/Poem					
CODC –a	To recall short stories with gesture/ facial expressions					
CODC –b	To tell poem in group					
D	Personal Hygiene					
DODC –a	Clean dress					
DODC –b	Condition of hand, mouth, nose and nail					
E	Creative Activities					
EODC –b	Handling pencil appropriately					
EODC –b	Turns the page of the book/copy properly					
EODC –c	To draw picture according to own interest					
F	Pre-writing/reading skill					
FODC-a	To understand concept through pictures					
FODC-b	To match picture and word cards					
G	Presentation					
GODC-a	To tell something about the pictures made by him/her					
GODC-b	To explain what he/she is doing					
H	Games					
HODC-a	To tell the name of games					
HODC-b	To participate in games actively					
HODC-c	To understand the rule of the games					
HODC-d	To keep materials in proper places					
I	Social feelings					
IODC-a	To play friendly					
IODC-b	Cooperative					
J	Interaction					
JODC-a	To ask small questions					
JODC-b	To answer the questions					
JODC-c	Two way communication with friends/ teachers					



