

Appendix 4

Gender Inputs to the SPHERE IPR Report

Jeanne Frances I. Illo

Gender Specialist

5 March 2010

This paper consists of three parts: (1) an assessment of the project vis-à-vis the gender equality indicators that the IPR team has agreed to use; (2) a gender assessment of the project using the Harmonized Gender and Development Guidelines, and my evaluation rating for gender equality; and (3) comments on the application of the gender equality criterion to the SPHERE components. The discussion of each indicator includes a presentation of key findings and recommendations. The completed box 16 of the Philippine Harmonized Gender and Development Guidelines (or Harmonized GAD Guidelines)¹ for project implementation and management, and box 17 for monitoring and evaluation are found at the end of this paper.

Part I: Assessment based on the IPR Gender Equality Indicators

Context

The Trust Fund to Support Philippine Basic Education Reforms (or SPHERE) aims to contribute to the achievement of the Philippines' basic education goals of 'improving quality and equity in learning outcomes.'² Two sets of outcome indicators measuring participation and completion, and quality and efficiency are expected to be disaggregated by sex and other variables.

The design document makes no mention of gender equality in the description of the components that will be supported by AusAID. Moreover, it does not include a strategy for improving gender equality (or reducing gender disparities) and addressing gender issues. The Social Safeguards (pp. 9-10) covers Indigenous Peoples (IP), but not gender equality. However, the AusAID SPHERE manager and the World Bank SPHERE Task Team Leader both claim that implicit in the document is SPHERE's support to gender mainstreaming efforts of the Department of Education (DepEd).

The Quality at Entry (QAE) Report rated SPHERE the maximum score ('6') in all but one of the criteria. Without gender equality as a QAE criterion in 2007 meant that neither AusAID nor the World Bank saw the need to actively promote gender analysis (or the identification of relevant gender issues) and the provision of technical assistance related to gender.

In late 2008, the SPHERE design was assessed based on the Harmonized GAD Guidelines, the initiative was rated '10.2', or a '4' using the AusAID QAE or Quality at Implementation (QAI) rating. When SPHERE implementation was assessed, it scored '10.5,' which was lower than the good-quality score of '15.'³ There was definitely room to improve implementation in connection with making SPHERE more responsive to gender issues.

¹ NEDA, NCRFW, ODA-GAD Network. *Harmonized Gender and Development Guidelines for Project Development, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation, Second Edition*. Manila: NEDA, NCRFW, ODA-GAD Network, 2007. (First published in 2005)

² Appraisal Document, Trust Fund to Support Philippine Basic Education Reforms.

³ Project design rating used Box 12 (for education) of the Harmonized GAD Guidelines; while the project implementation, management and monitoring and evaluation (PIMME) rating used Boxes 16 and 17 of the Guidelines. This gender assessment of SPHERE was first made in November 2009.

Indicator 13: Initiative has identified and addressed gender equality issues concerning access and safety, and participation and decision-making

Findings: Outcome indicators

1. SPHERE has likely contributed to the modest improvements in school performance that have been reported by the Department of Education (DepEd). Girls continue to have better educational profile than boys, but boys' participation has been improving.
 - At the elementary level, net enrolment, cohort survival, and completion rates improved by at least 2%, and dropout (school leaver) rate fell by 5.5% between School Year 2006-2007 and 2008-2009 (see table, below). The improvements were most evident among the boys. Among the girls, not only were the figures lower, there was also noted a slight drop in completion rate. All these resulted in the narrowing gender gap between male and female learners. *Is this an effect of the financial crisis in 2008/2009, or a focus on boy dropouts under the Drop-Out Reduction Program (DORP) of the Department of Education? A research on these gender trends may be needed.*
 - School access and performance indicators consistently favor females. In 2007-2008, four Mindanao regions (ARMM, Zamboanga Peninsula [Region IX], Davao Region (XI), and Region XII) posted the worst record for both boys and girls. Gender gaps were also widest in three of these (Regions IX, XI and XII), in addition to Western Visayas (Region VI).

Selected gender indicators for the Philippine basic education sector

Outcome indicator	% change (2008-09 ÷ 2006-07)			Gender disparity, in % points* (2007/08)			Regions with the worst situation, in % (2007/08)		Regions with the biggest gender disparity* (2007/08)
	Fem.	Male	All	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	Female	Male	
Net enrolment rate	1.9	2.7	2.3	1.7	1.7	1.1	VI (75.9) II (77.9) XI (78.4) XIII (78.6)	VI (75.0) XI (76.4) II (77.2) XII (77.4)	ARM (9.2) VIII (2.7) XII (2.5) NCR (2.5)
Cohort survival rate	1.4	3.9	2.7	9.8	9.2	8.2	ARMM (41.4) IX (68.0) XII (72.7) XI (73.7)	ARMM (49.4) IX (56.7) XI (61.7) XII (62.4)	VI (12.1) XI (11.9) XIII (11.8) IX (11.2)
Completion rate	-0.1	2.7	2.2	11.4	9.9	8.8	ARMM (44.8) IX (67.1) XII (71.4) XI (72.4)	ARMM (37.7) IX (54.1) XI (59.4) XII (60.1)	VI (13.2) IX (13.0) XI (13.0) XIII (12.7)
School leaver rate	-2.6	-9.8	-5.5	(2.8)	(2.4)	(2.2)	ARMM (14.3) IX (8.0) XII (6.7) XI (6.4)	ARMM (17.4) IX (11.6) XI (9.9) XII (9.4)	IX (3.6) XI (3.5) VI (3.2) XIII (3.2)

*Gender disparity is measured by deducting the figure (in percent) for the males from the corresponding figure for the females.

Source: RSD-OPS

2. The gender trends are less consistent at the secondary level: rising participation rates for girls and boys and narrowing gender gaps; improving cohort survival rates, but increasing gender disparity; and declining dropout rates and gender gaps.
3. As the NPSBE Mid-Term Review Mission noted, there has been modest improvement in the average achievement levels in the national assessment tests, but the 2008-2009 figures are

far below the targets.⁴ At both elementary and high school achievement tests, girls had better results than boys. In 2008-2009, the gender gap was smallest in Elementary Science (1.22 percentage points) and High School Mathematics (1.46 percentage points), and biggest in the languages.

Findings: Identifying and addressing gender issues

4. There were at least three ways in which gender concerns were identified under SPHERE. One was through the Joint Review Missions. In two of the five missions that were undertaken since 2008, the AusAID representatives raised key gender issues and challenges that need to be addressed.⁵ Under 'Other Cross-Cutting Concerns/ Issues' of the Third Joint Implementation Review Mission (p. 42 of the Aide Memoire), the Mission noted that while there is conscious effort to promote gender parity, there were persistent gender issues, such as: (1) different levels of school participation of girls and boys; (2) SIPs reviewed had no clear gender objectives, results and performance indicators; and (3) appreciation of gender principles does not always translate into practical actions. Among the recommendations were: (1) Regional Office and Division Office to conduct gender audits and monitor SIPs to ensure that schools maintain a gender focus; and (2) include in SIPs special measures programs for all students where necessary, such as paying attention to the particular needs of females (teachers and students) in terms of providing facilities (including sanitation amenities).
5. A second, interrelated way is through Technical Assistance (TA), as evident in a TA that was directly funded by AusAID in July 2009. A follow-up to the recommendation of the February 2009 Mission, the gender TA aimed at raising the awareness of the TWGs of gender issues. To do this, a gender workshop was conducted that reviewed the gender mainstreaming efforts at DepEd. The session also guided the participants in gender analysis exercises that focused on the draft BESRA Implementation and Accountability Plan (BIAP). The IPR Team discovered there has been little effort to pursue the results of the gender analysis of the BIAP. This raises the issue of follow-up of TA results within BESRA. It also suggests the need for a carefully crafted gender TA that would mainstream gender analysis and planning in the various TWGs/components of BESRA.
6. The semifinal draft of the BIAP for 2010-2012 envisions a learning environment that, among others, actively engages boys and girls in a stimulating teaching-learning process, is gender fair, provides mechanisms to address their vulnerabilities which affect their chances of availing basic education, staying in school and gaining learning mastery; and protection from abuse, discrimination and violence.⁶ The inclusion of gender-related statements was reportedly an input of the SPHERE TA to the TCT. However, these statements were not pursued in the body of the BIAP.
7. A third way is through efforts outside SPHERE either in DepEd normal operations or in projects (e.g., STRIVE and BEAM). The IPR Team noted a paper, "Issue 4: DepEd is Losing Boys in Basic Education," which analyzes the sex-disaggregated data on net enrolment and dropouts. There was little evidence that the same analysis has been done for planning and

⁴ National Program Support for Basic Education, Mid-Term Review Mission Report, 9-27 November 2009, p. 23.

⁵ National Program Support for Basic Education Project (NPSBE) and Support to Philippine Basic Education Reform (SPHERE): Third Joint Implementation Review Mission, 15-26 September 2008; and Philippines, Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA), Fourth Joint Implementation Review Mission: 16-27 February 2009. Aide Memoire.

⁶ Executive Summary of the BESRA Implementation and Accountability Plan, copy provided to the AusAID IPR and World Bank MTR teams, 12 February 2010; p. 3.

programming purposes. During the fieldwork in Northern Samar, the schools visited had statistics posted on the wall of the principal's office that pertained to sex-disaggregated net enrolment and aggregate data for other education indicators. (The schools, however, reported sex-disaggregated information on all the indicators to the Division Office.) There were no indications that sex-disaggregated data have been analyzed and used in the preparation of the SIP. But when situations and needs of girls and boys were raised in meetings with community stakeholders, there was awareness of different needs of girls and boys that need to be addressed (separate toilets for boys and girls and running water in toilets, particularly for girls) and a willingness to address these.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Provide TA to help BESRA, with SPHERE support, to put in place gender analysis tools that can be used at specific situations and levels. The TA can identify and test a set of key questions that can be asked in the analysis of the situation and the assessment of possible actions that can address relevant gender-related issues. At the school level, the tool can help analyze Student Tracking System data and other information in connection with the preparation of School Improvement Plans. At the division and regional levels, the tools can help DepEd managers and planners analyze their BEIS and other information for planning and programming.
2. Support research studies on why there are no differences in performance of boys and girls in some schools, communities, or divisions, and how parental decisions concerning education of boys and girls have been affected by macro forces, such as the Global Financial Crisis, business cycles, droughts, and availability of overseas employment.
3. Establish of accountability within BESRA for the promotion of gender equality and equity in connection with the vision of a learning environment that is gender-fair and free of discrimination and violence. This includes responsibility for ensuring that recommendations from the gender TA and from other TAs are translated into policies and actions.

Indicator 14: Initiative is adequately supporting DepEd efforts to mainstream gender in policies and capacity development programs to help SPHERE comply with the Philippines Harmonized Gender and Development Guidelines.

1. The DepEd has 'mainstreamed gender' in some key processes and functions, including the BEIS, review of learning materials for commercial production, NCBTS, and, until recently, the training programs of the HRDS. Except for the gender and development (GAD) training of the HRDS, these have been continued under the BESRA by the relevant TWG's. Application of gender equality/equity principles in BESRA, particularly in the areas supported by SPHERE, can be improved.
2. By using DepEd systems and processes, SPHERE has been implicitly supporting gender mainstreaming efforts at DepEd through the continuing generation of sex-disaggregated data (BIES); the NCBTS with gender strands or indicators; learning material review that includes anti-sexism and gender-sensitive criteria; and DepEd standards in classroom construction. However, it was not clear to the IPR Team whether the revised learning materials will promote gender equality/equity messages. Because 'gender and development' has rated low in the NCBTS-based prioritization of teachers, it is not clear how teachers' training (pre-service and in-service) is preparing teachers to become more sensitive to the learning situations of boys and girls, why they perform poorly, or why they leave school.

3. The SPHERE IPR Team discovered that these systems are in place in the regions visited. Regional and division managers seemed to have been most aware of the sex disaggregation in the BEIS. The IPR Mission saw little evidence that these have been carefully analyzed to understand what drive gender-related patterns of school access, performance and achievement; and, at the school level, to use the data to design project interventions that could improve the gender situation.
4. In the case of classroom construction, DepEd standards require separate toilets for boys and girls. Some of the classrooms visited by the IPR Team, however, had only one toilet, and if there were two toilets, there was no running water. Muslim girls in particular will not come to school while menstruating when schools do not have separate toilets with running water.
5. On how SPHERE management measures against the Philippines Harmonized GAD Guidelines:
 - a. Commitment of SPHERE management and DepEd leadership to gender equity and the narrowing of gaps between female and male learners. Except for a short-term gender TA, there was no regular SPHERE-funded gender TA, and there is no group (apart from EDPITAF) that could push the recommendations on how to make the BIAP more gender-responsive.
 - b. The World Bank-based SPHERE core team is backed up by a support team from the Bank's Philippines Office. The support team includes a social development (gender) specialist who joined the NPSBE Mid-Term Review and at least two Joint Implementation Review Missions. Without a gender equality strategy, the promotion of gender equality in SPHERE was done in at least two Joint Review Missions, often by AusAID.
 - c. Within DepEd, the Gender and Development (GAD) Program sits within the Human Resources Development Section and trained regional GAD focal persons. It is not clear, however, where these people are located in re-organized regional and division offices. Competence on the practical application of GAD is highly uneven among Central Office, regional and division offices of DepEd.
 - d. There is no TA item for gender. The July 2009 gender workshop was funded ad hoc by AusAID.
6. In summary, SPHERE has supported certain gender mainstreaming processes at DepEd, but it has not actively promoted a more gender-responsive BESRA or educational system.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Include in QAA measures for assessing responsiveness of SIPs to key gender issues facing both teachers and learners.
2. In planning for construction:
 - Include an assessment of the total student population segregated by sex should be part of the site appraisal and crosschecked with the number of existing toilet fixtures in the campus.
 - Include water provision in the costing of classrooms and ensure that latrine design and water provision do not become 'optional facilities' when construction budgets fall short of actual costs.
 - Improve SPHERE monitoring and reporting to specify whether or not constructed classrooms include separate toilets with running water.

Part 2: Gender Assessment of SPHERE

Using the Harmonized GAD Guidelines for project management and implementation (box 16) and monitoring and evaluation (box 17), the implementation of SPHERE is rated as “gender sensitive” (12.75). This is an improvement from its rating the previous year (10.5). For details, see the completed boxes that are found at the end of this report.

Quality Rating for Gender Equality: 4 (Adequate Quality)

Indicator 13: 4

Indicator 14: 4

Strengths: SPHERE has supported DepEd processes and initiatives that aim to address gender disparity issues, particularly high dropout rates among boys; minimize sexism and gender biases in learning materials; track sex-disaggregated education outcomes; and provide separate toilets for boys and girls.

Weaknesses: SPHERE itself is not promoting gender-responsive education. There is little analysis of what drives the gender disparities in education outcomes and little effort to understand the needs and situations of female and male learners that could inform planning at school and various DepEd levels. There is also limited attention to gender concerns in school design and especially latrine provision.

Part 3: Gender Assessment of the SPHERE Components

Component 1: Translation of system-level policies into actions

1.1 Funding for short to medium term TA, to translate policy ideas on reform into action plans and to build the capacity key DepEd managers to implement and manage change in line with DepEd reform

Key findings:

Two of the five Joint Review Missions have identified key gender issues that need to be considered. A recommendation of the Fourth Joint Review Mission (February 2009) was addressed by an AusAID TA. This produced a set of recommendations for enhancing the BIAP. To date, however, the current version does not contain any policy or activity that would have fleshed out the BESRA vision of a learning environment that is gender fair and ensures their protection from abuse, discrimination and violence.

Different levels of DepEd generate sex-disaggregated data on school performance. However, there has been little analysis of what cause the differences in access, participation, performance, and achievement between female and male learners. Neither has there been an application of gender analysis to SIP, DEDP, or REDP.

Development of gender analysis and planning skills is an area seems to be one area that has not been sufficiently covered by previous gender training in DepEd. It is also one area that is not currently covered by SPHERE TAs. Of the TAs, only the TA to the TCT included consideration of gender concerns in his TOR. Nonetheless, at least some of the other TAs have or can address gender concerns. Examples are the TA for ALS advocacy, and the QAA and M&E-related TAs.

1.2 Capacity development of regional offices

Key findings:

There have been some training or capacity-building activities on gender particularly for regional and division education managers under STRIVE and BEAM. However, these did not seem to include building their capacity to analyze data and information, craft programs that respond to gender issues, and provide feedback to the DepEd Central Office on gender-differentiated situation, needs, access, and performance of female and male learners.

1.3 Funding the construction and/or refurbishment of teaching and learning resource centers across the country, including ICT support, managed by regions as part of their QA work to enhance monitoring and to improve teaching, learning and assessment, and with satellite hubs constructed at division level

Key findings:

The 35 or so titles of learning/instructional materials that will be produced and disseminated are being reviewed. The review reportedly uses the IMCS assessment criteria that include anti-sexism in language and gender-fair messages and graphics. However, the IPR Team was not able to ascertain whether the revised learning materials would indeed be free of gender biases and/or promote notions of gender equality and fairness.

Component 2: Support for SBM through grants for school improvement plans

2.1. Provision of grant to public elementary schools which have installed the basic elements of SBM (with well-developed SIPs, established school-community partnerships, transparent reporting and accountability mechanisms at the school level)

Key Findings:

School-level sex-disaggregated data are being generated, but are not being analyzed during preparation of School Improvement Plans. For instance, reasons for school leaving by boys and girls and for differences between them in learning capacities and performance seem not to be pursued as part of SIP preparation. But when led through a gender analysis of the education and economic situation in the community, parents, teachers and barangay officials are able to identify gender issues that should be considered in the SIP.

Component 3: Classroom construction in high need locations in Southern Philippines

3.1. Construction of classrooms in identified priority schools under the DepEd-managed School-building Program in Southern Philippines

Key findings:

The 2007 version of the DepEd Education Facilities Handbook specifies latrine facilities for boys and girls, including the provision of toilet facilities for disabled boys and disabled girls. However, the IPR Team noted that in some schools visited, there is no supply of clean water. During the Wrap-Up Session at DepEd, EDPITAF claimed that UNICEF and LGUs are being tapped to provide water and sanitation facilities in schools.

The absence of water in latrines affects Grade V and VI and high school students, particularly girls who may stay away from school during menstruation. Is this being captured in the Student Tracking System or the School Information System?

SUPPORT TO PHILIPPINE BASIC EDUCATION REFORMS (SPHERE)
(26 February 2010)

Box 16. GAD checklist for project management and implementation

Element and guide question (col. 1)	Response (col. 2)			Score for the item or element (col. 3)	Result or comment (col. 4)
	No (2a)	Partly yes (2b)	Yes (2c)		
1.0 Supportive project management (max score: 2; for each item, 1.0)				1.00	
1.1 Is the project leadership (project steering/advisory committee or management) supportive of GAD or gender equality goals? For instance, has it mobilized adequate resources to support strategies that address gender issues or constraints to women's and men's participation during project implementation? (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0)		✓		0.50	WB, AusAID, and DepEd each have a Gender Policy, but AusAID is the agency that has been promoting GE within SPHERE; mmo TA that would help BESRA actively pursue gender-related objectives, policies and programs. AusAID funded a short-term TA, but there was no group (apart from EDPITAF) that could push the recommendations on how to enhance the BIAP.
1.2 Has adequate gender expertise been made available throughout SPHERE? For example, are gender issues adequately addressed in the project management contract and scope of services? (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) NOTE: The WB core team is backed up by a support team from the WB Philippines Office that includes a social development (gender) specialist (M. Padua). The WB has chosen to focus on 'gender equity' (i.e., the disadvantaged position of boys in terms of participation and achievement). The only TA on gender came independently from AusAID. Within DepEd, there are offices/technical staff been trained in applying GAD principles in specific QA activities, LRMDs, training, etc; some of these people are involved in BESRA, but not the HRDS that does the gender training.		✓		0.50	In 2008/09, it was noted that there was no explicit mention of promotion of GE in the AusAID's Trust Fund Admin Agreement with WB, and only implied in the Project Appraisal Document that refers to giving equal opportunities for boys and girls to access quality basic education services. Because of the lack of explicit GE mention in the Project Appraisal Document, GE is not consciously addressed in SPHERE.
2.0 Technically competent staff or consultants (max score: 2; for each item, 0.67)				1.00	
2.1 Are [the project staff members] DepEd personnel and TAs technically prepared to promote gender equality or integrate GAD in their respective positions/locations? OR, is there an individual or group responsible for promoting gender equality in the project? OR, has the project tapped local gender experts to assist its staff/ partners in integrating gender equality in their activities or in project operations? (poss. scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) NOTE: While there was appreciation and awareness of gender issues and objectives among some division, regional and central office managers and staff, competence in the practical application of GAD is highly uneven.		✓		0.33	Noted in 2008/09: GAD program sits within the Human Resource Development Services of DepEd and trained focal persons have been identified from the central to the regional and division levels. It is not clear, however, how these people are located in re-organized regional and division offices.

Element and guide question (col. 1)	Response (col. 2)			Score for the item or element (col. 3)	Result or comment (col. 4)
	No (2a)	Partly yes (2b)	Yes (2c)		
2.2 Does the project require the presence of women and men in the project implementation team? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67)		✓		0.33	Not explicit, but because women dominate the sector, they are well represented in the SPHERE/ BESRA management at various levels.
2.3 Does project require its monitoring and evaluation team (personnel or consultants) to have technical competence for GAD evaluation? (possible scores: 0, 0.33, 0.67) NOTE: SPHERE does not require this but the DepEd M&E system requires some degree of tracking of gender-differentiated outcomes.		✓		0.33	
3.0 Committed Philippine government agency (max score: 2; for each item, 1)				1.50	
3.1 Are regular agency personnel involved in implementing project GAD initiatives? OR, are agency officials or personnel participating in GAD training sponsored by the project? (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0)			✓	1.00	DepEd Central and a few Region/Division staff and teachers are DepEd trained in the July 2009 gender workshop on the BIAP.
3.2 Has the agency included the project's GAD efforts in its GAD plans? (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0)		✓		0.5	SPHERE indirectly supports indirectly gender mainstreaming in DepEd, although DepEd has no current GAD Plan.
4.0 GAD implementation processes and procedures (max score: 2; for each item, 0.5)				1.0	
4.1 Do project implementation documents incorporate a discussion of GAD concerns? IF APPLICABLE: Are subproject proposals required to have explicit GAD objectives and to have been supported by gender analysis? (possible scores: 0, 0.25, 0.50)		✓		0.25	Only in terms of addressing provision of equal opportunities to boys and girls to access basic education services.
4.2 Does the project have an operational GAD strategy? Alternately, has the project been effective in integrating GAD into the development activity? (possible scores: 0, 0.25, 0.50)		✓		0.25	Only in terms of addressing provision of equal opportunities to boys and girls to access basic education services.
4.3 Does the project have a budget for activities that will build capacities for doing GAD tasks (gender analysis, monitoring, etc.) (possible scores: 0, 0.25, 0.50)	✓			0.0	There is no line item for GAD; July 2009 workshop was funded ad hoc.
4.4 Does the project involve women and men in various phases of subprojects? (possible scores: 0, 0.25, 0.50)			✓	1.00	
TOTAL GAD SCORE -PROJECT MANAGEMENT				4.50	

Box 17. GAD checklist for project monitoring and evaluation

Element and guide question (col. 1)	Response (col. 2)			Score for the item or element (col. 3)	Result or comment (col. 4)
	No (2a)	Partly yes (2b)	Yes (2c)		
1.0 Project monitoring system being used by the project includes indicators that measure gender differences in outputs, results, and outcomes. (max score: 2; for each item, 1)				1.50	Explicit in the Key Results Framework, although very specific to boys and girls
1.1 Does the project require gender-sensitive outputs and outcomes? (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0)			✓	1.00	
1.2 Does the project monitor its activities, inputs, outputs, and results using GAD or gender equality indicators? (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0) NOTE: The challenge is for SPHERE to promote an analysis of the BEIS data that inquires about the factors affecting the numbers. At the school level, the challenge is for SIP preparation to include an analysis of the STS and SIS, what drive the figures and what these mean to school planning and SBM.		✓		0.50	From what I could gather from SPHERE documents, this applies only to outcome/ results, but not to activities or outputs.
2.0 Project database includes sex-disaggregated and gender-related information. (max score: 2; for each item, 0.5)				1.75	
2.1 Does the project support studies to assess gender issues and impacts? OR, have sex-disaggregated data been collected on the project's impact on women and men in connection with welfare, access to resources and benefits, awareness or consciousness raising, participation, and control? (possible scores: 0, 0.25, 0.50)			✓	0.50	DepED's BEIS in terms of boys and girls.
2.2 Have sex-disaggregated data been collected on the distribution of project resources to women and men, and on the participation of women and men in project activities and in decision making? IF APPLICABLE: Does the project require its subprojects to include sex-disaggregated data in their reports? (possible scores: 0, 0.25, 0.50)		✓		0.25	DepED's BEIS in terms of boys and girls. At the school levels, there are available data on PTA, SGCs (where these were available), and school staff.
2.3 Do project and subproject reports include sex-disaggregated data or cover gender equality or GAD concerns, initiatives, and results (that is, information on gender issues and how these are addressed)? (possible scores: 0, 0.25, 0.50)			✓	0.50	DepED's BEIS in terms of boys and girls. The report provided to the IPR team includes sex-disaggregated NAT results.
2.4 Are sex-disaggregated data being "rolled up" from the field to the national level? (possible scores: 0, 0.25, 0.50)			✓	0.50	DepED's BEIS in terms of boys and girls.
3.0 Gender equality and women's empowerment targets are being met (max score: 4)				2.00	
3.1 Has women's/ girls' welfare and status been improved as a result of the project? (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0)		✓		1.00	
Primary indicator: Declining dropout rate of boys and girls (although there was an increase in dropout rate of girls in 2008/09)					

Element and guide question (col. 1)	Response (col. 2)			Score for the item or element (col. 3)	Result or comment (col. 4)
	No (2a)	Partly yes (2b)	Yes (2c)		
3.2 Has the project helped in developing the capacity of the implementing agency for implementing gender-sensitive projects? (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0)		✓		1.00	
4.0 Project addresses gender issues arising from or during its implementation. (possible scores: 0, 1.0, 2.0) Has the project responded to gender issues that were identified during project implementation or M&E? OR: Has the project addressed gender issues arising from its implementation? NOTE: According to EDPITAF during the wrap-up session, water and sanitation facilities will likely be covered by a UNICEF project with DepEd. It's not clear whether these will be installed in SPHERE classrooms.		✓		1.00	The recent review saw specific sanitary needs of teen-aged girls being addressed through construction of additional toilet and water facilities. However, the toilets that were visited had no running water.
5.0 Participatory monitoring and evaluation processes (max score: 2; for each item, 1)				2.00	
5.1 Does the project involve or consult woman and man implementors during project monitoring and evaluation? Does it involve woman and man beneficiaries? (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0)			✓	1.00	M&E teams of DepEd at different levels tend to include both women and men; from the donor side, women and men constitute the Joint Review Missions.
5.2 Have women and men been involved in or consulted on the assessment of the gender impacts of the project? (possible scores: 0, 0.5, 1.0)			✓	0.50	
TOTAL GAD SCORE - MONITORING AND EVALUATION				8.25	
TOTAL GAD SCORE - PROJECT MANAGEMENT (from box 16)				4.50	
TOTAL GAD SCORE -PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION				12.75	SPHERE implementation and M&E is considered 'gender sensitive'.