

Report on Quality at Entry and Next Steps to Complete Design for

the Samoa Inclusive Education Demonstration Program

A: AidWorks details <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>			
Initiative Name:	Samoa Inclusive Education Demonstration Program		
AidWorks ID:	INI456	Total Amount:	1,250,000
Start Date:	31 January 2009	End Date:	30 June 2010

B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>	
Initial ratings prepared by:	– Janene Hallpike, (Disability Inclusive Development Team, AusAID)
Meeting date:	26 August 2009
Chair:	Ian Bignall, Counsellor, AusAID Samoa
Peer reviewers providing formal comment & ratings:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Faiza El-Higzi – Noumea Simi, Ministry of Finance, Samoa – Jerry Strudwick, (Education Thematic Group, AusAID)
Independent Appraiser:	– Fabia Shah, Education Thematic Group Advisor
Other peer review participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Donna Lene, (Principal, SENESE School) – Leta'a Dan Devoe, (Chief Executive Officer, Loto Taumafai School) – Helen Leslie, (Manager, NZAID) – Valma Galuvao, (Senior Activity Manager, AusAID Apia) – Pepe Faaopoopo, (Activity Manager, AusAID Apia) – Linda Kelly, (Consultant) – Elena Down, (Disability Inclusive Development Team, AusAID) – Pip Kelly, (NGO Team, AusAID) – Barbara O'Dwyer, (AusAID Gender Advisor) – Ines Tallos, (Education Thematic Group, AusAID) – Andrew Elborn, (Pacific Group, AusAID) – Bernadette Cariga, AusAID Manila Post – Penny Bond, (Procurement Agreement Services) – absent but submitted written feedback

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators <i>completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser</i>				
Quality	Rating (1-6) *	Comments to support rating	Required Action (if needed)	Action(s) Taken
1. Clear objectives	5	Good quality – needs minor work to improve in some areas	<p>To move the rating to 5, the following actions need to be addressed:</p> <p>How is the learning incorporated for one year to the next. Clarity on scope and target group needs to be achieved.</p> <p>More information on the model and include more details on where the model might be going. Annex work done by SENESE.</p> <p>Link budget items to activities/targets/outputs/objectives.</p> <p>Need to have clarity on the 1year program or rolling project and why. Is this project or program, and is this for 1 year or 5 years – needs to be clear in the objectives.</p> <p>Building in a full assessment of approaches/models tested in the program as a key program outcome.</p> <p>Clarify what will be done for gender equality and to ensure same access. Gender analysis of gender issues in the wider community is needed, and how it relates to this project.</p>	<p>Clearer explanation on learning under the Program Learning and Ongoing development (p.18)</p> <p>More refined program timing and scope is now addressed in this revised version.</p> <p>Linkages of budget items to activities /targets/outputs and objectives are clear.</p> <p>More detailed explanation on implementation arrangements for the first year and ongoing arrangements. (p.19)</p> <p>The Objectives are much clearer which will result in achievable outcome indicators.(p.15-16)</p> <p>Analysis on Gender equity is clearly addressed under Monitoring and Evaluation (p.25)</p>

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators*completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser*

2. Monitoring and Evaluation	4	Adequate quality, needs some work to improve	<p>More information on linkages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -MESC -Other government processes -more data and information on target groups -more data on how it can be worked with and improved -independent assessment at end of year 1 should be included -note what changes SIEDP will bring about, to be assessed for effectiveness at end <p>monitoring arrangement to try to transfer to GoS over time – GoS to be able to take over, really critical to work out how they can take data and maintain</p>	<p>More information is now included on linkages with all stakeholders involved and targeted groups. (p.24)</p> <p>Clearer anticipated outcomes of the program are incorporated to ensure monitoring arrangement is carried out effectively. (p.26)</p> <p>Design now incorporates AusAID to take responsibility in undertaking an annual program redesign based on lessons learned from year 1 of implementation – in consultation with GoS. Data collection and analysis mechanisms have been identified.</p>
------------------------------	---	--	---	--

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators*completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser*

3. Sustainability	4	Adequate quality, needs some work to improve	<p>More information on how AusAID is committed.</p> <p>How do pieces of work come together to create sustainability?</p> <p>How will GoS systems carry forward SIEDP?</p> <p>Needs a timeframe for it.</p> <p>Links with other programs and training and parent support.</p> <p>In line position funding for future needs to be considered.</p> <p>Including indicators to assess sustainability and ongoing ownership/implementation by GoS.</p> <p>Building in realistic review and redesign points for the 'Demonstration' Program.</p>	<p>Sustainability strengthened in revised design and it is well fitted into the risk management strategy. Key point being that this design is to develop a model, so sustainability response relates to this rather than to sustainability issues specific to a longer term program. (p.27)</p> <p>GoS's ownership of the program in the coming years has been addressed in some aspects of the design. (Management arrangements and Financial Arrangements p. 22-23)</p> <p>A timeframe is included with noted ongoing program developments. More refined linkages with other programs and training and parent support.(p.16&17)</p>
-------------------	---	--	--	---

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators <i>completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser</i>				
4. Implementation & Risk Management	4	Adequate quality, needs some work to improve	<p>Linkages between targets and inputs from year 1 to year 5 to be clear. Why have more than Year 1.</p> <p>Need smooth transition from year 1-2 and not lose sight of objectives</p> <p>Physical access is not mentioned in design. Weren't there any access issues? Annex explanation.</p> <p>Harmonisation arrangements with other donors and other stakeholders/coordination – does the program address these? Important to look at how to work with other donors and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Post resources to management.</p> <p>Design to include support for the Early Intervention Program managed by the Loto Taumafai Society. (see "Other Comments at Item E below")</p>	<p>Clearer targets and expected outcomes by the end of the program. (p.19)</p> <p>More than one year is desired so to ensure that the program is effectively carried out before GoS takes full ownership of the program in terms of monitoring and evaluation. (p.15-24)</p> <p>The objectives have been refined to achieve the expected outcomes and a successful roll over of the program to GoS. (p.21-23)</p> <p>Post resources to meet management of the program in its initial phase have been considered and are addressed in the revised design. (p.22-23)</p> <p>The Design now incorporates support for the Loto Taumafai Early Intervention Program. (p.16)</p> <p>The current funding mechanism for SIEDP will be through an accountable cash transfer to GoS, Ministry of Finance.</p>
5. Analysis and lessons	5	Good quality – needs minor work to improve in some areas	<p>Who is doing what; evidence from Samoan experience is needed. Annex evidence and analysis of pilot at SENESE.</p> <p>More information on models.</p> <p>Design should address data issues on gender and propose approaches to address gaps in learning outcomes re: gender.</p> <p>Include overall potential costs of inclusive education in Samoa.</p>	<p>Clearer explanation on problems, lessons, experiences guiding this approach to inclusive education and the cultural and geographical context of Pacific islands.</p> <p>More detailed explanation on models.</p> <p>Incorporated quantitative disaggregated data (gender, sex etc) as monitoring tools for this program. (p.24-25)</p>

* Definitions of the Rating Scale:

Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6)		Less than satisfactory (1, 2 and 3)	
6	Very high quality; needs ongoing management & monitoring only	3	Less than adequate quality; needs to be improved in core areas
5	Good quality; needs minor work to improve in some areas	2	Poor quality; needs major work to improve
4	Adequate quality; needs some work to improve	1	Very poor quality; needs major overhaul

D: Next Steps *completed by Activity Manager*

Provide information on all steps required to finalise the design based on <i>Required Actions</i> in "C" above, and additional actions identified in the peer review meeting	Who is responsible	Date to be done
1. The Design Team will modify the design by incorporating the actions discussed and agreed to at the meeting.	Design Team	18 September 2009
2. The Actions agreed to modify the design will be documented and circulated to peer reviewers for confirmation.	Post	11 September 2009

E: Other comments or issues *completed by Activity Manager*

- Following the peer review meeting, Post made a decision for the design to incorporate support for the Early Intervention Program implemented by Loto Taumafai Society. This is in response to concerns around the benefits of the program to spread to ensure other groups get the support as well.
- The limit to the number of words in the Design Document was largely noted and it was agreed that some of the data required to add more details on the context, for clarity and to provide further explanations will be annexed to the Design.
- Cross cutting areas such as Gender Equity have been fully addressed. (p.28)

F: Approval *completed by ADG or Minister-Counsellor who chaired the peer review meeting*

On the basis of the final agreed Quality Rating assessment (C) and Next Steps (D) above:

- ☒ **QAE REPORT IS APPROVED**, and authorization given to proceed to:
- ☒ **FINALISE** the design incorporating actions above, and proceed to implementation
- or: ☐ **REDESIGN** and resubmit for appraisal peer review

☐ **NOT APPROVED** for the following reason(s):

Ian Bignall

signed:



19/11/2009

When complete:

- Copy and paste the approved ratings, explanation and actions (table C) into AidWorks
- The original signed report must be placed on a registered file