2019 impact report
Our core values at Child’s Dream include transparency and accountability. A crucial aspect of these values is the evaluation of how our work impacts our beneficiaries. Over the last 18 months we have been developing an impact evaluation strategy for Child’s Dream that not only covers most of our core programmes, but also strikes the right balance between additional resources required and added value and insights gained. It is important to us that impact evaluation is done in a sensible way with the main objectives to improve our work for our beneficiaries and, of course, to demonstrate the success of our work to our supporters.

We have always monitored and evaluated (M&E) our programmes, but we have never approached M&E in a systematic and scientific way. Our focus was more on monitoring and evaluating outputs rather than longer term outcomes. We evaluated the schools that had received our buildings to find out which schools had poor management so that we could intervene, but we never compared our indicators to a baseline. Similarly, we tracked our university scholarship alumni to find out what they were doing after graduation, but we never went much beyond that. However, we always had a good hunch about whether our programmes were working well or not and why. Nevertheless, it is very comforting to know that our intuitions are now finally backed up with facts and research.
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Our Monitoring & Evaluation Coordinator, Sahara has developed M&E log-frames together with the teams for the following core programmes: school and boarding house constructions, high and vocational school scholarship programmes, our Children’s Medical Fund, as well as our university scholarship programmes. All these programmes represent roughly 60% of our total yearly project expenses. We aim at increasing this coverage gradually over the years.

In 2019 our teams had to lift the extra workload from our new M&E activities. Together we did 83 school evaluations, 20 boarding house evaluations and collected the surveys from 420 high and vocational schools and 156 university scholarship students and alumni. The entire Children’s Medical Fund database was cleaned up and 1,890 patient records were aligned.

The results from our impact measurement are very encouraging. Here are some of the highlights: 83% of our university scholarship alumni are employed, 51% in the non-profit sector and 13% in the government sector. 78% found jobs related to their field of study and 26% of our Myanmar alumni are entrepreneurs and have established their own organisations. Our high and vocational school scholarship programme has a graduation rate of 85%, which is well above the national average. 81% of our alumni are either studying or working. An overwhelming 97% of alumni are satisfied with our support. Since its start in 2006, our Children’s Medical Fund has closed 1,719 cases; of these 73.6% were treated successfully and 5.4% did not require any treatment. Of out the 1,264 successfully treated cases, 1,022 cases were life-saving.

In Laos and Myanmar, we have reduced classroom crowding from an average of 43 students per classroom to an average of 31 students per classroom. On average, all the 83 schools evaluated have seen a dramatic improvement in school building safety and classroom learning environment.

On the other hand, we also found some weaknesses. Our Laotian scholarship alumni struggle to find jobs due to the limited job market. Although most of our schools that we supported more than 5 years ago are structurally still very sound, some of these schools struggle to maintain their toilets due to water shortages. These are important insights that will help us to improve our designs for future projects.

I hope that you appreciate this report and our transparency about the impact of our work. A special thanks goes to Sahara and our extremely dedicated staff who made this report possible.
We design, implement, and partner to support interventions for children and young adults. We address current and future needs in Myanmar, Laos, Cambodia and Thailand related to:

- Basic or essential health
- Relevant and quality education
- Responsible leaders and qualified specialists
- Values of peace and justice
- Environmental sustainability

OUR STRATEGY

OUR DIRECT GOALS

OUR INDIRECT GOALS

VISION

EMPOWERED PEOPLE RESPONSIBLY SHAPING THEIR COMMUNITIES

MISSION

IMPROVING HEALTH AND EDUCATION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

OUR STRATEGY follows the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations.
When mentioning monitoring and evaluation (M&E) people often think of endless excel sheets and complicated numbers. However, when we think of M&E, our thoughts go straight away to our beneficiaries.

Every intervention aims at promoting positive and meaningful change in the lives of our beneficiaries and the essence of M&E is tracking and understanding that change. When planning the M&E of our interventions, the first question we ask ourselves is what changes do we want to see? Is the community in need of conducive learning environments for their children? Is there a need for high school scholarships to improve school continuation rates? These needs and changes are then translated into programme objectives and goals and a good M&E system is usually able to measure to what extent these have been achieved.

Technically speaking, in Child’s Dream we use results-based monitoring and evaluation systems. After identifying specific programme goals and objectives, we elaborate systems and indicators that measure outputs and outcomes. Outputs are defined as services and products delivered to the beneficiaries, outputs simply describe what we do. To take an example, the main output of our school building programme is the number of school building infrastructures built. Outcomes are instead defined as short term and medium term changes in behaviour, attitude, knowledge, awareness, etc. Outcomes are the positive and meaningful changes we want to achieve for our beneficiaries. Continuing the school building programme example, here the outcomes set are to provide sustainable and conducive learning environments and to increase access to basic education. Output and outcome are defined within a monitoring and evaluation log frame, whose function is to specify indicators, baselines, targets, reporting procedures, data sources, data collection procedures etc.

So, how do these M&E log frames translate into practice? Well, it has been a wild ride. We surveyed hundreds of alumni; we visited dozens of remote schools and boarding houses; we discussed issues and achievements with teachers and principals; we spent hours and hours analysing more than 1,800 patients’ records. The results of these efforts are reported in the following pages.
CURRENT PROJECTS IN IMPLEMENTATION AS OF MARCH 2020

775

CAMBODIA
285

LAOS
270

THAILAND
119

MYANMAR
101

379,893 DIRECT BENEFICIARIES REACHED AS OF MARCH 2020

PROJECTS BY TYPE

- SCHOOL BUILDING: 330
- PLAYGROUND: 114
- WATER SYSTEM: 91
- BOARDING HOUSE: 72
- HS SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMME: 27
- SOLAR CHARGING STATION: 23
- COMPUTER LABORATORY & TRAINING: 17
- POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMME: 17
- YOUTH CAPACITY BUILDING TRAINING: 15
- TEACHER TRAINING & CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: 15
- VOCATIONAL & SKILLS TRAINING: 12
- MIGRANT/IDP LEARNING CENTRES: 7
- SCHOOL HEALTH PROGRAMME: 6
- SOCIAL ENTREPRISE: 6
- STATIONERY & TEACHING AID PROGRAMME: 5
- HEALTH CARE PROGRAMME: 5
- COORDINATION & SUPPORT PROGRAMME: 5
- TERTIARY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMME: 4
- RESEARCH & CONFERENCE SUPPORT: 2
- SCHOOL INCOME GENERATION PROGRAMME: 1
- SCHOOL DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAMME: 1
We strongly believe that a safe and secure learning environment is essential for educational success and well-being. Therefore, we support children and youth in accessing education by providing quality education infrastructure, either building completely new schools, or replacing dilapidated ones which were unsafe and unhygienic.

Nevertheless, the challenge can persist even with improved school buildings as many families are unable to afford the traveling or boarding expenses. Also, in the rainy season many students receive no education due to travel difficulties or dangers such as flooded roads.

Children from very remote villages sometimes have to take shelter in rudimentary boarding houses near the school, these usually poorly built by their parents. Therefore, we construct boarding houses to offer free, solid accommodation and managed care close to schools, thus offering students/boarders a high standard in their learning and living environment.
EASING ACCESS TO BASIC EDUCATION WITH BOARDING HOUSES

As of December 2019, a total of 72 boarding houses implemented by Child’s Dream were in use across Thailand, Myanmar, Laos and Cambodia. With a total of 32 infrastructures, the boarding house programme initially saw a heavier implementation in Thailand. However, since 2014, due to a lack of need, the programme has not seen any growth. On the other hand, in Laos, Cambodia and Myanmar the programme has seen a slow steady growth, counting 23 boarding houses in Laos, 12 in Cambodia, and five in Myanmar.
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

To assess programme outcomes boarding houses are visited and evaluated after two years, after five years, after 10 years, after 15 years etc. During these visits, the maintenance of the infrastructure is evaluated; indicators include: cleanliness, ventilation, light, quality of walls, roofs, ceilings, floors and furniture. The aim is to ensure that maintenance is carried out and that children live in a safe and clean environment. In case of serious structural issues that cannot be fixed by the schools or the community, Child’s Dream considers and offers support. The field teams also collect information on WASH, the aim being to assess how the infrastructure provided affect hygiene and sanitation. The evaluation data is then compared with the baseline data.
In 2019 the project teams performed 18 boarding house evaluations, which correspond to 25% of the overall boarding houses implemented. Overall, the teams carried out eight “two year evaluations”, seven “five year evaluations” and three “ten year evaluations”. Of these 18 evaluations, eight were performed in Thailand, six in Laos, two in Cambodia and two in Myanmar.
Guidelines for each indicator have been developed to standardise ratings across the four countries of intervention. The graph above shows that all baseline indicators have recorded fairly low ratings and that the implementation of new boarding house infrastructure dramatically improves not only the building conditions, but also the living environment. The graph also shows that, after five years, the quality of the buildings tend to slightly decrease, mostly due to wear and tear, lack of funding for minor maintenance and, in certain boarding houses, poor management.

The boarding house indicators are rated on a Likert scale that goes from 0 to 6:
- 0 – NO INFRASTRUCTURE
- 1 – VERY BAD
- 2 – BAD
- 3 – POOR
- 4 – ACCEPTABLE
- 5 – GOOD
- 6 – VERY GOOD
STORIES FROM THE FIELD: NAMLAN BOARDING HOUSE

The Namlan boarding house was built in 2016-2017 in Myanmar, in response to the high dropout rates that affected the students coming from the schools surrounding Namlan City. Since RDFSS, our local partner organisation, could only rent a house and accept a limited amount of children, Child’s Dream provided one boarding house and 10 toilets. The goal was to address the financial burden rural students face when going to secondary school, thus increasing continuation rates.

In 2019, the Namlan boarding house hosted 88 students and two teachers. The evaluation showed very positive results, with both building conditions and the living environment scoring highly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CATEGORIES</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>2 YEARS EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIVING CONDITION</td>
<td>ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCESS TO WATER SOURCE</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROOM BRIGHTNESS</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLEANLINES</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROOM VENTILATION</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROOFS CONDITION</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WALLS CONDITION</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUILDING SAFETY AND SECURITY</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLEAN TOILET WITH WATER FOR FLUSHING</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CROWDEDNESS</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLEAR BOARDING HOUSE RULES</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating 0-6**

- **0 – NO INFRASTRUCTURE**
- **1 – VERY BAD**
- **2 – BAD**
- **3 – POOR**
- **4 – ACCEPTABLE**
- **5 – GOOD**
- **6 – VERY GOOD**

**EVALUATION BY BOARDING HOUSE PROJECT**

**INDICATOR ANALYSIS**

**Namlan Boarding House Building**
The Pich Chenda High School, Cambodia, serves students that come from five surrounding communes; travel distances to the school are estimated at between eight and 23 km. The long commutes to the school used to reduce the incentive for students to continue their studies; therefore, in 2016-2017, Child’s Dream built two fully furnished boarding houses and 16 toilets. The boarding houses currently host 225 students and six teachers, who now benefit from the opportunity to attend high school at a significantly reduced cost.

The 2019 evaluation showed positive results, with overcrowding being the only remaining challenge. Seeing this issue, Child’s Dream is now considering the possibility of sponsoring another boarding house.
## Evaluation by Boarding House Project

**Pich Chenda High School Boarding House**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2 Years Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Condition</td>
<td>Access to Electricity</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to Water Source</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Brightness</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Ventilation</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Condition</td>
<td>Floors and Ceilings Condition</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roofs Condition</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls Condition</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Safety and Security</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Infrastructure</td>
<td>Boarders to Toilets Ratio</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean Toilet with Water for Flushing</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Crowdedness</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear Boarding House Rules</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating 0-6**

**0 – No Infrastructure**

**1 – Very Bad**

**2 – Bad**

**3 – Poor**

**4 – Acceptable**

**5 – Good**

**6 – Very Good**

**Play Video Testimonial**

FROM OUR PICH CHENDA BOARDING STUDENTS
WHY WE DO IT

We strongly believe that a safe and secure learning environment is essential for educational success. Therefore, we support children and youth in accessing education by building educational infrastructure, primarily school buildings with fully-furnished classrooms and toilet facilities. In many villages in our target countries, there are few or no schools at all nearby, requiring students to travel long distances or live away from home. In Laos, for instance, there is only one primary school for every four or five villages, with an average class size of 60 students. Many families are unable to afford the traveling or boarding expenses. Also, in the rainy season many students receive no education due to travel difficulties such as flooded or damaged roads. Particularly with poor quality school infrastructure, rotten classrooms with leaking roofs and gaping walls prevent students and teachers from continuing their lessons in an enabling environment.
CREATING ACCESS AND IMPROVING THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

As of December 2019, a total of 300 school buildings implemented by Child’s Dream were in use across Thailand, Myanmar, Laos and Cambodia. With so much deficient school infrastructure, Laos and Cambodia registered the highest numbers of school buildings supported, with 139 and 101 schools respectively. On the other hand, we built 43 school infrastructures in Myanmar and only 17 in Thailand. These differences in output numbers are justified by the different local contexts.

In Myanmar, ethnic conflicts and a slow peace process have made it difficult to support both ethnic minorities and government schools, while in Thailand the government is able to cater to the needs for school building infrastructure.
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

To assess programme outcomes, schools are visited and evaluated after two years, after five years, after 10 years, after 15 years, etc. During these visits, the maintenance of the infrastructure is evaluated; indicators include: cleanliness, ventilation, light, school compound safety, quality of walls, roofs, ceilings, floors, and furniture. The aim is to ensure that maintenance is carried out and that children can study in a safe and clean environment. In case of serious structural issues that cannot be fixed by the schools or the community, Child’s Dream considers and offers support. The field teams also collect information on school management and WASH, such as completion rates, dropout rates, classroom crowding, students to toilet ratio, etc. The purpose is to assess how the infrastructures provided affect schooling and sanitation within the areas targeted. The evaluation data is then compared with the baseline data.
In order to track and understand outcomes and to further support schools’ needs, in 2019 the project teams performed 83 school evaluations, which roughly corresponds to 27% of the overall schools implemented. Overall, the teams carried out 37 “two year evaluations”, 30 “five year evaluations” and 16 “ten year evaluations”. Of these 83 evaluations, 36 were performed in Laos, 30 in Cambodia, 12 in Myanmar and five in Thailand.
### Improving School Building Conditions and Classroom Learning Environments

Rating guidelines for each indicator have been developed to standardise ratings across the four countries of intervention. The graph on the following page shows that all baseline indicators have recorded significant low ratings and that the implementation of a new school building infrastructure dramatically improves not only the school building conditions, but also the classroom learning environment. The graph also shows that, after 10 years, the quality of buildings and learning environments tend to decrease, mostly due to wear and tear, lack of funding for minor maintenance and, in certain schools, poor management and/or natural calamity. To expound on the last point, during the evaluations carried out, a few schools presented damage, more or less severe, caused by earthquakes and/or storms. These schools are currently receiving support from Child’s Dream to fix the damage.

### Table: Comparison of Indicator Averages Over Time

The school evaluation indicators are rated on a Likert scale that goes from 0 to 6:
- 0 – NO INFRASTRUCTURE
- 1 – VERY BAD
- 2 – BAD
- 3 – POOR
- 4 – ACCEPTABLE
- 5 – GOOD
- 6 – VERY GOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Categories</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baselines</th>
<th>2 Years Evaluation</th>
<th>5 Years Evaluation</th>
<th>10 Years Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment/Effective Use of Classrooms</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Brightness</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Cleanliness</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Ventilation</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Settings</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Decoration</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Building Condition</td>
<td>Building Safety and Security</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roofs Condition</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floors and Ceilings Condition</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls Condition</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rating 0-6 for all schools evaluated in 2019.
In Myanmar and Laos, the construction of school building infrastructures also reduced classroom overcrowding from an average of 43 students per classroom to an average of 30 to 32 students per classroom, certainly an average more in line with the recommended international standard. In Cambodia, average classroom overcrowding did not significantly change due to the local school policies. Indeed, in our Cambodian schools, to reduce the issues of classroom overcrowding and teacher shortages, classes are taught in shifts, in the morning and in the afternoon.

AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER CLASSROOM OVER TIME COMPARISON

Average for schools evaluated in 2019 in Myanmar and Laos
In 2012, the Cambodian villagers of Basaet and Samdech requested the construction of a secondary school, as the nearest school was more than 15 kilometers away. To address this issue, in 2013 and in 2016, Child’s Dream constructed two new school buildings to provide the youth of the area the opportunity to attend secondary school. Currently, the school employs 14 teachers and serves 275 students. The 2019 completion rates are estimated at 89.09% while the dropout rates are set at 15.27%. Both figures are considered acceptable for the Cambodian context. Aside from the student to toilet ratio indicator, which could be improved with the construction of additional toilets, the evaluation analysis indicates that the school is able to maintain good school building conditions and a conducive learning environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Categories</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2 Years Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Services</td>
<td>Access to Electricity</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to Water Source</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>Classroom Brightness</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Cleanliness</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Decoration</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Settings</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Ventilation</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Use of Classrooms</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Building Condition</td>
<td>Building Safety and Security</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floors and Ceilings Condition</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roofs Condition</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walls Condition</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Compound</td>
<td>Clean School Compound</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe School Compound</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management</td>
<td>Students Completion</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students Dropout</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher to Students Ratio</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Infrastructure</td>
<td>Students to Toilet Ratio</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toilet Cleanliness</td>
<td>No Infrastructure</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating 0-6

- 0 – No Infrastructure
- 1 – Very Bad
- 2 – Bad
- 3 – Poor
- 4 – Acceptable
- 5 – Good
- 6 – Very Good
In 2009, Child’s Dream sponsored the construction of a primary school building in the village of Pak Khan, Laos. The original school, which was constructed in 1997, had become dilapidated and provided neither a safe nor a stimulating learning environment. The objective was to provide a conducive learning environment that also ensured the safety of all students. During the 2019 evaluation, the team found the infrastructure to be still safe and solid and the learning environment to be quite positive. However, the team also found that the school did not have access to water, thus rendering difficult the use and cleanliness of existing toilet facilities.
## EVALUATION BY SCHOOL PROJECT

### INDICATOR ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CATEGORIES</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>10 YEARS EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS TO SERVICES</td>
<td>ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCESS TO WATER SOURCE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>CLASSROOM BRIGHTNESS</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASSROOM CLEANLINES</td>
<td>VERY BAD</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASSROOM DECORATION</td>
<td>VERY BAD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASSROOM SETTINGS</td>
<td>VERY BAD</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLASSROOM VENTILATION</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFFECTIVE USE OF CLASSROOMS</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL BUILDING CONDITION</td>
<td>BUILDING SAFETY AND SECURITY</td>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLOORS AND CEILINGS CONDITION</td>
<td>VERY BAD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROOFS CONDITION</td>
<td>VERY BAD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WALLS CONDITION</td>
<td>VERY BAD</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL COMPOUND</td>
<td>CLEAN SCHOOL COMPOUND</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAFE SCHOOL COMPOUND</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>TEACHER TO STUDENTS RATIO</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>STUDENTS TO TOILET RATIO</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOILET CLEANLINESS</td>
<td>NO INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>VERY BAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We initiated Child’s Dream High School and Vocational Scholarship Programme to provide middle school students from rural and marginalised communities with the opportunity to continue education at a higher level. Implemented in Myanmar, Laos, Cambodia and Thailand, the programme aims to improve the continuation rate of students between lower and upper secondary levels, by providing financial support to help them in continuing and completing their upper secondary education. Accepted students receive full scholarship support which covers all education related costs, as well as funds for living and transportation in their three years of upper secondary study. The academic year and the implementation timeline differ across countries.
1,898
HIGH SCHOOL AND VOCATIONAL SCHOLARSHIPS AWARDED

615
CAMBODIA

95
MYANMAR

669
LAOS

519
THAILAND

RUNNING TOTAL OF SCHOLARSHIPS AWARDED BY COUNTRY

INTAKE YEAR


CAMBODIA
MYANMAR
LAOS
THAILAND
In order to understand programme outcomes, a 2019 online survey was administered via Google Forms to 631 alumni and the findings presented reflect the self-reported survey responses of 420 alumni, which corresponds to a response rate of 67%. Alumni who graduated in 2019 were not invited to participate in the survey to ensure that the results only reflect the situation of those who graduated at least one year before. To reduce bias, duplicate respondents were removed from the dataset and all remaining answers were cross-checked for consistency as existing language barriers might decrease response accuracy.
Overall, the programme has recorded a completion rate of 85%. Completion rates have been positive for all three countries: Thailand and Cambodia registered 85% and Laos recorded 84%. Myanmar has not recorded any graduates yet.

Cambodia currently holds the highest number of active students (325) and Laos counts the highest number of graduates (386).

OF THE 1,898 STUDENTS WHO RECEIVED A SCHOLARSHIP

- 831 graduated
- 831 currently studying
- 119 discontinued
- 117 dropped out

A GROWING PROGRAMME

The programme has expanded from 17 beneficiaries in 2010 to 1,898 in 2019. The programme is gender unbiased, but more female applicants successfully passed our strict selection criteria.

1,898 BENEFICIARIES

2010-2019

66% female
(1,248)

34% male
(650)

Basic Education Scholarship Programme

CHILD’S DREAM IMPACT REPORT 2019

1,898 BENEFICIARIES

2010-2019

66% female
(1,248)

34% male
(650)

A GROWING PROGRAMME

The programme has expanded from 17 beneficiaries in 2010 to 1,898 in 2019. The programme is gender unbiased, but more female applicants successfully passed our strict selection criteria.
Respondents to the 2019 alumni tracking survey were asked to rate Child’s Dream services and support. Across the three countries surveyed, none of the respondents gave a negative rating and the majority of the alumni provided very good reviews of the support received. Only very few respondents gave a moderate rating of “acceptable”.

For outcome analysis, a survey was sent to 631 beneficiaries who graduated between 2013 and 2018. We received 420 valid responses, which correspond to a response rate of 67%. 188 of these responses are from Laos, 124 from Thailand and 108 from Cambodia. The first Myanmar alumni will be surveyed in 2020.
DIFFERENT OUTCOMES ACROSS COUNTRIES

80% of the survey respondents are either employed or enrolled in higher education, 14% are looking for jobs or other opportunities and 6% are not searching for employment or other opportunities. Student outcome differs across the three countries surveyed. While in Thailand 77% of the alumni continued to higher education, in Cambodia 56% are employed.

CURRENT SITUATION OF RESPONDENTS

Total % | n=420

- 47% studying
- 33% working
- 14% job seekers
- 6% non job seekers

77% of the Thai respondents continued to higher education.

56% of the Cambodian respondents are employed.
EMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Total % | n=137

- **PAID FULL-TIME**: 54%
- **PAID PART-TIME**: 14%
- **SELF EMPLOYED**: 11%
- **VOLUNTEER**: 10%
- **MULTIPLE JOBS**: 5%
- **INTERNSHIP**: 5%
- **MILITARY**: 1%

OPPORTUNITIES AFTER HIGH SCHOOL

All the alumni surveyed further responded to more specific questions about their current situation. 68% of the employed alumni indicated to have either full-time or part-time paid positions. 77% of the alumni studying are undertaking bachelor degrees.

ENROLMENT INTO FURTHER EDUCATION

- **202 RESPONDENTS**
  - **77% Bachelor Degree**
  - **14% Vocational Course**
  - **9% Other Certifications**

"This scholarship is very important for me because it can help me to reach my goal and to complete me."

**MS. DUL SREY VOLEAK**
HIGH SCHOOL SCHOLARSHIP STUDENT
GRADE 12 AT POUK HIGH SCHOOL
BANTEAY MEANCHEY PROVINCE, CAMBODIA
EDUCATION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Child’s Dream believes that a country can only develop in a sustainable and peaceful way if all members of society can access quality education, fulfil their aspirations and potential, apply their knowledge, and contribute towards the development of their communities. Our University Scholarship Programme provides scholarship support for academically strong students to attend tertiary education in Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar and Thailand. With the advantage of higher education, youth have improved skills and knowledge, access to better employment and serve as future contributors and leaders to the development of their communities.
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

In order to understand programme outcomes, a 2019 online survey was administered via Google Forms to 217 alumni and the findings presented reflect the self-reported survey responses of 156 alumni. Alumni who graduated in 2019 were not invited to participate in the survey to ensure that the results only reflect the situation of those who graduated at least one year before. To reduce bias, duplicate respondents were removed from the dataset and all remaining answers were cross-checked for consistency as existing language barriers might decrease response accuracy.
547 BENEFICIARIES
2006-2019

50% FEMALE
50% MALE

A GROWING NUMBER OF BENEFICIARIES

Since 2007, the USP has seen a steady growth, reaching a total of 547 beneficiaries in 2019. The programme is gender balanced.
Overall, the programme has recorded a graduation rate of 84%.

The USP International Myanmar Bachelor currently holds the highest number of alumni (180) and the USPLB counts the highest number of active students (80).

### BENEFICIARIES STATUS | CUMULATIVE BY PROGRAMME

**2006-2019 | Total % | n=547**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th>Discontinued</th>
<th>Dropped Out</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar-International Bachelor</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos-Bachelor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia-Bachelor</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar-Bachelor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINANCIAL SUPPORT IS THE MOST VALUED BENEFIT

Respondents rated Child's Dream's support in three categories. Overall the alumni seem satisfied with Child's Dream's support, with only a handful negatively rating its support. Financial support is considered the most valuable benefit provided by Child's Dream.
For outcome analysis, a survey was sent to 217 beneficiaries who graduated between 2009 and 2018. We received 156 valid responses, 50 from the Laos programme and 106 from the Myanmar one. This corresponds to a response rate of 72%.

**Current Situation of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>n=156</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working and Studying</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Seekers</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Job Seekers</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82% of the respondents are employed and 6% are studying. A few (9%) are looking for jobs and a handful are not searching for any kind of opportunity. 78% of the respondents found jobs related to their fields of study.
### EMPLOYMENT BY SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>n=128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Profit</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Services</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over a quarter of the Myanmar respondents are founders of either non-profit organisations, social enterprises, or for-profits organisations. 51% of the respondents are currently employed in the non-profit sector, 9% are self-employed and 12% are public servants. Only 26% are employed with for-profit organisations.

26% of the Myanmar respondents are entrepreneurs.

Over a quarter of the Myanmar respondents are founders of either non-profit organisations, social enterprises, or for-profits organisations.
MAIN TASKS AT WORK

Provide training: 17%
Project management: 16%
Teaching: 14%
Networking: 12%
Strategy development: 12%
Research & development: 10%
Administrative/HR: 7%
Media/info campaign: 5%
Raising funds: 4%
Social/medical services: 4%

MAIN EMPLOYMENT FIELD

Education and culture: 30%
Protection/human rights: 12%
Economic development: 11%
Health: 11%
Environmental sustainability: 9%
Gender: 8%
Wash: 7%
Food security & livelihood: 6%
Humanitarian response: 5%
Disaster risk management: 1%

IMPACTFUL CAREERS

All alumni engaged in impactful careers were asked to answer further questions about their employment. Education and culture are the most frequently named fields of employment, followed by human rights and economic development. Providing training and teaching are among the most frequent tasks at work, together with project management.

"Child’s Dream is like a second parent for me. Because if I did not get a scholarship, I would not have this level of education and I would still be working as a migrant worker." — Ms. Aye Aye Mon

Child’s Dream University Scholarship Programme Alumna & Co-Founder, Gateway Learning Center
REDUCING CHILDHOOD MORTALITY AND LONG-TERM DISABILITY

CMF supports the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for 2030, specifically Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all ages.

Established in 2006, CMF provides access to life-saving operations and medical interventions for infants and children. In promoting the health service, we prioritise treatments of congenital disorders as it is one of the leading causes of child mortality. The surgical procedures are normally expensive and complex; the majority of families cannot afford the necessary medication, let alone the costly operations.

With approx. 150 patients annually, our targeted beneficiaries are children aged 0-12 who have been diagnosed with cardiac disorders, anorectal malformations, and neural tube defects. Without financial support and access to quality health care, many of these children either die prematurely or are crippled by disability, and are unable to attend school, perpetuating the cycle of poverty.
A GROWING PROGRAMME

As of the end of 2019, the program counts a total of 1,959 cases, which corresponds to 1,890 patients. One patient can present multiple cases. The majority (92%) of the cases are from Myanmar or are from Myanmar descendants. The remaining 8% are from Laos.
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Once patients are officially registered in the programme, they will start treatment and will be monitored and supported by the staff. Patients’ cases and information are recorded in a database that keeps track of the treatments provided and the outcome of these. For monitoring purposes, information is cross checked against medical reports every six months and programme statistics are then produced to understand output and outcome.

1,890
PATIENTS FROM 2006-2019

1,959
CASES FROM 2006-2019

56%
MALE

44%
FEMALE

73.6%
TREATMENT SUCCESSFUL

Sometimes, one patient suffers from more than one disease which results in more than one case per patient.
A WIDE RANGE OF MEDICAL CONDITIONS

Counting 59% of the overall cases, cardiac disorders are the predominant medical condition. Another 16% are general or unspecified cases. These were recorded between 2006 and 2008, when patients were welcomed in the programme regardless of their medical condition. Among the general or unspecified cases, we had patients with bone fractures, cancer, severe fevers etc. The remaining 25% of the cases are other congenital disorders, such as anorectal malformations or neural tube defects.

CLOSED CASES VS OPEN CASES

Of the overall 1,959 cases recorded, 88% (1,719) have been closed and another 12% (240) are ongoing.
CLOSED CASES BY REASONS

2006-2019 | Total % | n=1,718

- **TREATMENT SUCCESSFUL**: 73.6%
- **DEATH RELATED**: 6.9%
- **NO TREATMENT REQUIRED**: 5.4%
- **CANNOT CONTACT ANYMORE**: 4.5%
- **UNABLE TO TREAT**: 3.0%
- **REFUSED TREATMENT**: 3.0%
- **RESETTLEMENT**: 1.6%
- **REFERRED TO PARTNER**: 1.2%
- **TREATMENT POSTPONED**: 0.6%
- **DEATH UNRELATED**: 0.2%

**DIFFERENT CLOSING REASONS**

Cases can be closed for a wide range of reasons. Often is because of the patients’ full recovery and, indeed, 73.6% of the cases were closed because of successful treatments. Yet, there have been different cases where, unfortunately, patients have passed away because of the severity of their conditions. Other instances were instead luckier, with patients being able to heal without any treatment. Along these lines, other closing reasons include patients’ refusal of the treatments, patients’ resettlement to a third country, patients’ referral to other partners, inability to contact patients or inability to treat the medical condition.

**SAVING LIVES**

When successfully closing a case, depending on the severity of the condition treated, the programme has either saved a life or has improved it. Having seen the severity of the majority of the cases recorded, 81% of the successful treatments are lifesaving.
EMPLOYEES BY NATIONALITY

AS OF END OF 2019, WE COUNTED 43 PAID EMPLOYEES
AVERAGE AGE 35 YEARS

43
PAID EMPLOYEES

33% (14) THAILAND
28% (12) MYANMAR
16% (7) CAMBODIA
7% (3) LAOS
5% (2) USA
5% (2) SWITZERLAND
2% (1) PHILIPPINES
2% (1) GERMANY
2% (1) ITALY
EXPERIENCE BY FOCUS GROUP 2019

- **BASIC EDUCATION**: 47%
- **HIGHER EDUCATION**: 37%
- **HEALTH**: 15%
- **SOCIAL ENTERPRISE**: 1%

**EXPENDITURE 2019**

- **USD 8,359,440**
- **MYANMAR**: (1,949,993) $23%
- **CAMBODIA**: (1,941,401) $16%
- **LAOS**: (1,300,700) $9%
- **THAILAND**: (364,002) $4%

**ORIGIN OF DONATIONS 2019**

- **SWITZERLAND**: 36%
- **LIECHTENSTEIN**: 13%
- **SINGAPORE**: 11%
- **HONG KONG SAR**: 8%
- **USA**: 7%
- **GERMANY**: 7%
- **THAILAND**: 7%
- **OTHER**: 11%
- **REGIONAL**: 4%
- **MYANMAR MIGRANTS & REFUGEES**: 9%

**EXPENDITURE 2019**

- **USD 8,655,185**
- **MYANMAR**: (3,961,850) $47%
- **THAILAND**: (364,002) $4%
- **USA**: (18,583) $98
6% ADMINISTRATION COST IN 2019

76% PERSONNEL COSTS
13% ADMINISTRATION, IT, LEGAL, AND TRAVELS
11% DEPRECIATION & PROVISION

DONATION VOLUME
TOTAL DONATIONS RECEIVED IN 2019: USD 8,655,185

(m USD) vs. ADMINISTRATION COST (%)

*Average admin cost of ZEWO-approved (Swiss) NGOs. (SOURCE Annual Report ZEWO 2014)