

Training for development

An evaluation of the Kathmandu University –
Community Education Project

A project funded by HimalPartner and Digni through Norad.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1 <i>Preface</i>	3
1.2 <i>Summary</i>	4
1.3 <i>Methodology</i>	5
2. Description	6
2.1 <i>Background</i>	6
2.2 <i>The project</i>	7
3. Evaluation	9
3.1 <i>Evaluation on indicators</i>	9
3.2 <i>Discussions</i>	15
4. Conclusions and recommendations	22
Appendixes	24

1. Introduction

1.1 Preface

Wengen's tjenesteri was awarded the assignment to evaluate the Kathmandu University - Community educational Project (KU-CEP) in august 2015. The assignment was to evaluate the KU-CEP as described in the Terms of Reference (see appendix 1).

Evaluating development projects requires a double focus. On the one side one evaluates whether the goals and intentions from the initial plans and applications have been fulfilled. This is the «control function» of the evaluation. This is often the priority for external donors. On the other side one have to consider the development of the project, the capacity of the participating partners, lessons learned and whether or not development have happened, even if the described goals have not been fulfilled as planned. This is the «learning function» of the evaluation. This part is often the priority for the implementing partners.

KU-CEP is a development project on several levels. It is not only development in the sense of contributing to the overall development of Nepal. It is also development in the sense that it is a project that challenges both the partners and the participants on both content and organization.

A re-occurring frustration from many NGOs being evaluated by external evaluators is «how can they possibly know? » After the partners have spent countless of hours, energy and creativity for more than 5 years on developing a project, how can an external evaluator possibly get the full picture during a 9 days' visit? This is a valid frustration. There are always limitations to these kinds of evaluations. There is always a risk that something slipped in the process. That key people weren't available, cultural messages were misinterpreted and written reports were misplaced. One way to overcome this, at least partly, is through close and honest communication between the evaluator and the organisation or project being evaluated before, during and after the fieldwork. It has been the ambition for this evaluator to establish and maintain such a communication throughout the evaluation process. This does however not come without challenges. There is a risk of developing a too close relation between the evaluator and the evaluated, and as a result a less objective perspective. Finding this balance is challenging.

I hope I have managed to maintain the necessary distance and at the same time grasped the essence of the project, its partners and the outcome. I hope both Kathmandu University and HimalPartner will find the report and its conclusions useful for the continuous development of this project, and any other joint projects they will embark on in the future.

Drammen 04.01.2016

Anders Wengen

1.2 Summary

This report is called "Training for development". The title is a reference to one of the main goals of the KU-CEP. The report will show that the project has been partly successful in fulfilling this goal.

The report is divided into four parts. The first part is the introduction, consisting of the chapters *Preface*, *Summary* and *Methodology*. The second part is the description of the project and its development, consisting of the chapters *Background* and *The program*. The third part is the evaluation consisting of the chapters *Evaluation on indicators* and *Discussions*. The final part is the chapter *Conclusions and Recommendations*.

The project has three objectives: community development, community training for students and business incubation. Out of these community training for students has been the most prioritized objective. A huge number of students have been exposed to the rural areas of Nepal, areas they most probably wouldn't have visited if it wasn't for the project. They have become interested in developing the country, and a certain sense of urgency have developed among the students to contribute in building their country and support vulnerable groups. It has been a goal to "open" the country for the privileged groups that mainly constitutes the student of Kathmandu university. Through community projects the students are exposed to the rural areas of Nepal and are encouraged to get involved in the development of the country. KU wants their students to have applicable, hands-on knowledge in their fields. Knowing the theory of their field is not sufficient – they have to have experience in *using* it as well.

It has also been a goal to use this project as a means to develop the rural areas of Nepal through basic, small scale projects. The ambition has been to make minor improvement in the daily lives in the communities. There is no available information that suggests that this has been successful.

As for the business incubation it is too soon to draw any conclusions as it has been in function for less than two years.

The most serious shortcoming for the project is the lack of a good monitoring system. This has led to an uncertainty in project objectives, lack of data in terms of goals fulfilment and a serious uncertainty in terms of the effects in the communities of both good and bad. This requires immediate attention.

The administrative routines in terms of financial reporting routines, internal control and auditing seems to be more than acceptable.

The evaluation raises a few discussions that has a relevance for not only this project but for several of the activities at KU. These includes a discussion on *the role of the university*, *business incubation*, *learning by doing*, *brain drain and the values of KU* and *earthquake, blockade and opportunities*. Some of these discussions raises important points that should be discussed thoroughly in both KU and HimalPartner.

The main conclusion of the report is that KU-CEP has been partly successful. The evaluation has a few recommendations if the project is to be extended, but concludes that the project has had several positive effects for the participating students and for the partners KU and HimalPartner.

1.3 Methodology

The evaluation process has consisted of a desktop study of all available written documentation, interviews with key individuals and a community field visit.

The desktop study was conducted from September to late November. The evaluator was given access to all written documentation from the project, from the pilot phase in 2011 to the most recent reports from 2015. When the evaluator has asked for extra documentation this has been provided. Included in the desktop study was a review of all financial reports, including budgets and accounts.

The second part was interviews with key stakeholders of which the majority were in Nepal. This was mainly done on-site at Kathmandu University from November 27th to December 6th 2015. HimalPartner presented a list of key stakeholders they recommended being interviewed as part of the the evaluation. This list was followed to a large extent. There were only small changes made, due to availability and time constraints. The interviews were based on information from the desktop study and communication with HimalPartner. In addition to interviews a participatory session were held with students who had participated in the project.

The third part was a field visit to a community chosen by Kathmandu University, hosted by students who had participated in the project.

In addition to the evaluator there has been at least one representative from HimalPartner on all interviews and on the fieldtrip. At least one representative from Kathmandu University was also present on most of the interviews. At the participatory process with the students, KU staff were asked not to participate. The community field trip was also done without representation from the KU staff.

Three meetings were held with the evaluation team during the stay in Nepal to discuss findings and clarify facts. In addition, there was daily interaction between the evaluator and the evaluation team where the project was discussed.

Main findings were presented to KU staff December 6th and to HimalPartner December 11th. A draft report was made available the 11th December for the parties in order to clarify ambiguities and correct factual errors.

The evaluation team consisting of representatives from both KU and HimalPartner has contributed significantly to the evaluation. The final report including its discussions, descriptions and recommendations is however the responsibility of the evaluator alone.

2. Description

2.1 Background

Kathmandu University (KU) was established in 1991 as an autonomous, non-profit, non-government institution. Its vision was «To become a world class university devoted to bringing knowledge and technology to the service of mankind». Since the beginning the university has had a strong focus on introducing its students to real-life challenges. Through a variety of programs and projects its students have received an education that is more focused on learning than teaching. The students are encouraged to gather experience, solve real-life problems and practice their craft, be it in engineering, arts or any other subject given at the university.

Since 1993 HimalPartner has been a close partner of KU. HimalPartner has a long experience from working in the country in a variety of fields, including hydropower and technical training. This experience was useful for KU when they started developing their undergraduate programs. From its start and up until 2009 the cooperation between the KU and HimalPartner has been on developing KUs programs from undergraduate to Ph.D. programs.

In 2009 the cooperation had come to point where KU no longer needed HimalPartners support for their regular programs. The question was whether KU should continue on its own and HimalPartner should direct its focus elsewhere in the country, or whether there were other areas of cooperation available. During this process KU presented the idea of a Community Education Project(KU-CEP).

For HimalPartner this was a welcoming initiative. HimalPartner was initially established as an NGO focusing on community development through education, construction and business development. The initiative presented by KU was about just that. Letting students bring their newly achieved knowledge to the community so both the students and the communities would benefit, and facilitate business incubation in the wake. KU-CEP was a project that brought together the core values of both KU and HimalPartner.

They soon decided to develop a pilot project together and apply for funding from Norad through Digni. The main goals for the project were community development, community training (for students) and business incubation. The application was approved and a two-year pilot project started in 2010.

Pilot phase (2011-2012)

The main goal of the pilot phase was to investigate and evaluate the possibilities of establishing outreach centres for KU, do baseline studies in possible project areas and organize field trips with students. During this phase several hundred students were exposed to the rural areas of Nepal. The focus was less on community development and more on exposing the students to the rural areas.

Significant administrative resources were devoted to start-up challenges such as travel, accommodation and recruitment as well as to involve university staff in the project development and implementation. A few activities were implemented, mostly local trainings. An evaluation was done and a decision to apply for ordinary project funding was made. The chosen target areas for the project were Tamakoshi valley, Langtang valley and the outreach centres of Dhulikel Hospital.

Program period (2013-2015)

When the project went into its main phase, a new project manager was hired. It was decided that the focus on community development should be strengthened. The number of students per batch were reduced, so that the villages weren't «flooded with students» as they had some experience with before. A group of faculty members travelled to the chosen communities and did a feasibility study. This study is unfortunately not available, but it was from the basis of this challenges were identified for the students. The students should then find solutions, develop project ideas and then present them to a committee who chose the best and most doable projects.

It was decided to include more schools from the university in the project which led to both school of science and school of arts now being included. The number of projects increased significantly with a high in 2014 with more than 50 specific projects implemented in the community.

In 2014 the KU-CEP was strengthened with a full time position. In addition to strengthen the administrative capacity of the project this lead to the start-up of the incubation leg of the project. Kathmandu University Business Incubation Centre (KUBIC) was established as a part of KU-CEP. The ambition was to support the students who had developed products or ideas in the KU-CEP with a potential marked, to develop their idea further and establish a business. The initial plan of the incubation program in Ku-CEP was to also establish Incubation centres in the communities, but this was put on rest until the KUBIC project at KU was up and running.

Since its beginning in 2010 more than 1500 students have participated in more than 150 projects of a great variety. The KU-CEP has been an extra-curriculum activity and its content has not been a part of the education as such, but has been an opportunity for the students to utilize their knowledge in underprivileged areas of Nepal.

2.2 The project

The Kathmandu University Community Education Project (KU-CEP) is a three legged project that includes community development, community training for students and business incubation. The project recruits undergraduate students from the schools of engineering, science and arts who travel to rural, marginalized areas of Nepal to implement a variety of activities. Around 70 % of the projects are training on different fields from agriculture and mechanics to health and education. The remaining 30 % are product development and implementation, mostly from the school of engineering.

Some of the students are encouraged to apply for business incubation if they have developed products that are considered relevant for a greater marked. They then apply for admittance to the business incubation centre. Currently there are 11 companies included in this activity.

2.2.1 Involved parties

There are two formal parties in the project, KU and HimalPartner. Initially there was a plan to involve local Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community based organizations (CBOs) in the project. This was to ensure local ownership and involvement in the project. There have been no MoUs of this kind entered. The only involved parties in planning and implementation of projects have been in HimalPartner and KU - while local parties and VDCs have been on the receiving side. There has been some communication with local official representatives, but not systemized. There is

one MoU entered with University of Seoul from 2015, but related to KU-CEP this agreement is mostly concerned with supporting students from South-Korea in their field work in cooperation with KU-CEP students.

2.2.2 Management

At present time the project is being led by a project coordinator and an assistant manager for Business Incubation. The project coordinator is doing this in addition to his daily full-time job at the university. The assistant manager is employed full time and is utilizing most of the time towards the Business Incubation Centre. There is a steering committee for the project but this has not been called for more than 18 months. The project coordinator is however communicating with them via e-mail when he seeks advice. The coordinator reports directly to the registrar of the university.

There has been close cooperation between HimalPartner and KU-CEP throughout the whole project period, with an exception of two periods including the last 5 months. Before this the HimalPartner representative shared offices with KU-CEP and was readily available when needed.

2.2.3 Outputs

Since its beginning 1300 students have participated in the project and 84 projects have been implemented in 10 different communities in rural Nepal.

One baseline study and one geomatics study has been conducted.

3. Evaluation

3.1 Evaluation on indicators

There is no systemized monitoring system for the project. Without any systemized data from the whole project period, it is impossible for an evaluator to draw any decisive conclusions on neither output nor impact. There doesn't exist a consistent set of indicators, systemized evaluations or lessons learned. The yearly reports are mainly output-focused and tells a story of high activity in several different fields - but says nothing about short- or long-term effects for neither local communities nor students.

Considering the two partner's competence and experience, this is surprising. Measuring impact is challenging, but a systemized collection and discussion of at least output data should be expected for a project of this magnitude.

The lack of a clear set of indicators that shows direction relevant to the goals of the project, is a reoccurring issue in this report. This is due to an ongoing discussion in HimalPartner on which monitoring system to use, and the fact that the main donor did not request this in the project design. This is an explanation that bares some weight, but it is not completely satisfying. Having indicators is not only necessary for reporting from the project, it is also necessary for monitoring and keeping the project on track. Project goals has a tendency to be broad. With defined indicators the project management could have focused their efforts more. The broad scope of projects in the field is not necessarily a good thing. It could indicate a lack of focus, a lack of long-term planning - with the lack of development in the villages as a result. A system for monitoring, be it logical framework approach or something else, should have been in place, even if it wasn't specified as necessary from the donor. An NGO with the long experience HimalPartner has should have insisted on this.

With that said, it is still possible to evaluate the project. But the reader of this report must bear in mind that the only historical data available are the annual reports from the project and the initial project documents. All interviews are done with informants who are challenged on their perspectives on the project here and now. Its is their *opinions* that constitutes the main corpus of the available data. Their experiences do of course bear weight, but is strictly speaking mostly anecdotal. There are no reasons to believe they are wrong, but there is also a limited opportunity to verify it. The only strategy to verify information has been through cross referencing information between the different informants. The consistency is high.

In the following each of the questions defined in the Terms of Reference will be discussed.

3.1.1 Project goal (2013-2015)

The project goal as described in the application is as follows:

"The students' and faculties' at Kathmandu University have gained interest and involvement in development of rural Nepal to the extent that it reduces the brain-drain from Nepal and contributes to making model communities in the areas of the centres."

The project goal is three goals in one. Firstly, the issue is whether the students and faculties have gained interest and involvement in development of rural Nepal. Secondly, whether this involvement is so strong that it convinces students who would otherwise have moved out of the country to

remain in Nepal and work there. Thirdly it is to contribute to making model communities in the areas of the centres.

Most of the informants in this evaluation have been asked what the goals of this project are. It is encouraging that all informants have agreed on them. It is not so encouraging that they have agreed on a different set of goals than the ones in the project design. The goals the informants agree on are 1. Community development, 2. Community training (for students) and 3. Business incubation. These goals are not articulated directly or defined in the written documentation. Parts of what they entail can be read into the goals and in the list of *indicators* though, which raises an important point.

Having a monitoring system is important for any kind of project. What system one chooses will vary, but if one decides to use a specific system, for instance the log frame system, one must be clear on how it works. In this project it looks like one have begun with a log frame design, but decided not go through with it whole heartedly.

In KU-CEP there seem to be some confusion related to what is a goal and what is an indicator. It is not possible to see how the indicators listed here actually tells whether the project goal is achieved.

If all the listed indicators were positive, would that have meant that the goals were achieved? Probably not. Whether students and faculties have *gained interest and involvement* in rural Nepal can not be indicated only by gaining practical experience or being exposed to rural communities. None of the indicators touch upon the issue of brain drain, except perhaps the third goal dealing with business incubation, but also this only to a certain degree. As long as «model community» isn't defined, it is also quite hard to see how any of the indicators show what has been achieved here. The same goes for a «full-fledged program».

It is important to emphasize that this does not mean that neither the project goal nor the indicators necessarily are wrong as such. It is rather the lack of consistency that is the issue. Some of the indicators are probably goals, some of the project goals are rather an overall goal and there is clearly a need for a more comprehensive set of indicators. This is a technical issue that can and should be improved for future projects.

Due to this the project goal, indicators and results will be discussed separately, rather than handling them as a continue hierarchy as would be the case was this a complete log frame system.

3.1.2 Indicators of project goal

1. The students and faculty members gain practical experience from rural communities.

The students and faculty members have indeed gained practical experience from rural communities. Around 1500 students have been through the project since the pilot started in 2010, all supervised by a team of skilled and involved faculty members. They have gained experience through a vast number of projects in a variety of fields. The quality of their experience, whether there are differences between the different school and faculties, whether there has been a development over time etc. can not be determined due to lack of systemized data. It is however important to say that

all the informants tell a story of a good, motivating and inspirational project. There is nothing in the data that questions this.

2. Through the Project, faculties and students have been exposed to the rural community for a month or fewer days through various surveys, baseline studies and workshops.

Most of the projects have lasted for 5-8 days. As far as the available data suggests there has only been one baseline study conducted in the pilot phase. It is unclear what this baseline was used for. It was not utilized in the designing of projects in the field. It was early in the project suggested that a second baseline study should be conducted towards the end of the project, but this has not been done. There have been workshops conducted both in the communities and at KU. There has also been developed a website where many of the activities and projects are presented.

3. Incubate business which will use local resources of rural communities and orient students toward entrepreneurial skills.

The first businesses that were included in the incubation part of KU-CEP came in 2014. Since then the total number of companies in the project have increased to 11. It is expected that several more companies will be included during 2016. 18 months is not enough time to draw any conclusion on the set-up or success of this but those involved are optimistic about the future for several of the companies. There is however no way to tell until the companies are through the start-up phase.

4. To design and operate a full-fledged program for students and faculties at centre 1

The idea of establishing several centres were abandoned early in the project. The reason was that there already was decentralized health centres in field, and it did not make sense to establish a second groups of centres running parallel with these. These health centres works as a hub for the students when on field trips, providing accommodation and meeting facilities. They also have a certain role in the communication between KU and and the communities, but holds no role in KU-CEP other than that. There are no business incubation activities done in the field. There is at the moment one centre being reconstructed after the earthquake in one of the communities. The usage of this is being seen in combination with RECIPE. Before it functioned as a base for the students when in the field. What a full-fledged program for students and faculties really entails is not clear, but there are reasons to believe it has not been achieved.

5. To have a minimum of 3-5 small enterprises running as a result of KU's incubation program

Look at indicator 3

6. To have mutual cooperation with the local community.

There is no doubt that the main focus of KU-CEP has been to provide useful experiences for the students, and that this has had a much higher priority than involving the communities in the project. There is no formal cooperation with any local organizations, no MoUs have been signed and it does not seem that the interaction with the community before, during and after student field trips is systemized in any way. There is communication with the local communities, but mostly on practicalities and as a target group for student activities, but this can hardly be defined as *cooperation*. There have been some assessments done prior to student field trips in order to get a

basic impression of the communities and to identify need. This has however mostly been through observation and guidance by a faculty member. Some students have conducted a feasibility study prior to their field project, but the general impression is that also this is done without much interaction from the locals. It is safe to say that the vast majority of the projects have been decided on without any real village participation.

7. A second centre is started implemented.

There are no new centres being planned in KU-CEP, but it is being discussed in relation to the development of RECIPE. There were plans to establish a second centre earlier in 2015, but this was stopped due to the earthquake.

8. Baseline study in Tamakoshi, Langtang and Dolpa, Geomatics survey in Tamakoshi

There has been done one baseline study in Tamakoshi and a geomatics survey done in an area close to Tamakoshi. Due to lack of capacity early in the project there was no baseline done in the other areas. It does not seem like the data from the baseline and geomatics study is used when designing community projects. Asked directly none of the informants can give a clear answer on this. From the project plans early in the pilot phase, it seems that the purpose of the baseline was to establish a threshold to measure development from. This would have required an «after» baseline for comparison. This has not been done, and is not being planned

3.1.3 Expected results

1. Capacity building/organizational development

KU and HimalPartner have known each other since the early -90s and they have developed a close cooperation and relationship since then. The cooperation on KU-CEP has however been of a different kind than the previous ones. Doing community work through students, introducing students to challenging environments and develop business from academic results are individually daunting tasks for any educational facility or development organisation. Doing it in combination is even harder.

Capacity building is both an individual and organizational achievement. Most the informants, specially those working directly with the project, have learned significantly through the project. The extent to which this learning have benefitted the two organizations is difficult to determine.

For KU the project has been a learning experience on several levels. The project in itself have challenged them on logistics, internal communication and internal cooperation. They have had to connect the schools and faculties tighter in order to organize the field trips. It has also been a new experience to report on the projects as required from the Norwegian donor. This has lead them to increase its focus on administrative routines at the university, with the result that they now have established a separate team that follows the accounting and auditing of the projects.

For HimalPartner the cooperation with KU has been more on an administrative level. KU has been in charge of the implementation on the ground and HimalPartner has supported KU when needed. Specially the first years the need for support was extensive on the administrative level. The last year the need in this regard has decreased significantly, and both KU and HimalPartner have devoted

more time to discuss new projects related to the experiences from KU-CEP. It is during these latter projects HimalPartner have gained most in terms of capacity building.

2. Contribute services, which will benefit the local communities

This is difficult to establish due to lack of relevant data. There are reports on projects done, but no qualitative data on impact, follow-up, sustainability, usage, harm risks, learning points etc. There are some stories of failed projects, but nothing serious. This is however not satisfying. The general impression is that no-one really knows the result of most of the projects, be it good or bad.

During the field trip to the village Salambu some of the projects were presented and there was some interaction with community member. The feedback was that some projects had failed and some had been a great success. An example of a good project was an improved cooking stove that had been developed by students. It was an impressively easy concept to direct smoke out from the kitchen through a small chimney. It was easy to install and around 700 households in the area had it installed. The fact that this was done by local people who had learned the trade from students, and were paid 200 rupees per stove, adds to the success.

It is beyond this evaluation to do a thorough analysis of all the implemented projects. Only one village out of more than 10 were visited, and only a few projects were presented, most of them related to one specific family. This is not enough to draw any conclusion. More than 70% of the projects are trainings on different areas from first aid trainings to women to physics labs at school. The impact from these kinds of activities are difficult determine, due to lack of data (records of participants, relevance of content etc.) and the long time frame since the first projects.

3. KU contributed with services, which will benefit the local communities, incubate business which will use local resources etc.

The issue of whether KU contributed with services that benefitted the local communities is already commented on. Did KU incubate local businesses that utilized local resources? Again, the lack of data makes it difficult to evaluate this. Incubation in the communities were deliberately been taken out of the project. There was however one project, the enhanced stove, which had given some locals a trade that was being used in a village. This must however been seen as a fortunate added value, and not a result from deliberate activity to start local businesses. The community centres that was thought to facilitate local business development has not happened, so there are good reasons to believe that any effect here has been accidental.

4. The community based project from the second year students of electrical and electronics department will benefit the community.

This is questionable. The only project from this department that was planned to visit had collapsed, and the solar panels were sent back to KU for repairs. No other projects had been monitored and it was not possible to get any updated information on any of the projects. It must be mentioned that most of the communities this schools have visited lies in the areas that were severely hit by the earthquakes, so the availability of data would be limited.

5. Outreach centres in two regions will be established.

At the moment there are no outreach centres running. The one that did exist was not so much an outreach centre as a base for students when in the field. This one is now being renovated and is planned to be used by RECIPE

6. Possible same streamline projects running in the other departments of KU will be incorporated in this project which will benefit the local community more.

There have been efforts the last few years to send multi-faculty groups to the communities. They have just to a small degree worked together on projects, but they have travelled together and has had the possibility to learn from and motivate each other. There have also been cases of ongoing projects in some schools that have been linked to KU-CEP activities, so that students could work on existing projects through the project.

3.1.4 Perspectives from the students

As part of the evaluation a two-hour participatory session with a group of students that had participated in KU-CEP was done. They gave a good insight on how they have experienced the project, what they have learned and what they believe could be improved. Several good suggestions came during the process. Some of it is incorporated in this report elsewhere, and some will be mentioned here.

Experiences

The students made it clear the KU-CEP had been a very good experience for them. Out of the 18 participating students, all said they had learned a lot, that they were more motivated to work in Nepal, and that they now saw opportunities they hadn't seen before.

For all the students KU-CEP was in fact the first time out of the valley, and several mentioned that the project had given them a new kind of self-confidence.

Suggestions

All the students were satisfied with the project, but they also had ideas for improvements of which three will be listed here.

- Better feasibility studies

The students suggested that a feasibility checklist was developed. This would help them look for indicators of challenges in the communities. Suggestions were number of houses, number of children in schools, quality of infrastructure, number of solar panels etc. Having this would also make it possible to measure development over time.

- Follow-up

All the students were curious if their project had had any impact. They requested a follow-up on both short and long time, both to learn and to develop ideas further.

- Fewer communities.

They questioned whether it was necessary with so many communities. With fewer communities they could work closer and all the groups could evaluate and improve on each others projects.

3.1.5 Sustainability

When discussing sustainability in this context, one often thinks of it in terms of «will the project survive after the donor pulls out?» In this case there are good reason to say yes. The project was planned to last until the end of 2015, but has now been postponed with one year due to the earthquakes in April and May 2015. There is however a clear ambition to continue the project after this. There is already a process in place for KU to finance KU-CEP with its own resources combined with support from local donors.

3.1.6 Finances

A comprehensive audit and accounting control was not conducted, as this was beyond the scope of this evaluation. All budgets, accounts and audit reports since 2013 have been reviewed. The accounts for 2015 is not yet ready, but the preliminary accounts are reviewed. Interviews with the project management team and the manager of the newly established project administration team were conducted

There is a good, transparent financial report system in place at KU. Every cost is double signed by the administrative team before final approval by the designated accountant. The accounting system is transparent and digitalized and readily available for inquiries. Due to the instalment of a new system, it is challenging to get hold of record from before 2014, but also these were made available on request.

The audits are reliable and comprehensive. It is encouraging to see that they are conducting comprehensive audits that includes more than just finance. They are increasingly focusing on whether the project is fulfilling its goals, gender issues etc in the audit reports.

There is nothing negative to report on.

3.2 Discussions

3.2.1 The role of the university

«We don't want to educate engineers who can't use a screwdriver»

In Nepal «University» has a different meaning than in most western countries. In Norway, as in the rest of Europe, the university traditionally has been seen as an academic institution that awards degrees in academic fields. Their two main activities have been research and teaching. Professional and practical education like nursing, engineering, teaching etc. belonged in the university colleges. This has however changed over the last decade, and today most universities and university colleges are merging into one higher education sector. Still, for many the university is still understood as before.

I Nepal university is a term that includes both universities and colleges. Some universities, like KU and Tribhuvan University (TU) are being approved by the Nepali parliament and are governed by a «university act». This act gives the university great freedom to establish schools and constituted colleges where the university has the administrative and financial responsibility. They can also establish «affiliated» colleges where they don't have any direct administrative or financial responsibility, but controls and approves activities. So the difference between a university and a college is insignificant.

When KU was established it made a point to differentiate itself from the Indian university tradition which was very theoretical and somehow disconnected to the rest of society and the development of the country. The founders of KU were convinced that this could not be the role of the university in Nepal. Contrary to the Indian model they said one of the most important roles of the university is to develop the society in which it is a part. They therefore wanted their students, even on lower levels, to be challenged on how their knowledge can be utilized to develop the whole country, including the rural areas.

KU has developed tremendously since its start in the -90s. They are now educating students in a variety of fields, they have professors who hold Ph.D. degrees, they have PhD programs, and they are both teaching and doing research. It is safe to say that the western requirements for being a university is fulfilled. It is however important to keep in mind that in the Nepali context being a university is much more than this.

According to our informants, what differentiates KU from most other universities, even in Nepal, is their strong ambition to be a key actor in the development of Nepal. Most technical universities and university colleges around the world have periods where the students do internships, assignments and field works. These are exclusively meant to give the students practical experience that will benefit their education. Any benefit for the local communities are seen as an added value. To ensure that no harm is being done, most institutions have a code of conduct to guide the students, they are being closely supervised and high risk projects are avoided if they can do harm to the local community. KU also has these programs.

But in addition KU has the KU-CEP which aims at taking the fieldwork a step further. In this project KU goes from being solely an educational institution, to become a proactive part who does development work directly. Most educational institutions would say they contribute to development by educating the population, develop educational programs that target specific needs, allow master and PhD students to do research on specific development issues etc. For KU this is not enough. They do not want to only be the middle man between the challenge and its solution. They want to identify the challenge, develop the solution and implement it.

If there is one thing history has taught us when it comes to development work, it is that it is difficult. Even the easiest, most basic interventions have the potential to cause harm. But more often we experience development projects that basically doesn't do anything, neither good nor bad. It requires skills and experience in several fields to identify challenges, risk factors and opportunities, and it requires a substantial amount of resources to be able to do proper follow-up. This is not only to ensure the quality of the projects, but it's also out of respect to the communities.

This should not stand in the way of local initiatives to improve its country. Over-complication of basic interventions is just as common as over-simplification of complicated ones. One can, and should, contribute to the development of marginalized populations, but there is a dynamic here that must be considered. One needs to decide on what one wants to emphasize, both internally and externally.

Saying to the community that «we are students from KU, we are here to learn from you, try our ideas and see if they work» is different from saying «we are students from KU, we are here to observe your challenges and try to fix them». Saying «we want to give the students relevant experience in the

field» is different from saying «we want the students to develop the rural areas of Nepal». The difference isn't necessarily that big in action, but there is an important difference in how one sees one's role.

From the interviews in the evaluation it seems like KU wants to work as a long term development partner *and* a student fieldwork organizer. They have up to now focused more on the field work part, but want to increase its focus on development. It is unclear whether all the considerations this entails has been fully discussed and appreciated by KU. One thing is to donate resources to specific projects on a needs-basis. It is a different thing to have an ongoing development program. How does KU see its role in this? How can this role be embedded in the university and how does it align with the KUs role as an educational facility? Does KU have the capacity and resources to do this?

3.2.2 Business incubation

«One of my students called me and said he had gotten a job. A paid job. I was so disappointed. I told him, do you want to take a job or to create a job? You should create, not take!»

Entrepreneurship has in most countries become an integrated part of bachelor and master programs. All countries need an innovative and growing private sector, and starting at the educational facilities makes sense. So the fact that KU is pursuing this is logical and sensible. It is difficult to see any other institution where a business development centre makes more sense. But KU has also in this regard pushed a bit further. They do not only train and guide its students into becoming businessmen and women. They have established an incubator which not only provides office space and access to tools and machinery, but also takes the role as an investor.

There are many terms and definition in the business development sphere, and there is hardly a consensus of the meaning of any of them. The role KU has taken would in Norway be something between the municipal office for entrepreneurship (in Norwegian «Etablererveiledningen»), Young entrepreneurs («Ungt Entreprenørskap»), a low end business cluster («næringshage») and the entrepreneur support service which is present at most higher education facilities (“gründerhjelpen” and the like). In Norway an incubator would be a middle to high- level service for businesses with an extraordinary potential for success or high growth potential.

In none of these services a business could expect direct investments. They will basically be offered office support, mentoring, training and the opportunity to work together with other entrepreneurs either for free or to a very low cost.

This evaluator is not very familiar with neither the Nepali finance sector, the Nepali market nor KUs competence in the field. Still, there are some general considerations when it comes to business development that is valid in most countries and in most markets which seems to have not been thoroughly discussed.

Investing in companies is always high risk. Investing in newly established companies with owners with no prior knowledge of how to run a business and a product that is new to the market is extremely high risk. Most ideas and products, no matter how ingenious they are, fail to succeed in the market. With amateurs in management as well it does not seem very promising. In any normal business situation, I would say that the chance of losing 100 % of the investment is high to very high.

It is not surprising that lack of funding is one of the biggest obstacles for business development in Nepal, as it is in most countries, and it is commendable that KU wants to find a solution. It is however questionable whether investing directly in companies is the right answer, be it as a part of KU-CEP or any other project. If the goal is business development, there are alternative solutions that should be considered. The key question is: if facilitating business development in Nepal is the goal, how is this best done?

The most challenging time for a newly established business is from year 2 to year 5. This period is infamously known as «the valley of death». KU says in its contracts with companies that it will sell its shares back to the company after year three. When investors invest in mature companies it is not unusual to have an exit strategy after a certain period. They buy a profitable company, spend time and resources to make it even more profitable or re-structure it, and then re-sell it with a profit. When investors, be it public or private, invest in companies at an early stage, having a fixed exit time is unusual. It is more often than not bad business, both for the investor and for the business. What happens if the company has a market, but no cash to buy back shares? What about the next phases of the company when the investment needs are higher?

In this specific case there are also other considerations such as: What if the owners and KU disagrees on the way forward? Can the remaining 80% be used as security for private loans to the company? To what extent is KU willing to increase the investment if that is needed for success? What if KU staff wants to invest privately, will there be conflicting roles? These are only some of the questions that is not properly discussed. The point is that doing these kind of decisions are complicated and requires an insight in both entrepreneurship, business analysis and the relevant markets. KU does not have this competence at the moment. Are they interested and capable of investing what is needed to build this?

Incubation activities in the rural community can have a great impact. Creating jobs locally is crucial to re-build the country. But it's not quite clear if the purpose is job creation or business development. These are two very different goals and they require different strategies. Both requires training as a key component, and in many cases that might be sufficient. But if the investment element is planned to be a part of this activity as well, there are several pitfalls that should be considered. If it is business development, direct investment can make sense. If it is job creation, loans, renting of equipment, short term credits, saving groups etc. might be more useful.

There are several other issues that should be discussed on this matter but it does not lie within the scope of this evaluation to discuss this in depth. The advice is that the set-up of all the the incubation plans should be re-evaluated to ensure that one actually achieves one's goals.

It must be emphasized that there are no reasons why KU should not work on business development. The question is whether there is a sound, overall plan to this activity.

3.2.3 Learning by doing - systemizing experiences and academic potential.
«There is a difference between Norway and Nepal. You plan first, then you act. We act, then we adjust. We are learning by doing. That's our methodology»

Learning by doing isn't a bad thing. On the contrary, learning by doing is crucial for any program or project. But for the learning to take place, one needs to have systems that ensures that experiences

and feedback are collected, evaluated and changes implemented. There has to be more than anecdotal feedback from students or a general questionnaire at the end of each project. True learning comes from systemized feedback, systemized assessments and evaluations. How can one improve on the projects if there are no data that tells us if they are good or not? No analyses that tells us why they are what they are? How can we tell if a community is developing if we don't follow the community over time?

The lack of a systemized collection of data is the greatest weakness of this project. It challenges the possibility to evaluate the project properly and increases the level of uncertainty concerning impact. But more importantly it reduces the possibility for a continuous improvement of the project, to the benefit of both students, local communities and KU. If we want to learn from action, we need to understand why the action gave the result it gave.

This lack of systemized data collection and analysis also strongly interferes with the opportunity to benefit academically from the project at the university.

Having more than 1500 students participating in the kind of project work the KU-CEP has been involved in, is an amazing opportunity for any academic institution. It offers a range of research opportunities, from methodology development and holistic approaches to development to research connected to specific products, considerations in utilizing local knowledge and resources, communication constrains and possible solutions and so forth. If the project actually is the only of it's kind in South East Asia, it is in itself an interesting case for research.

This is an opportunity KU has to be aware of. An increased effort here can produce a range of very useful insights on how educational facilities can contribute to community development. There is a question whether the university has sufficient resources to utilize this opportunity properly. This is a valid concern. There are probably ways of doing some of this within the existing resource base by utilizing the students more effectively, to both KU and the students benefit, but an increase in resources will of course also be helpful.

A thorough discussion about the academic opportunities for the project should be conducted sooner rather than later. What are the academic potential in KU-CEP? What can we learn from the specific projects and are there any aggregated findings that are worth exploring? How can the feasibility studies and student's reports be designed so that they contribute to a larger body of data that can be useful for academic research? The questions are many, and is not only valid for KU-CEP. KU is involved in a huge range of projects and programs. Whether the academic potential from these are utilized properly is a much needed discussion for the institution.

3.2.4 *Braindrain and the values of KU*

«The jobs are not here, but the opportunities are»

One of the goals of this project is to increase the interest and involvement in developing Nepal to the extent that it reduces brain drain. This is more of an overall vision than actual measurable goal.

Throughout all the papers and reports on KU-CEP, there is hardly anything specific on this issue. That is surprising considering that it is one of the main goals of the project. Shouldn't it be mentioned at least *somewhere* in the reports?

It soon became clear that this is such an integrated part of the university that it is reported on directly. The fight against brain drain is so imbedded in the university culture that it's easy to forget it as a specific project goal. It's a value that has trickled down from the leaders of the university, to all the university staff and eventually to the students. This is their goal. This is what they work for every day. Everything they do has «keeping the students in the country» as an integrated part.

In that context one could argue that it's not really a project goal for this specific project, as much as a university goal and value. But it *does* have a specific value for KU-CEP and it does make sense to discuss it here. This is in fact the core of the project.

When the project was put on the table by KU in 2009, this was the motivation. The idea was that if they show the realities of Nepal to the students, it will motivate them to want to make a difference. Keep in mind that most of the students of KU come from privileged families living in the Kathmandu valley. It is estimated that as much as 95 % comes from private schools in Kathmandu, and most of them have never been out of the valley. For many KU-CEP was the first time ever they travelled to rural Nepal. They were happy with the opportunity to see and learn from the «real Nepal». And it was in fact inspirational. They *did* become motivated to do something, to contribute.

The incubation leg of the project was meant as an additional reason to stay. The idea being that if they create their own job in Nepal, they wouldn't leave. They would stay, make a living and create more jobs.

It is not possible to say whether this project in fact makes a difference on brain drain. First of all, no indicators are identified in the project that could indicate whether it is working or not. Secondly it is hard to say which factors are pushing from Nepal and which are pulling from abroad. Among the students in that were involved in the evaluation, 2/3 said they would move abroad after they finished at KU. But the reason where not to find a job. It was to finish the education, take a masters- or PhD degree they couldn't get in Nepal, or just to explore the world. They all wanted to come back later to work in Nepal. Does this prove anything? No, but it can be an indication of what the university is striding for, that with just a few more reasons to stay, the numbers remaining will increase.

There is a clear sense of urgency at the university. Not only in the sense that the situation at the moment is extra difficult due to the blockade and the earthquakes. It is on a more overall level. They *want* to play a role in building the country, it is their main motivation. They must do it now. This sense of urgency might sometimes lead them to jump on projects a bit fast, at the cost of proper assessments and monitoring systems. If there is a chance that it can accelerate development, they will do it. This is a good thing, and it must be preserved. Drowning good initiatives and intentions in bureaucracy is the last thing they need. Finding the balance between the need for monitoring and the need for action is a difficult task all involved parties should be aware, both at KU and elsewhere.

3.2.5 Earthquake, blockade and opportunities

On April 25th Nepal was hit by a massive earthquake that caused havoc in great parts of the country. Just a few weeks later they were hit again. The two quakes together caused a massive damage to infrastructure and buildings. In some areas whole villages was wiped off the ground. It is suggested that in addition to all the fatalities and injuries, more than 700 000 people were pushed into poverty

as a result of the quakes. We do not know the number of people being traumatized, but there are reasons to believe it's a very high number. More than 7 months after the quakes thousands of people still do not dare to move back into their houses and are still sleeping outside, despite the growing winter cold.

The quakes had a big impact on KU as well. Most of the planned activities were put on hold, and the students immediately started focusing on the communities that was hardest hit. It was a moving reaction to a national disaster. Thousands of students from all over Nepal stepped up to the challenge and risked both health and resources to help as many as they could. This was something that happened at all the universities in Nepal, and there is no reason to believe that the students from KU had an extra motivation towards helping the communities. Some have suggested that the students with KU-CEP experience worked more efficiently because they knew the communities. This is however uncertain. What is certain is that KU started a comprehensive relief work soon after the quake, and that a very high number of students participated in this. They worked hard and used their experiences and knowledge to the fullest. This led to many of the planned KU-CEP projects being put on hold, but it also led to an increased determination among both students and faculty members in KU that they had to work harder and do more to ensure a positive development for the country.

The last 8 months there has been a blockade on the Nepal-India border. This has contributed to an even more serious situation in Nepal. There is a critical lack of basic supplies such as cooking oil, fuel, gas and medical equipment. The GDP of the country has plummeted, and it is estimated that as much as 800 000 have been pushed into poverty due to the blockade alone. Millions of children are not attending schools, people in many industries have lost their jobs and the political situation is unstable.

With all this in mind, it is impressive to witness the work being done at KU. The students are determined - they want to take part in the re-building of the country, be it hydro plants, houses, farming equipment or compost systems. These are young adults from the most privileged groups in Nepal, and they are *competing* for the opportunity to travel out to the remote villages to do *something*. This not a small step for a country like Nepal. Despite the difficult times, there are few things that can be more encouraging than this.

At KU they see the grave situation as an opportunity. Maybe using students to rebuild the country isn't the most efficient way right now, but in the long run it might be the best thing they can do. They have a generation of students who will learn re-building on a massive scale, mapping huge areas, safe building structures, water and sanitation etc. They are now utilizing a grave situation to equip their growing generation with the tools that can, hopefully, one day make them independent of the international community. This is a sound strategy in a difficult situation that should be supported.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

KU-CEP has been a good project and it should be continued. There are however potential benefits in focusing on one of the three elements of today. There is also a strong need to establish better and more comprehensive monitoring routines.

It is surprising to see that there is quite an uncertainty among the administration staff, both at HimalPartner and KU, on what the purpose of the project really is, what the results are and whether or not the project has achieved its purpose. There has been a drift from three equally important goals initially in the project towards a prioritized list of goals where community learning for students has been the most important. This drift has not been communicated to HimalPartner and it is not clear how consciously this drift has happened. Having a good monitoring system with a comprehensive set of indicators could have prevented this.

Out of the three legs of the project; community development, community learning (for students) and incubation, it is the community learning leg that has been most successful. The students are very satisfied, there are reasons to believe the impact has been good and there is an increasing acceptance at KU that this is a good and useful project. Doing these kinds of field trips can as an added value contribute to the development of communities, but that should not be the goal. Facilitating field trips and keep a close look at the project to ensure that no harm is done is probably a better approach.

The incubation leg is not a natural part of the project. Only 30% of all the projects in KU-CEP are product development, and out of these only a handful are admitted in the business incubation centre. In other words, it a very limited number of students from KU-CEP that benefits from the incubation.

Recommendations

1. Establish a systemized monitoring and evaluation system.

This is the most serious shortcoming of the project. Defining a good system here will be important, not only for potential donors, but for the continuous development of the project and for KU to utilize the academic potential in it.

2. Reduce the ambitions on community development and incubation.

These two elements are the most complicated ones in the project, and the ones that benefits the lowest numbers of students. It is also the riskiest parts of the project. Incubation should be extracted from this project and community development should be considered an added value more than a goal. The focus should be on facilitating good, useful and inspirational field experiences for the students.

3. Do no harm

No matter the ambitions for community development, one has to put in place a system for «do no harm», targeting both the management of the project and for the students.

4. Ensure that the project is included in the academic calendar.

At the moment the project is not included in the calendar, which makes it difficult for the coordinator to find suitable timeslots for the student to go on field trips. To day the trips happens during holiday season. This is not a good solution, neither for the students nor KU. If the project is to be continued, including it in the academic calendar must be a key priority.

5. Consider increasing the administrative resources for project coordination.

At the moment the project seems to suffer from limited administrative resources. If the project adopts the idea of more comprehensive monitoring system, and if they include the project in the academic calendar, there will probably be a need for an increase in manpower.

6. Involve communities and students directly when evaluating and planning programs

Involving the people, you work with should always be on top of the list. Allowing them to participate in development of the projects, focus areas and to give good feedback and recommendations for improvement will benefit the communities, the students and KU. This should be done in structured way so that input and recommendation are collected and evaluated properly. This does not require a lot of extra time of resources allocated to the project, but it does require a monitoring design that allows this kind of involvement.

The value of introducing the students to real life, of allowing privileged groups from Nepal to not only to experience, but interact and work with rural communities, cannot be overrated. With some adjustment, I believe the project should continue. It is a project that strongly resonates with the with the vision of KU: «To become a world class university devoted to bringing knowledge and technology to the service of mankind»

Appendixes

1 - Terms of References

Terms of Reference Evaluation/Assessment/Assignment of 'Kathmandu University'

Introduction

The Project named 'Kathmandu University Community Education Project' (KU CEP) intends to reach to the rural communities through the university outreach programme in the field of education, community development and business incubation. The project is a partnership between Kathmandu University (KU) and HimalPartner, and was started in 2010 (planning) and implemented in its pilot phase in 2011-2012. It has been further extended till a project within the period of 2013-2015 through a widening scope of activities and geographical areas with funding through HimalPartner.

It is time to do an overall evaluation of the project period 2013-2015 to assess whether or not KU CEP has achieved what it was set out to accomplish and what the impact has been.

The project was intended to end in 2015, but KU has applied HimalPartner/Digni for one year extension for the CEP project in 2016. Due to the earthquake and KUs role organizing volunteers in the aftermath and using the skills and resources available for relief work they plan to continue to contribute in the rebuilding phase with offering relevant services in cooperation the affected communities.

KU wishes with this project to expose the university students and faculty members to rural environment, partly to enhance the students' understanding of the rural living conditions. They wish to enhance the students motivation for service in rural communities after their graduation. And the long term presence of the university is also intended to benefit the local communities in terms of development of small businesses enterprises and community services. Such kind of services are planned and undertaken in close cooperation with local communities and partners who are already working in the target areas. At the very start, three target areas were identified (Tamakoshi, Langtang and Dolpa) for the outreach centres, identified through various surveys and baseline studies.

This project cooperation between KU and HimalPartner is founded on a well-established collaboration from mid 1990s with various engineering programs at the undergraduate level, developing laboratories and libraries, facilitating qualitative study and research to the faculties and students, and finally assisting to start graduate level education. During their study period students and faculties have been exposed to the rural community in order to use their academic knowledge for the benefit of the communities. It is an unfortunate fact that many rural communities are lagging far behind the mainstream population in development and living standard. KU's community education programs are oriented towards those people and communities, and are at present in a expansion phase through addition of the 'Resource Centre for Innovation People and Energy' (Recipe), another joint collaborative of KU and HimalPartner, and the establishment of a vocational skills training programme (Technical Training Centre).

Project goal (2013-2015):

The students' and faculties' at Kathmandu University have gained interest and involvement in development of rural Nepal to the extent that it reduces the brain-drain from Nepal and contributes to making model communities in the areas of the centers.

Indicators of project goal:

- *The students and faculty members gain practical experience from rural communities*
- *Through the Project, faculties and students have been exposed to the rural community for a month or fewer days through various surveys, baseline studies and workshops.*
- *Incubate business which will use local resources of rural communities and orient students toward entrepreneurial skills*
- *To design and operate a full-fledged program for students and faculties at centre 1*
- *To have a minimum of 3-5 small enterprises running as a result of KU's incubation program,*
- *To have mutual cooperation with the local community.*
- *A second centre is started implemented.*
- *Baseline study in Tamakoshi, Langtang and Dolpa, Geomatics survey in Tamakoshi*

Expected results

- *Capacity building/organizational development*
- *Contribute services, which will benefit the local communities*
- *KU contributed with services, which will benefit the local communities, incubate business which will use local resources etc.*
- *The community based project from the second year students of electrical and electronics department will benefit the community.*
- *Outreach centers in two regions will be established.*
- *Possible same streamline projects running in the other departments of KU will be incorporated in this project which will benefit the local community more.*
- *As talk is going on with international and national universities, INGO's and other free lancers who are willing to work with KU in these areas will simply benefit the communities.*

Target group

The target group of KU is the students/faculty members. By improving their capacity, increasing their understanding, giving them tools for action the target group who are the poor, children, underprivileged and women will get their lives improved.

The purpose and scope of the evaluation/assessment/assignment

Assess the impact of the project on the students, faculties and educational programmes at KU (internal), on the target communities (external) and make recommendations for the follow-up including a rapid assessment of KU CEP's partnership model and organizational sustainability.

Important issues to examine

- *The needs:* Is there a need for this project in Nepal, and if so, for how long will it be needed?
- *The project design:* Was the project plan based on reasonable presuppositions?
- *Processes/implementation:* Was the project being carried out effectively?

- *Results*: Has the project achieved the desired results?
- *Cost-effectiveness*: Are the costs reasonably proportional to the achievements?
- *Lessons learned*: what are they and how are they documented?
- *Sustainability*: how has the HimalPartner support enhanced the sustainability of the Project?
- *Five abilities –assessment*: Rapid organisational assessment of KU
- *Added value*: What kind of added value has HimalPartner contributed with in the project?

List of stakeholders

The main stakeholder groups are as follows:

- HimalPartner
- Digni
- Beneficiaries
- Other funding agencies of Kathmandu University
- Local and regional governmental officials
- Networking partners – e.g KVTC
- Representatives from district government in Charikot and Syaprubeshi
- Selected representatives of locals in target areas: Charikot, Manthali, Salambu (outreach centre of DH hospital) or Melamchi (outreach center of DH hospital)
- Kathmandu University administration and faculty members
- Students
- Others

See enclosed detailed stakeholder list submitted by ‘Kathmandu University’. This should be the base for the planning of the program drawn by the ‘consultant’ in cooperation with the ‘assessment team’.

Methods

A participatory assessment method will be used where all parties will approve the terms of reference (ToR). The chosen ‘external consultant’ will answer to this ToR with an “Assessment approach” and will lead an ‘evaluation team’ consisting of 1-2 representatives of Kathmandu University and HimalPartner. The team will participate in most of the interviews and workshops together with the external consultant. After consultation with Kathmandu University and HimalPartner the external evaluator is independently responsible for the objectivity in the final report.

The methodology to be used will include the following:

- **Reading of documents**: The assessment team will read the project documents and the following other relevant project related, organisational related and technically related documents
- **Interviews**: The assessment team will interview relevant stakeholders (see above) through individual interviews, focus group discussions and workshops.
- **Field visits**: Relevant field visits may be conducted in the target area.
- **Follow up**: The recommendations and discussions in the evaluation will be presented at a workshop at KU prior to the final report, and will serve to inform future projects of KU and HimalPartner

The consultant and the evaluation team

The evaluator should possess more than five years relevant experience of project implementation/evaluations in various fields relating to community development. The evaluator as well as the other team members should be able to understand the context of China and have a realistic view on time for making changes in institutions and communities in the country.

Role	Name	Appointed by
External Evaluator:	Anders Wengen	KU/HimalPartner
Team member	Sushil Shresta	KU
Team member	Supriya Koirala	KU
Team member	Andreas Stokseth	HimalPartner
Team member	Geir Kippenes	HimalPartner

Report:

The assessment report should be well-researched and include recommendations for future direction of the work. The following parties will comment on the report before the external evaluator finalizes his report; Kathmandu University and HimalPartner.

The reports shall be in English, and shall be forwarded in digital form (pdf-format) as well as two sets of hardcopies. The final report should contain:

- Executive summary
- Background and Purpose
- Findings and Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned
- A list of abbreviations
- Relevant appendices (ToR, lists of individuals and groups interviewed etc.)

Delivery dates

SN	Activity	Deadline	Responsibility
1	Documents submitted to the evaluator	August 2015	Project advisor
2	Evaluator Nepal	28 th of November-10 th of December 2015	
2	Kick-of meeting for evaluation team	30 th November 2015	evaluator
	Field visit		

3	Workshop or dissemination seminar	9 th of December 2015	evaluator
4	Submission of Draft Report	15 th of December 2015	
5	Submission of Final Report	18 th of December 2015	evaluator

Budget

Evaluation budget 2015	NOK	NPR
Income		
Digni/HimalPartner	NOK 65 000,-	
Expenditure		
Evaluator food and accommodation	NOK 7 000,-	
Evaluator travel expenses	NOK 10 000,-	
Evaluator honorary	NOK 43 000,-	
Evaluation expenses Nepal	NOK 5 000,-	
Total	NOK 65 000,-	

Based on template 0815
HimalPartner

Appendixes

- Detailed stakeholder list
- Period project document (2013-2015)
- Annual application 2013-2015
- Annual application 2016
- Annual report 2013-2015
- Mid-term evaluation 2012

2 – Evaluations team and informants

Evaluation team consisted of:

Evaluator: Anders Wengen

From HimalPartner: Andreas Stokseth

From Kathmandu University: Sushil Shrestha and Supriya Koirala

The team received valuable support and input from HimalPartner staff in Nepal

Interviews conducted with:

Ms. Heidi Westborg Steel

Ms. Silje

Mr. Tore Skeie

Mr. Sushil Shrestha

Dr. Ram Kanta Shrestha

Dr. Suresh Raj Sharma

Prof. Bhola Thapa

Mr. Brijesh Adhikary

Prof. Mohan Bikram Gewali

Dr. Mahesh Banskota

Ms. Supriya Koirala

Student workshop with the following students:

Yurika Upadhyay

Asmita Shrestha

Arjun Bhusal

Oryana Raj Pandey

Apurba Bhattari

Prashun Acahrya

Sobita Pathak

Prashant Mainali

Lasata Joshi

Parikrama Sapkota

Manoj Rai

Pratik Satyal

Ankit Raghubanshi

Murish Dungs

Rohit Shrestha

Shilpa Koirala

Rakchya Karici

E-mail correspondence with:

Mr. Inge Johansen