

Joint Summative Evaluation/Independent Completion Report of Support to the Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Initiative Summary

Initiative Name	Support to the Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka		
AidWorks initiative numbers	INJ411 and INJ872		
Commencement date	3 June 2010	Completion date	31 July 2013
Total Australian \$	\$10,132,598		
Total other \$	N/A		
Delivery organisation(s)	UNICEF Sri Lanka		
Implementing partner(s)	Sri Lankan Ministry of Education		
Country/Region	Sri Lanka/South Asia		
Primary sector	Education		
Initiative objective/s	To rehabilitate, construct or repair 23 schools and education structures to the nationally-accepted Child Friendly Schools (CFS) standard, providing access to quality learning for children in Sri Lanka's Northern Province in line with the priorities of the Ministry of Education.		

Evaluation Summary

Evaluation Objective: To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the project; to review and analyse the project achievements, what worked, and what did not work and why.

Evaluation Completion Date: 28 February 2014

Evaluation Team: Andrew Whillas, Infrastructure Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, Independent Consultant (Evaluation Team Leader); Rani Noerhadhie, Senior Program Officer, Australian High Commission (observer); Arulrajah Sriskandarajah, UNICEF Sri Lanka Education Officer (observer and interpreter); field staff from the UNICEF Kilinochchi Office (to manage the day-to-day logistics of the school visits).

Evaluation overall conclusion: Feedback from the beneficiaries (school communities) was positive, with reports of an increase in school attendance and a high level of ownership for the rehabilitated and reconstructed schools. This suggests the benefits of the program will be sustainable. DFAT disaster risk reduction requirements relating to environmental issues and climate change were considered during the design process to ensure long-term sustainability of the project. Incorporation of gender equality and women’s empowerment as cross-cutting elements was evident. Women were active participants in decision-making on the school construction and rehabilitation, including through their representation on the School Development Committees. Separate water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) facilities were provided for girls and boys in most schools. In the schools where major construction was undertaken, the quality of construction was of an acceptable standard and local materials were used. The evaluation details a number of areas for improvement in five recommendations and 14 lessons learnt. The evaluation recommends that UNICEF rectify the construction defects identified and ensure that the schools are safe. It also recommends UNICEF provide a detailed acquittal of the balance of funding (27.5 per cent) spent on non-construction costs in order to demonstrate value for money. Some of the important lessons learnt were the importance of having an experienced construction engineer to oversee the technical aspects of construction, and preparing detailed project design documentation before the commitment of funds with a formalised complaints handling system to manage problems during project implementation.

DFAT’s response to the evaluation report

- The evaluation report’s recommendations are clear and the report addresses the Terms of Reference including the OECD DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. DFAT agrees with all five recommendations.
- The report identifies a number of construction defects in the reconstructed and repaired schools. On 18 July 2014, UNICEF confirmed in writing to DFAT that all defects in the 13 major-construction schools had been fully rectified and that the school buildings were safe for their intended use. For the 10 minor-construction schools, UNICEF advises in its final project report to DFAT that a structural engineer has certified that the structural works meet Ministry of Education construction standards and confirms that the school buildings are structurally sound and safe.
- The report finds that infrastructure construction was not a key strength of UNICEF. Nevertheless, as one of the few humanitarian actors at the time with access to the post-conflict areas to carry out reconstruction and rehabilitation work, DFAT’s choice of UNICEF as a delivery partner was an appropriate response in the post-conflict environment.
- DFAT intended the evaluation to focus on the ‘quality’ of the construction and therefore engaged an infrastructure specialist to lead the evaluation. This approach was taken because broader project impact, including the impact of the child-friendly approach (CFA), would have been difficult to measure given no baseline and monitoring system to measure impact was established at the outset. UNICEF’s final

report outlines the importance of the CFA to the project. DFAT agrees it played an important role but considers it would have been difficult to measure in this instance.

- The evaluation found that UNICEF could not demonstrate value for money for the 27.5 per cent of funds spent on non-construction related costs at the time of the evaluation. As part of its final project report to DFAT, UNICEF provided a detailed acquittal that elaborated the following breakdown:
 - indirect support costs (UNICEF headquarters) – 6.5 per cent (as specified in project contracts)
 - field travel for supervision – 1.6 per cent
 - administrative costs of UNICEF Sri Lanka – 8.4 per cent
 - UNICEF staff costs for promoting the CFA – 11 per cent.
- DFAT considers that local administrative costs were reasonable given the difficult delivery environment in post-conflict areas, including security and access challenges. The project encompassed not only construction, but also technical support to implement CFA concepts. These concepts were important to create a quality learning environment in the post-conflict setting. As a result, DFAT considers the cost comparison with an education infrastructure project in Indonesia as not appropriate.
- All 13 major-construction schools have been fitted with ramps for wheelchair access. However, the 10 schools which received minor-construction were built back to their original MoE design, which means they did not receive ramps (a Child-friendly school requirement). Further, only 10 of the 13 major-construction schools received toilets with disability access. DFAT agrees with the evaluator that in future all construction work should ensure accessibility for people with disability.

DFAT's response to the specific recommendations made in the report

Recommendation	Response	Actions	Responsibility
<p>1. In the case of the six minor-construction schools where new classrooms were built and/or significant work was undertaken on structural elements, and the construction was not monitored by a qualified structural engineer, UNICEF should arrange for a structural engineer to review the quality records and engineers' logs and certify in writing that the elements or classrooms in question have adequate strength and are safe, or if not, what corrective actions are required to make it safe.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>UNICEF have obtained written certification from the Director of School Works (DSW) of the Ministry of Education for Northern Province (who is a structural engineer) confirming that defect rectification has been completed and structural works in the 10 minor-construction schools meet the relevant standards. Based on this certification, UNICEF's final report to DFAT confirms that all identified corrective actions have been undertaken and the school buildings are structurally sound and safe.</p>	<p>UNICEF</p>

Recommendation	Response	Actions	Responsibility
<p>2. That UNICEF provides a letter to DFAT, along with their final report, confirming in writing that all defects identified by the evaluation and listed at the hand-over inspection, plus other defects discussed by the evaluator with UNICEF field engineers during the evaluation visits, have been rectified and that the schools are safe.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>For the 13 major-construction schools, UNICEF have provided a letter to DFAT confirming that all identified defects have been rectified and the schools are safe.</p> <p>For the 10 minor-construction schools, based on the certification of the Director of School Works, UNICEF's final project report to DFAT confirms that all identified corrective actions have been undertaken as required and the school buildings are structurally sound and safe.</p>	<p>UNICEF</p>

Recommendation	Response	Actions	Responsibility
<p>3. At completion of the defects liability period for each school, UNICEF should provide DFAT and the MoE with certification that “the buildings as constructed are safe and satisfy the relevant standards, codes and building regulations in Sri Lanka, and do not contain any asbestos containing materials”.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>For the 13 major-construction schools, UNICEF have provided a letter confirming the buildings constructed are safe and satisfy the relevant standards, codes and building regulations in Sri Lanka, and do not contain any asbestos containing materials.</p> <p>For the 10 minor-construction schools, the Director of School Works (DSW) of the Ministry of Education for Northern Province has confirmed that defect rectification has been completed and structural works in the 10 minor-construction schools meet the construction standards of the Ministry of Education and do not contain any asbestos containing materials.</p>	<p>UNICEF</p>

Recommendation	Response	Actions	Responsibility
<p>4. That UNICEF provides a detailed acquittal of the balance of the funding 27.5 per cent (approximately USD2,772,802) that was not directly allocated for the design construction and supervision of the 23 schools.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>In its final project report to DFAT, UNICEF provided a detailed breakdown of the costs of UNICEF activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - indirect support costs (UNICEF headquarters) – 6.5 per cent (as specified in project contracts) - field travel for supervision – 1.6 per cent - administrative costs for UNICEF Sri Lanka – 8.4 per cent - UNICEF staff costs for promoting the child-friendly approach – 11 per cent. 	<p>UNICEF</p>

Recommendation	Response	Actions	Responsibility
<p>5. That all future construction activities supported by DFAT in the education sector comply with DFAT’s Disability Inclusive Design criteria, and the Ministry of Social Services Sri Lanka policy “Promotion of Accessibility to the Built Environment for Persons with Disabilities” and include, inter alia, toilets for people with disabilities as well as the associated ramps, handrails and doorways suitable for wheelchair access.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>DFAT will continue to work with partners to ensure that, where possible, all future construction activities are accessible for people with disabilities.</p>	<p>DFAT</p>

**Support to the Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas
in Northern Sri Lanka
Funded by DFAT and implemented by UNICEF**

AidWorks INJ872

**SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT /
INDEPENDENT COMPLETION REPORT**

**Andrew Whillas
Infrastructure Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist
December 2013**

Initiative summary

Initiative Name	Support to the Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka (SESCAANSL)		
AidWorks initiative number	INJ872		
Commencement date	1 June 2010	Completion date	31 July 2013
Total Australian \$	10,132,598.00		
Total other \$			
Delivery organisation(s)	UNICEF Sri Lanka		
Implementing Partner(s)	Ministry of Education		
Country/Region	Sri Lanka, Northern Province		
Primary Sector	Education		

Acknowledgments

The Evaluation Team Leader gratefully acknowledges the time given and contributions made by all stakeholders met during the visits. Any errors, misunderstandings and omissions are solely the responsibility of the writer.

The preparation of the Terms of Reference for the summative joint evaluation and the planning of the mission were undertaken jointly by DFAT and UNICEF through the Evaluation Management Team and the Evaluation Reference Group.

The Evaluation Team Leader (ETL) was accompanied on the field trips by the DFAT, Colombo, Senior Education Program Officer, Rani Noerhadhie as an observer, and the UNICEF Sri Lanka Education Officer Arulrajah Sriskandarajah as an observer and interpreter. Also accompanying were Field Staff from the UNICEF Kilinochchi Office who managed the day-to-day logistics of the school visits as well as capably and cheerfully providing the essential interpreter support.

Author's details

Andrew Whillas, Infrastructure Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, Independent Consultant, Bangkok, Thailand Telephone +66 2720 0978 Email: ajwhillas@gmail.com

Disclaimer

This report reflects the views of the writer, rather than those of the Government of Australia or of the Government of Sri Lanka, or of UNICEF.

Table of contents

Acronyms	12
Executive summary	13
Background and context	13
The project	13
Purpose and focus of the evaluation	14
Outline of the evaluation findings	14
Outline of the lessons learned	15
Key recommendations	15
Evaluation criteria ratings	16
1.0 Introduction	17
1.1 Initiative background	17
1.2 Evaluation purpose and questions	19
1.3 Evaluation scope and methods	19
2.0 Evaluation findings	21
2.1 Relevance	21
2.2 Effectiveness	23
2.3 Efficiency	29
2.4 Impact	35
2.5 Sustainability	35
2.6 Gender equality	38
2.7 Lessons learned – approach and synergies	38
2.8 Lasting outcomes	40
3.0 Conclusion and recommendations	40
3.1 Lessons learned for Australian aid initiatives	42
3.2 Recommendations	43
ANNEX A: Evaluation supporting information	45
ANNEX B: Field visit and stakeholder meeting schedule: DFAT / UNICEF School Construction Evaluation in the North: 7 – 17 October 2013	50
ANNEX C: Persons met	54
ANNEX D: Evaluation field notes from visits to schools	67
ANNEX E: Draft Summative Evaluation Plan – October 2013	78
ANNEX F: Terms of reference	30

Acronyms

ACM	Asbestos Containing Materials
AUD	Australian Dollars
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BESP	Basic Education Support Project (UNICEF managed)
CC	Construction Contractor
CFA	Child Friendly Approach
CFS	Child Friendly Schools
DEO	District Education Office
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Australia)
DLP	Defects Liability Period
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DSC	Design and Supervision Consultant
EP	Evaluation Plan
ET	Evaluation Team
FOE	UNICEF Field Office Engineers
GoSL	Government of Sri Lanka
GTMS	Government Tamil Mixed School
ICR	Independent Completion Report
ICTAD	Institute for Construction Training and Development
JPA	Joint Plan for Assistance for the Northern Province – 2011
LCC	Local construction contractor
MoE	Ministry of Education
MV	Maha Vidyalayam – a combined primary and secondary school
NCC	National Construction Contractor
NP	Northern Province
PDD	Project design document
PEO	Provincial Education Office
QA	Quality Assurance
RCTMS	Roman Catholic Tamil Mixed School
SESCAANSL	Support to the Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka - “The Project”
SCR	Students to Classrooms Ratio
SDS	School Development Society
SLCO	UNICEF Sri Lanka Country Office
TLS	Temporary Learning Spaces
TO	Technical Officer
TSEP	Transforming School Education Program (World Bank program)
USD	United States Dollars
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene program (UNICEF)
ZEO	Zonal Education Office

Executive summary

This report is a joint summative evaluation of the project, 'Support to the Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka', which was implemented by UNICEF and funded by DFAT, from June 2011 to June 2013. The project involved the construction or rehabilitation of 23 schools, which are all now operational with 11,910 enrolled students and 539 teachers.

Background and context

The long-running conflict in Sri Lanka resulted in the destruction of infrastructure throughout the Northern Province, including the widespread loss of education facilities. The World Bank estimated that as many as 2,000 schools were damaged as a result of conflict between 1983 and 2009.

UNICEF and the Ministry of Education (MoE) identified key gaps in the education sector that were not being met by other means. These included the urgent rehabilitation of education facilities, the supply of school furniture, equipment and teaching/learning materials. A project to support 'The Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka' (SESCAANSL) was initiated by UNICEF in May 2010, through a request for funding for an integrated package of assistance to children affected by conflict. DFAT partly funded the education component from June 2010 to July 2011 (Phase 1) to the value of AUD3 million, for the reconstruction of three selected schools in the northern Kilinochchi district.

In February 2011, a multi-sectoral assessment of the immediate needs in the Northern Province was jointly undertaken by the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL), the UN agencies, and other organisations. The assessment was reported in the Joint Plan for Assistance (JPA) for the Northern Province – 2011. Within the education sector, UNICEF and the GoSL concluded that 347 schools in the province needed priority rehabilitation. The GoSL lacked the capacity to renovate the facilities.

On 4 May 2011, in response to the assessment, and based on the success of Phase 1, DFAT agreed to Phase 2: AUD5.0 million for education sector assistance for 12 months. Between July 2011 and 31 July 2013, DFAT provided additional funding of AUD2,132,598, bringing the total contribution to AUD10,132,598¹ over three years.

The project

The project proposed to rehabilitate schools to nationally-accepted Child Friendly Schools (CFS) standard, providing access to quality learning for children in the North in line with the priorities of the Ministry of Education. The CFS requirements included water and sanitation facilities (WASH), facilities for children with disabilities, and adherence to Disaster Risk Reduction standards. UNICEF was responsible for the management of all phases of the school reconstruction and rehabilitation.

Under DFAT funding, 23 primary, secondary and mixed schools were rehabilitated or reconstructed in two districts of Northern Province. Of the schools, 13 involved major construction with new designs, six involved minor construction to MoE standard classroom design, and four involved minor rehabilitation managed by the relevant School Development Society.

By the end of the project in July 2013, 247 classrooms were completed, as well as 50 laboratories, libraries and IT rooms, and 10 halls. WASH facilities were provided at nine of the 13 large schools which did not have existing WASH facilities. At the time of the evaluation, all 23 schools had been completed and handed over to the MoE. The schools were all operational with 11,910 enrolled students and 539 teachers.

¹ Total of the three DFAT Financial Management and Accountability (FMA) Act Regulation 9 approvals.

Purpose and focus of the evaluation

DFAT and UNICEF agreed to undertake a joint summative evaluation of the project. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, and sustainability of project implementation. The assessment includes value for money, quality of implementation and the construction, as well as compliance to the Child Friendly School requirements.

The evaluation reviews and analyses what the project has achieved, what has worked, and what did not work and why. Lessons learned from the evaluation will inform and shape DFAT's and UNICEF Sri Lanka's current and future programming in the education sector.

Outline of the evaluation findings

Relevance

School re-construction was very relevant at the outset of the project to address the urgent infrastructure needs at that time. As the backlog of classrooms to be refurbished is eliminated, classroom reconstruction will be of diminishing relevance going forward. Sector support is transitioning from humanitarian to longer-term development programming in line with the DFAT Sri Lanka Country Strategy objectives. The evaluation found instances where the numbers of classrooms constructed did not correlate well with student enrolments, leading to instances of over- or under-capacity.

Effectiveness

Feedback indicated that stakeholder engagement throughout the reconstruction process was strong and effective, and that teachers and students were very positive about their new school buildings.

The objectives and scope were poorly defined in the grant agreements and no formal design document was produced for either Phase 1 or 2, leading to difficulties in monitoring. Schools with minor reconstruction were built back to the original MoE design which does not satisfy the CFS disability requirements. For the project-designed larger construction schools, disability access was met in terms of ramps, but only a small percentage have disabled toilets which are a CFS requirement.

Efficiency

The project was completed on time, with value for money demonstrated for the majority of schools. However, there were quality and procurement risks with six minor-construction schools and structural defects on major and minor construction schools (the latter can be fixed). Value for money could not be demonstrated for the 27.5% of non-construction related grant funds. The selection of some schools was not the 'best fit' due to over- and under-investment at some schools.

Sustainability

DFAT Disaster Risk Reduction requirements relating to environmental issues (e.g. unexploded ordnance, tsunami and storm surge) were considered during the design process. The major-construction schools are generally of good quality construction and built with local materials. The quality of the minor-construction schools could not be ascertained - low construction quality generally translates to high maintenance needs.

The main concern is the lack of a periodic maintenance budget for the MoE for major maintenance works. Meetings suggested that small routine maintenance could be managed at the school level by the staff supported by the School Development Society.

Gender equality

Women were active participants in decision-making both through their representation on the staff and the School Development Society. Separate WASH facilities were provided for girls and boys in most schools.

Outline of the lessons learned

Key lessons learned include:

- detailed project design documents should be prepared to define the scope, cost, implementation schedule, reporting and monitoring arrangements, preferably before the commitment of funds
- an independent and critical assessment of the government's school infrastructure investment decisions will ensure that resources are properly targeted and avoid over-capacity in any locations
- if the recipient government procurement systems are used, appropriate checks and balances should be undertaken
- all construction activities need to be independently and systematically monitored to ensure compliance with the design and safety of final structure
- the modality of community-based contracting is good for small reconstruction works provided appropriate technical support is given.

Key recommendations

Recommendation 1: In the case of the six minor-construction schools where new classrooms were built and/or significant work was undertaken on structural elements, and the construction was not monitored by a qualified structural engineer, UNICEF should arrange for a structural engineer to review the quality records and engineers' logs, and certify in writing that the elements/classrooms have adequate strength and are safe, and if not, list the corrective actions required to make them safe.

Recommendation 2: That UNICEF ensures all defects identified and listed at the hand-over inspection, plus other defects discussed with the UNICEF field office engineers during the evaluation visits, are rectified before the final inspection.

Recommendation 3: At completion of the defects liability period for each school, UNICEF should provide DFAT and the MoE with certification that "the buildings as constructed are safe and satisfy the relevant standards, codes and building regulations in Sri Lanka, and do not contain any asbestos containing materials".

Recommendation 4: That UNICEF provides a detailed acquittal of the balance of the funding (27.5% - approximately USD2,772,802) that was not directly allocated for the design and construction of the 23 schools.

Recommendation 5: That all future construction activities supported by DFAT in the education sector comply with DFAT's Disability Inclusive Design criteria, and the Ministry of Social Services Sri Lanka policy "Promotion of Accessibility to the Built Environment for Persons with Disabilities" and include, inter alia, toilets for people with disabilities as well as the associated ramps, handrails and doorways suitable for wheelchair access.

Evaluation criteria ratings

The evaluation team assessed the project against the following criteria, and provided the listed ratings with a brief explanation. These ratings are discussed in more detail in the report.

Evaluation Criteria ²	Rating (1-6)	Explanation
Relevance	5	School reconstruction was very relevant at the project outset to address infrastructure backlog. Issues with the siting of some schools.
Effectiveness	3.5	The objectives and scope were poorly defined. Minor construction did not satisfy the disability requirements. CFS requirements were only partially met. Good stakeholder engagement.
Efficiency	3.5	Quality and procurement risks with six minor-construction schools and structural defects on major and minor construction schools (the latter are fixable). Value for money could not be demonstrated for the 27.5% of non-construction related grant funds. The selection of some schools was not 'best fit', with some schools predicted to have over-capacity and others under-capacity.
Sustainability	3.5	The main concern is the lack of a maintenance budget. There is also concern over the quality of the minor construction schools, as this could not be ascertained – low construction quality generally translates to high maintenance needs.
Gender equality	5	Women were active participants in the decision-making, particularly through the School Development Societies. Separate WASH facilities for girls and boys were provided in most schools.

Rating scale

Satisfactory		Less than satisfactory	
6	Very high quality	3	Less than adequate quality
5	Good quality	2	Poor quality
4	Adequate quality	1	Very poor quality

² If impact is included, a rating is not expected to be applied.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Initiative background

The long-running conflict in Sri Lanka resulted in the destruction of infrastructure throughout the Northern Province, including the widespread loss of education facilities through the direct impact of war, lack of maintenance and abandonment. The World Bank estimated in 2009 that as many as 2,000 schools – the bulk of education facilities in the north – were damaged between 1983 and 2009. Support from the international development community has helped return many schools to a basic, useable state through essential repairs. This includes building Temporary Learning Spaces which provide a basic structure with a roof but no walls.

UNICEF was working with the Ministry of Education (MoE), provincial authorities and other development/donor actors to identify high priority needs in the north that were not being supported through other means. The UNICEF/MoE investigation confirmed that there were key gaps in the education sector particularly in the urgent rehabilitation of education facilities, the supply of school furniture, equipment and teaching/learning material. The project, ‘Support to the Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka’ (SESCAANSL) began in 2010 with a UNICEF request to DFAT. UNICEF presented to DFAT the Northern Province Education Funding Proposal 2010–2012 – an integrated package of assistance to children affected by conflict. DFAT partly funded the education component for the period June 2010 to July 2011 (Phase 1) to the value of AUD3 million. Phase 1 supported the reconstruction, repair, and refurbishment of three selected schools in the northern Kilinochchi district.

In February 2011, a comprehensive multi-sectoral assessment of the immediate needs in the Northern Province was jointly undertaken by the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL) and donor partners. The assessment was reported in the Joint Plan for Assistance (JPA) for the Northern Province – 2011. UNICEF and the GoSL, principally the Northern Province Ministry of Education, conducted the assessment of the education needs. The assessment concluded that 347 schools in the province needed priority rehabilitation, ranging from minor repairs to full construction.

In response to the findings of the JPA assessment, and based on the experience of Phase 1 and positive feedback from the GoSL and local communities, a Contribution Agreement³ was prepared between DFAT and UNICEF on 4 May 2011. This agreement was for a further AUD5.0 million for Phase 2 for additional education sector assistance to cover the 12-month period to 4 May 2012. DFAT provided additional funding of AUD2.1 million between July 2011 to 31 July 2013, bringing the contribution to AUD10.1 million over three years. The Phase 2 funding support to UNICEF was focused on 20 conflict-affected schools in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu districts of the Northern Province. Table 1.1 provides details of the schools by type of construction, rooms constructed, student and teacher numbers, and building construction, design and cost.

By the end of the project, the aim of the DFAT funding is to support the school construction project to achieve its objective of rehabilitation, construction or repair of 23 schools and education structures compliant with Child Friendly School (CFS) requirements. The CFS requirements, which also include adequate WASH facilities, adequate facilities for children with disabilities, and adherence to Disaster Risk Reduction standards, will enable at least 10,000 marginalised and conflict-affected children in the north to access education within a conducive learning environment and benefit from safe and durable education facilities leading to improved learning achievement.

³ Contribution Agreement (DFAT Agreement Number 59321) between DFAT and UNICEF, for AUD 5.0 million, signed by UNICEF 4 May 2011. The Agreement completion date was specified as 4 May 2012. The copy of the Contribution Agreement sighted has not been signed by the DFAT delegate.

SESCAANSL ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

Table 1.1 - Summary Details of Project Schools and WASH Facilities																																												
Type of Construction	District	School No.	Schools Visited by ET & Order	Name of School	Phase	Grades Taught	Rooms & Facilities Constructed or Rehabilitated by Project										New WASH Facilities constructed by the Project					Total WASH Facilities at Schools (New + Pre-Project) (2)					Student Population					Teachers** Numbers October 2013	Current Student Classroom Ratio SCR	Current Teacher to Classroom Ratio	Current Student Teacher Ratio	Building design	Building Construction	Construction Cost USD						
							Classrooms	Laboratories	Was any basic laboratory equipment provided?	Activity rooms	ICT Rooms	Library	Hall/ Auditorium	Total Instructional Rooms	Administration Office	Canteen	Teachers Quarters	Principals Quarters	Total Number of New Toilets	Number of New Male Toilets (including Urinals)	Number of New Female Toilets	Number of Disabled Toilets	New Water Supply system	Male and Female Hand Washing Facilities constructed?	Number of Male Toilets	Number of Urinals	Number of Female Toilets	Number of Disabled Toilets	Number of Hand Washing Facilities	Do WASH facilities at school (new + pre-project) meet MOE minimum standards per student? Yes or No	Estimated Student Population at planning stage (1)								Male Students (Boys) March 2013	Female Students (Girls) March 2013	Student* Population March 2013	Student* Population October 2013	Total number of students with Disabilities (Male + Female)	
Major Construction	Kilinochchi	1		Palai Central College ^	1	1-13	41	5	No	0	2	1	0	0	49	3	1	0	0	27	13	12	2	1	Yes	6	9	13	2	17	Yes	700	545	571	1,116	1,116	2	48	27.2	1.2	23.3	DSC	UNICEF CC	1,064,781
		2		Massar GTMS^	1	1-5	21	NA	No	0	1	0	0	22	0	1	3BR	0	8	4	2	2	1	Yes	2	2	3	2	20	Yes	90	83	66	149	149	0	18	7.1	0.9	8.3	DSC	UNICEF CC		
		3	8	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	1	1-13	24	3	No	4	NA	No	1	32	NA	1	NA	NA	12	5	5	2	2	Yes	11	6	24	2	37	No	1,752	1,129	982	2,111	2,111	-	68	88.0	2.8	31.0	DSC	UNICEF CC	785,970	
		4		Gnamimadam GTMS	2	1-9	9	NA	No	1	1	No	11	NA	NA	4BR	NA	0	0	0	0	1	No	5	3	5	2	28	Yes	62	35	42	77	77	-	10	8.6	1.1	7.7	DSC	UNICEF CC	473,543		
		5		Jeyapuram MV	2	1-13	8	2	No	1	1	1	1	14	NA	NA	4BR	NA	0	0	0	0	1	No	6	5	9	2	18	Yes	462	224	238	462	462	0	19	57.8	2.4	24.3	DSC	UNICEF CC	633,279	
		6		Kallaru Tamil Vidyalayam	2	1-9	11	NA	No	1	NA	1	1	14	NA	NA	2BR	NA	0	0	0	0	1	No	5	3	9	2	17	Yes	214	107	107	214	214	1	8	19.5	0.7	26.8	DSC	UNICEF CC	568,552	
		7		Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	2	1-5	10	NA	No	No	1	1	1	13	1	NA	4BR	NA	10	5	5	0	1	Yes	8	4	10	2	13	Yes	232	111	121	232	361	-	16	36.1	1.6	22.6	DSC	UNICEF CC	546,784	
		8		Vivekananda Vidyalayam	2	1-11	5	2	No	1	NA	No	1	9	NA	NA	4BR	NA	0	0	0	0	1	No	3	5	8	2	17	Yes	436	295	325	620	620	-	26	124.0	5.2	23.8	DSC	UNICEF CC	582,032	
	Mullaitivu	9	1	Katchilaiamadu G.T.M.S.[1]	2	1-13	13	2	No	No	1	1	1	18	1	NA	4BR	1	7	5	0	2	1	Yes	6	6	7	2	51	Yes	579	287	292	579	573	2	28	44.1	2.2	20.5	DSC	UNICEF CC	650,281	
		10		Udayarkattu MV	2	6-13	15	4	No	1	2	1	1	24	NA	NA	NA	1	12	5	5	2	1	Yes	14	10	8	3	39	Yes	938	361	401	762	1,382	1	35	92.1	2.3	39.5	DSC	UNICEF CC	686,976	
		11	5	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	2	1-9	16	NA	No	No	1	1	1	19	1	NA	NA	NA	2	1	1	0	1	Yes	2	6	3	0	18	Yes	182	91	95	186	186	-	13	11.6	0.8	14.3	DSC	UNICEF CC	513,986	
		12	4	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	2	1-11	8	3	No	No	NA	1	1	13	NA	1	NA	NA	2	1	1	0	1	Yes	2	6	4	0	31	Yes	401	179	192	371	371	1	29	46.4	3.6	12.8	DSC	UNICEF CC	413,065	
		13	3	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S.[3]	2	1-9	9	NA	No	No	1	1	1	12	1	1	4BR	1	3	1	2	0	2	Yes	3	6	3	0	38	No	279	208	197	405	395	-	23	43.9	2.6	17.2	DSC	UNICEF CC	335,735	
Minor Construction	Mullaitivu	14		PTK Central College	2	1-13	15	NA	No	No	NA	No	15	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	NA	4	12	4	0	16	No	914	668	784	1,452	1,452	-	53	96.8	3.5	27.4	MoE	PEO CC	50,340		
		15		Iranaipalai RCMV	2	1-13	6	NA	No	No	NA	No	No	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	NA	1	6	5	0	11	Yes	222	423	350	773	773	-	29	128.8	4.8	26.7	MoE	PEO CC	49,703	
		16		Thevipuram GTMS	2	1-11	5	NA	No	No	NA	No	No	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	NA	2	4	5	0	0	Yes	186	95	107	202	202	-	22	40.4	4.4	9.2	MoE	PEO CC	25,869	
		17	2	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam[2]	2	1-5	4	NA	No	No	NA	No	No	4	1	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	NA	1	4	1	0	11	Yes	85	27	27	54	54	-	7	13.5	1.8	7.7	MoE	PEO CC	27,932	
		18		Thaneerootu GMMs	2	1-11	3	NA	No	No	NA	No	No	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	NA	4	6	4	0	12	Yes	274	183	162	345	345	1	21	115.0	7.0	16.4	MoE	PEO CC	34,550	
	Kilinochchi	19	6	Muruganantha Primary Vidyalayam	2	1-5	5	NA	No	No	NA	No	No	5	1	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	NA	2	6	5	0	12	Yes	222	101	117	218	218	-	12	43.6	2.4	18.2	MoE	PEO CC	49,870	
		20		Mudkumban GTMS	2	1-11	5	NA	No	No	NA	No	No	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	NA	2	12	5	0	8	Yes	408	240	210	450	450	1	19	90.0	3.8	23.7	MoE	SDS	27,501	
		21		Karukkattivu MV	2	1-13	5	NA	No	No	NA	No	No	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	NA	1	4	1	0	2	No	169	98	79	177	177	-	20	35.4	4.0	8.9	MoE	SDS	7,742	
		22		Skanthapuram No2 GTMS	2	1-9	5	NA	No	No	NA	No	No	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	NA	1	4	1	0	0	No	165	90	80	170	170	-	8	34.0	1.6	21.3	MoE	SDS	8,900	
		23	9	Kalmadunagar G.T.M.S.	2	1-5	4	NA	No	No	NA	No	No	4	1	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	1	No	1	1	1	0	5	Yes	53	27	25	52	52	0	7	13.0	1.8	7.4	MoE	SDS	11,492	
Totals						247	21	0	9	11	9	10	307	10	5		3	83	40	33	10	25		92	130	138	21	421		9,025	5,607	5,570	11,177	11,910	9	539	48.2	2.2	22.1			7,548,883		
Notes:		* October 2013 figures for schools visited by ET. Figures for other Phase 2 schools as reported by UNICEF in March 2013. Phase 1 schools figures March 2012																																										
		^ Figures from UNICEF Final Report March 2012																																										
		~ USD figures from UNICEF Progress Report March 2013																																										
		PEO CC = Construction Contractor procured by Provincial Education Office, MoE																																										
		UNICEF CC = Construction Contractor procured by UNICEF																																										
		SDS = School Development Society																																										
(1)		Assume planning stage is: for Phase 1 = May 2010 ; for Phase 2 = JPA February 2011																																										
(2)		As at January 2014. Figures provided by UNICEF February 2014.																																										

1.2 Evaluation purpose and questions

On completion of Phase 2 of the Support to the Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka (SESCAANS�), and in accordance with the quality processes of both organisations, DFAT and UNICEF agreed to undertake a joint summative evaluation of both phases of the project.

The evaluation will assess efficiency, effectiveness, lessons learned and relevance of the project. The evaluation will review and analyse what the project has achieved, what has worked, and what did not work and why. This analysis will inform and shape DFAT and UNICEF Sri Lanka current and future programming in the education sector post humanitarian response phase. The evaluation was led by an external consultant with DFAT and UNICEF supporting an impartial and independent process.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to assess:

- i. the extent to which SESCOANS� achieved its objectives
- ii. whether the schools were constructed to meet CFS and other specified requirements
- iii. the quality of the school construction and any maintenance schedules
- iv. the appropriateness of the delivery approach for the context (i.e. the selection of schools, monitoring and engagement of stakeholders)
- v. whether the overall project represents value for money in the re-construction of schools
- vi. whether the project aligns with the policies and strategies of DFAT, UNICEF and GoSL
- vii. lessons learned and recommendations that will inform and shape future programming in the education sector
- viii. whether the project has improved access to education for boys and girls.

1.3 Evaluation scope and methods

In 2011 at the start of the project, the urgency of the need meant that goals, objectives and outcomes were not specified nor was a monitoring and evaluation plan developed and implemented. Usually in bilateral activities, a project design document is prepared, but in this case, the activity was documented through a series of exchanges of documents containing broad education sector needs assessments, rather than project-specific targets.

The evaluation used a desktop study of the program documents that were available to prepare an evaluation plan to formulate key issues to discuss with individuals and groups of stakeholders during field visits.

Following a briefing in Colombo with DFAT and UNICEF on 6 October 2013, the evaluation team proceeded to the North Province from 7–11 October where visits were made to nine of the 23 schools assisted by the program. During the school visits, discussions were held with staff, students, parents and members of the School Development Society. Field notes from the visits to the schools are provided at Annex D. Key provincial, district and zonal education officials were also interviewed. A list of persons met is provided at Annex C. On return to Colombo, interviews were held with the Ministry of Education and a consultant and contractor involved in the schools reconstruction, as well as with SDC who is involved in school reconstruction in North Province. The questions which provided the basis for discussions with stakeholders are set out in Table 3 of the Evaluation Plan at Annex E. More detailed lists of questions for assessing the construction aspects and for use in the school level discussions are provided in the annexes to the Evaluation Plan (Annex 2: Draft of Construction Related Information to be Collected and Annex 3: Areas to be discussed with Community Level Stakeholders). Information collected during the discussions with stakeholders at the schools is summarised in Annex D: Evaluation Field Notes from Visits to Schools.

In the time available, it was only possible to visit nine of the 23 constructed schools and effort was made to ensure that the sample was representative. The visits included one of the three schools constructed under Phase 1, and eight of the 21 schools constructed under Phase 2. Approximately half each were from the two focus districts, Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu.

UNICEF utilised three modes of implementation for the construction and rehabilitation works of the 23 schools. Firstly, the 13 schools requiring major construction works (i.e. works valued at over USD50,000) were implemented using a construction contractor (CC) with a separately hired design and supervision consultant (DSC). Both the DSC and the CC were contracted to UNICEF and procured by UNICEF under open tender processes. The 13 schools were divided into packages split between four construction contractors and two design and supervision consultants.

Secondly, six of the 10 minor construction and rehabilitation works (i.e. less than USD50,000) were implemented by a local construction contractor procured under an open tender process following MoE procedures administered by the Provincial Education Office (PEO). Thirdly, the rehabilitation of the remaining four schools was undertaken by the School Development Society (SDS), with funding provided to the school via block grant from UNICEF. No separate design and supervision consultants were hired as the minor works involved the rehabilitation of existing buildings with any new classrooms following the MoE standard designs. Supervision of the works was by the Zonal Education Office technical staff, supported by UNICEF field office engineers.

The aim of the field visit program was to visit examples of all three implementation modes to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the various approaches. Table 1.2 shows a summary of schools assisted under the project, together with those that were visited as part of the evaluation.

Table 1.2: Summary of schools assisted and visited

Type of assistance	Mode of implementation	Monitoring	Kilinochchi district	Mullaitivu district	Total	Total Visited
Major Construction – (greater than USD 50,000)	Design Consultant & Construction Contractor - Procured by UNICEF	Consultant + UNICEF + Zonal Educ. Office (ZEO)	3 + 5 = 8	5	13	
Visited			1 + 1	4		6
Minor Construction (less than USD 50,000)	Construction - Contractor Procured by Prov.Ed.Off.	ZEO + UNICEF	1	5	6	
Visited			1	1		2
Rehabilitation (less than USD 50,000)	School Development Society (SDS)	ZEO + UNICEF	4	-	4	
Visited			1			1
Total Schools in Districts			13	10	23	
Total Schools Visited			4	5		9 (39%)

For the major works, six of the 13 sites were visited which covered examples of the work of both DSC consultants and all four of the CC, allowing for any differences in construction quality, supervision and monitoring and contractor management issues to be observed.

For the minor rehabilitation works, two of the six schools rehabilitated by the PEO-contracted CC were visited (one in each district). For the SDS minor works, one school was visited.

In Kilinochichi District, a total of four schools were inspected - two with major construction works undertaken by CCs, one of which was from Phase 1; and two schools with minor construction works, one implemented by a local construction contractor procured by the PEO, and the second implemented by the SDS.

In Mullaitivu District, a total of five schools were inspected - four with major construction works undertaken by two construction contractors. Three of the schools constructed by the same contractor had been the subject of a complaint letter regarding construction quality, and UNICEF and DFAT requested that the fieldwork program include a visit to these schools. The fifth school visited involved minor construction works implemented by a local construction contractor procured by the PEO.

As construction of all the schools was completed at the time of the visit, the assessment of the quality of construction can inevitably only be superficial, limited to a visual inspection of accessible areas. Consequently, maximum use had to be made of available construction documentation (records, reports and photographs) to form a judgement as to whether the buildings were constructed to an acceptable quality standard and in accordance with the approved drawings and specification.

Some schools were still within the contracted six months Defects Liability Period (DLP) and minor construction defects and some outstanding works e.g. landscaping and site drainage, still had to be completed. Any such items observed by the Evaluation Team Leader as needing attention were conveyed to the UNICEF field engineers who accompanied the team leader, for follow-up action.

2.0 Evaluation findings

DFAT has adopted a series of questions for this evaluation based on the DAC evaluation framework. The team has provided ratings to the six evaluation areas guided by the questions outlined below and in the Terms of Reference (TOR: Annex F). The six areas are: relevance; effectiveness; sustainability; efficiency; sustainability; gender equality; and lasting outcomes.

Lasting outcomes was listed as a lower priority in the TOR and only to be assessed if adequate information was available. This information was not available so this area has not been assessed. Lessons learned from the project approach and delivery are discussed, with relevance to this specific project and also in the Conclusion, with implications for broader programming.

2.1 Relevance

Rating: 5 / 6

This evaluation criteria aims to determine whether the project is contributing to the higher level objectives of the aid program and the GoSL. Relevance has been rated at the second highest level – 5 out of 6 points – as school construction was very relevant at the outset of the project to address the infrastructure backlog. The Terms of Reference asked two specific questions.

- (i) *Does the project align with the policies and strategies of DFAT, GoSL and UNICEF?*
- (ii) *Has the project been responsive to changes in the priorities of DFAT, UNICEF, and the GoSL to maintain its relevance over the Program life?*

The reconstruction of schools is an essential part of restoring basic services in areas where people have been displaced, and ensuring the success and sustainability of the returnee process. Discussions with community members during the school visits support the findings of surveys by various international organisations which indicate that restoring educational facilities is a critical

priority for families. Schools help restore the community to a sense of normalcy after decades of multiple displacement and help reduce the trauma of children.

The initial support provided in Phase 1 included Temporary Learning Spaces (TLS) in the school grounds, which allow the establishment of class teaching while the permanent classrooms are being reconstructed. The provision of the TLS was often mentioned in discussions with staff as an important means of restoring normalcy to the learning patterns of the children and was strongly recommended as a lesson learned in similar situations. In some schools, the TLS have been retained after the permanent classrooms have been completed and are being used for other purposes, such as bicycle shelters.

(i) Does the project align with the policies and strategies of DFAT, GoSL and UNICEF?

The support for permanent school construction is in line with priorities of the Ministry of Education (MoE) and broader objectives of the Government of Sri Lanka for the recovery of the north. It is a part of UNICEF's wider integrated support program for the return and resettlement of conflict-affected children and their families in the Northern Province. Education is one of DFAT's flagship sectors globally and, therefore, the project aligned well with the Australian Government's global objectives.

In the Sri Lankan context, the SESCOANS� activity was also in line with the Australian Government's strategy to support the stabilisation and recovery of conflict-affected communities in the north of the country. It complemented other wider DFAT-funded programs implemented through UNICEF (e.g. nutrition, water and sanitation) and other programs such as the Basic Education Support Program (BESP) which supported implementation of the child friendly approach in the North, East, Central and Uva provinces. These programs formed part of Australia's accelerated aid program to support reconstruction of northern communities. The three separate funding allocations to UNICEF provided comprehensive education sector support in humanitarian context.

Australia's humanitarian support to the education sector was complemented by non-humanitarian support in 2012 through co-financing of the World Bank's Transforming School Education Program (TSEP) until 2016. DFAT funding in TSEP supports the government's sector plan across primary and secondary grades, nationwide. In 2013, DFAT also continued support to implementing the child friendly approach in Northern and Eastern Provinces through UNICEF.

While the SESCOANS� program was highly relevant to meet an urgent need, DFAT's Sri Lanka Country Strategy is now moving on from humanitarian programming towards more longer-term development programming. This evaluation will inform and shape DFAT's and UNICEF Sri Lanka's education sector programming, as well as any future humanitarian support situations requiring school construction and rehabilitation.

(ii) Has the project been responsive to changes in the priorities of DFAT, UNICEF, and the GoSL to maintain its relevance over the program life?

The project was part of a humanitarian response to support post-conflict recovery in the Northern Province during a time of large internal migration that continues today as infrastructure reconstruction proceeds and livelihoods improve. The pace and extent of this migration is not predictable and affected by factors outside the control of the education sector planners. Usable quantitative data at the targeted schools is limited to total student and teacher participation before displacement and it is not known to what extent pre-displacement numbers will be re-established. In addition, in some cases, schools have been relocated away from potential tsunami wave impact zones in response to recent policy priorities of both the GoSL and DFAT. This adds further complexity to school infrastructure planning and investment decision-making.

The SESCOANSI project reacted to the fluid planning situation via a two-phase implementation approach. Phase 1 was an initial and immediate response and focused on a small number of low-risk, high-priority large district schools with known significant permanent capacity constraints. Phase 2, which followed a year later, had the benefit of better population data and further planning and priority setting by the provincial, district and zonal education offices. Based on this information, the scope of Phase 2 was broadened, expanding assistance to a further 20 schools across two districts. The schools ranged in size from four to 24 classrooms. Other modes of assistance were also utilised in Phase 2, depending on the size and complexity of the rehabilitation task, including the use of School Development Societies and local construction contractors procured by the Provincial Education Office.

The project has been responsive to changes, adapting and broadening to maintain its relevance.

2.2 Effectiveness

Rating: 3.5 / 6

This evaluation criteria aims to determine whether the project is on track to achieve its objectives. Effectiveness has been rated just below 'adequate quality' at 3.5 out of 6 points. Construction and rehabilitation of all 23 schools has been completed – all schools are operational, with 11,910 students enrolled and 539 teachers. Stakeholder engagement throughout the reconstruction process was strong and effective, according to the overall feedback. Students and teachers have been very positive about their new classrooms and school buildings.

Disaster risk reduction measures were included in the design. However, it is difficult to evaluate if the project met its objectives, as the objectives were poorly defined at the outset. School construction did not fully meet the requirements of Child Friendly Schools (CFS), particularly in terms of disability inclusion. The Terms of Reference asked the following question:

(i) Were the schools constructed to meet the CFS requirements?

with the following sub-questions:

(ii) Whether the school management committee was involved in, and influenced, the selection of schools, design of the school, and supervision during the construction process?

(iii) Were Disaster Risk Reduction measures and disability inclusion considered in the schools construction design?

(iv) Were gender differences considered in the school design and were men and women (boys and girls) included in decision-making processes?

(v) To what level did men and women (boys and girls) participate in the decision-making around school selection, design, and construction?

(i) Were the schools constructed to meet the CFS requirements? To what extent has SESCOANSI achieved its objectives?

It is difficult to assess the extent to which the project has met its objectives, as the objectives were stated in vague terms. The initiative was an urgent humanitarian response, with no project design document (PDD) prepared- this was justified on the basis of the urgency of the need. Phase 1 funding was based on general support for the UNICEF: Northern Province Education Funding Proposal 2010–2012. The scope was not clearly defined and outlined in a single page as a “package of interventions”, listing areas such as: “repair/rehabilitation of 100 schools... through the Construction of 100 Temporary Learning Structures; Repair/rehab of schools ..; teacher accommodation; teaching & learning kits, etc”.

The DFAT: Quality At Implementation Report (QAI) 2010 stated “reconstruction, repair, 5 schools” but the 2012 QAI reported that the “Number of schools has been reduced to 3” without a written explanation provided. UNICEF advised the evaluation team that the reduction was a result of, the other two schools were supported by the Government. During the early period of rehabilitation in 2010/2011, school lists were shared to many donors by the provincial department of education to get early and maximum assistance. The provincial department of education got approval from the government for rehabilitation. Therefore, during completion of the first two schools, UNICEF and DFAT agreed to take the third bigger school and more expensive school (Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam). UNICEF advised the ET that an email chain of correspondence exists with DFAT agreeing to the change in scope.

The scope of Phase 2 was based on DFAT Contribution Agreement No 59321 for AUD5 million. It included a one-page attachment, stating: “construction /rehabilitation of 30 schools; Supply of furniture for 10,000 children; stationery for 100,000 students, etc”. The final output of Phase 2 was just 20 schools. UNICEF advised this number came from discussions with the education planning staff in the two districts to determine the highest priority schools which could be funded from the available budget and that there is a chain of email correspondence with DFAT which clarifies when the number of schools changed at different points in time. UNICEF maintains that in a constantly changing environment of post conflict return, discussion with education planning staff to determine highest priority schools was a flexibility of the project that contributed to its relevance and impact.

It was pointed out by UNICEF to the Evaluation Team that the two documents it submitted to DFAT (i) Northern Proposal 2010 – 2012 which gives detailed information; (ii) Joint Plan of Action (JPA) 2011 (a one page document) upon which the funding was agreed should be considered a plan rather than a proposal. The context was post conflict where UNICEF received funds against an emergency appeal process which documents (i) and (ii) formed part of. It is both common practice for UN agencies to receive money this way and for donors to give funds in this way in situations of emergency, cutting out the time that would be required to develop a full proposal, which under normal circumstances can take a full fiscal year. A full proposal was not requested by DFAT or other donors funding UNICEF emergency and post emergency work in the north in 2010 and 2011. As UNICEF moved towards regular programming this changed. UNICEF reported that email correspondence from 2011 (not viewed by the ET) indicates that DFAT funding was defined in tranches as funding became available and the size and scope of the project did change as DFAT sought to provide funds. Consequently the scope of the project was to some extent defined by the changing funding availability and partly by the context and means by which UNICEF solicited and received contributions through emergency appeals.

In total, 23 schools were reconstructed or rehabilitated in Phases 1 and 2 for a total DFAT contribution of AUD10.1 million. As of October 2013, all of the schools have been rehabilitated and handed over, with the major construction schools still within the defects liability period.

In terms of meeting the CFS requirements, not all schools achieved this aim. Schools with minor-reconstruction were built back to their original MoE design, which did not satisfy the CFS disability requirements, particularly in terms of ramps. For the project-designed larger construction schools, disability access was met in terms of ramps, but only 10 of the 13 schools (77%) have disabled toilets which are a CFS requirement. This is discussed further in the following sections.

The objectives were multiple and vaguely framed. The project achieved the sub-set of objectives relating to school rehabilitation and reconstruction.

(ii) Whether the school management committee was involved in, and influenced, the selection of schools, design of the school, and supervision during construction process?

The School Development Society (SDS) is an established part of the school governance arrangement in Sri Lanka. It plays an active role in the ongoing operations and maintenance of the school. In all schools visited by the evaluation team, the SDS, representing parents and staff, was actively involved in discussions about the provision and rehabilitation of the school buildings. For four of the schools, the SDS directly managed the rehabilitation of existing buildings with supervision by the Zonal Education Office technical staff, supported by UNICEF field office engineers.

The functional design of government-managed schools in Sri Lanka must be in accordance with Ministry of Education's Guidelines, which provide standards and regulations on classroom sizes, window and door sizes, etc. Hence, only certain aspects of the design can be influenced by the SDS and the school staff. These aspects included the location and orientation of the buildings on the school grounds; some choice in the overall form/style of the building design; some choice – with teaching staff – on the provision of activity⁴ rooms versus classrooms; furniture design options; blackboard sizes and heights; choices of internal and external paint colours; and landscaping.

Input into the designs was solicited by the design and supervision consultant (DSC) architects during initial visits to the schools. Meetings were held with the principals, staff and SDS members who would then share the information with their cohorts and provide feedback as required. The designs by the two contracted consultants were different from each other, and also different from the MoE standard design. The main differences from the MoE design were larger windows to improve natural light and ventilation in the classrooms, and ramps for disabled access to the ground floor areas. The dimensions of rooms and circulation spaces (verandas, stairs, etc) generally followed the MoE standards. The two consultant designs had marginal differences, mainly relating to architectural treatments of columns and downpipes, and the use of metal screens or glass in windows.

MoE planners determined the number of classrooms and other facilities to be provided at each school, based on the current availability of classrooms at the school, the projected student population, and the available budget.

For the 13 project schools involving major⁵ construction, UNICEF first worked extensively with the District and Zonal Education Offices, school principals and the SDS to scope the facilities required at each school. UNICEF contracted a design and supervision consultant (DSC) to undertake the detailed design of the facilities and to supervise the construction. The designs were prepared by the DSC architects based on a UNICEF briefing, which was determined in consultation with the MoE and DFAT based on provincial priorities and the available budget. Construction was undertaken by a national construction contractor (NCC), procured by UNICEF by open tender. The standard contract arrangements involve the MoE/school handing over the construction site for the duration, with the contractor responsible for the security and safety of the site, and only authorised persons allowed to enter the site. The SDS and school staff were kept informed of construction progress through regular briefings.

It was reported that there were generally good relations between the NCC and the school staff and the SDS, with regular communication and areas for construction access and materials storage agreed and cordoned off. There were no reports of any accidents or safety issues affecting the students and staff. At one school, communications problems were reported between the Tamil-speaking school

⁴ Activity rooms include: libraries; computer laboratories; general activity room; agriculture room; home science laboratory; music room; and staff room for education access.

⁵ Defined by UNICEF in this context as construction valued at more than USD50,000.

staff and the Sinhalese-speaking NCC from Colombo but the Zonal Education Office technical officer and the UNICEF field office engineers successfully acted as intermediaries.

Depending on the scale and complexity of the minor construction works, two methods of implementation were used. UNICEF and the Zonal Education Office technical officer (ZEO TO) would meet with the SDS to ascertain their willingness and capacity to undertake the works under a block grant agreement. In four schools, the SDS agreed to undertake the works themselves using community labour with technical support from the ZEO TO and UNICEF field office engineers (FOE).

In the remaining six minor-construction schools, the SDS advised that it did not have the capacity to undertake the works. The ZEO arranged for the Provincial Education Office to procure, by open tender, a local construction contractor to undertake the works. Monitoring of construction was by the ZEO TO and UNICEF FOE, with informal monitoring support provided by the SDS.

The school management committee (SDS) did not directly influence the selection of the schools which was done by the MoE at the Provincial and National level. The SDS had some involvement and influence in the design of the major construction schools via consultations arranged by the DSC architects during the design phase. The SDS had little formal involvement in the supervision of the major construction schools as the DSC had been contracted by UNICEF to provide this specialised service. The SDS were more actively involved in the design and supervision of the minor works, particularly the four schools where the SDS actually managed the rehabilitation themselves.

(iii) Were Disaster Risk Reduction measures and disability inclusion considered in the schools construction design?

The project schools are exposed to two unusual hazards: tsunami and unexploded ordnance (UXO). The evaluation team was advised that all school sites had been cleared of UXOs before re-opening after the conflict. Provided the current Sri Lankan building code requirements are properly incorporated into the design and construction, other environmental hazards from climate change are expected to be satisfactorily addressed. The evaluation team is confident that the 13 major-construction schools are in line with the Sri Lankan building codes and regulations, and DFAT Disaster Risk Reduction requirements.

However, such confidence is not shared with the 10 minor construction schools. While the MoE standard designs are considered compliant with Disaster Risk Reduction guidelines, these schools do not have the quality assurance documentation to show that they have been re-constructed in accordance with the MoE designs due to the weak monitoring arrangements. UNICEF was managing the funds for major and minor school rehabilitation on behalf of DFAT. As such DFAT would expect that UNICEF establish an appropriate construction monitoring system to assure DFAT, through appropriate inspections, testing and documentary/photographic evidence that the funds were used for their intended purpose and that the schools, both minor and major constructions, were constructed in accordance with the approved design and were safe.

All but one of the schools visited by the team have been reconstructed on the site of the pre-conflict school. Kallapadu GTMS was relocated one kilometre inland from its original location to reduce the risk of future tsunami damage. It was reported that 65 of the school's students were killed during the 2004 tsunami. The new location will also protect the school from any potential storm surge effects. However, children now have further to travel to school and this is having a detrimental impact on the enrolments, as discussed later.

At three of the major-construction schools visited, staff and parents reported flooding of the grounds after heavy rain but floodwater did not enter the classrooms. Floor levels have been constructed above known flood heights. Due to the generally flat and low terrain throughout the Northern Province, measures to prevent the grounds flooding are likely to be prohibitively expensive.

All the major-construction schools have been fitted with ramps for wheelchair access. In some schools, the landscaping had not been completed and there were large steps from the ground to the ramp. Such instances were pointed out to the UNICEF FOE for rectification by the contractor during the defects liability period. Disabled toilets had been constructed in only two of the six DSC-designed schools visited. These two schools each had separate disabled toilets for females and males, all with accessible water supply and privacy.

For the 10 schools involving minor⁶ construction only, work was done according to the existing standard MoE classroom designs. No changes have been made to these MoE standard designs to align them with disability inclusive design or CFS requirements (such as ramps for disabled access). Doors were generally wide enough for wheelchairs but often there were 50mm to 100mm steps from the verandas into the classrooms. Hand-washing facilities were provided in only one of the two MoE-designed schools visited.

All 13 major construction schools comply with DRR design requirements. Ten minor construction schools are based on existing MoE design standards and comply with DRR provisions to the extent that the existing MoE standards do. All major construction schools have been fitted with ramps for wheelchair access but only two of the six schools visited had toilets for the disabled. Minor construction schools were not fitted with ramps or toilets for the disabled.

(iv) Were gender differences considered in the school design and were men and women (boys and girls) included in decision-making processes?

(v) To what level did men and women (boys and girls) participate in the decision-making around school selection, design, and construction?

In all schools visited, the SDS, principals and staff had played an active role in decision-making surrounding the design and construction of the schools. This was a conscious decision by the MoE and UNICEF to build ownership and hence sustainability of the new schools. Women are represented on all of the SDS, and in most schools, female teacher's out-number males.

In some of the major-construction schools, student opinion was canvassed about the layout of the school on the site and the orientation of the classrooms, as well as paint colour schemes. In two schools visited, school feedback from staff and students resulted in design changes: (1) the relocation of one of the classroom blocks to preserve and integrate part of the original 1934 school building into the facilities; and (2) the building was rotated 180 degrees so that the first floor veranda could be used by students to view the playing field. In all cases, the school community selected the colour scheme.

The main gender-related facilities provided were separate toilet blocks for males and females (students and teachers). The cubicles were identical except that often urinals would be substituted for a cubicle in the male toilets. All cubicles had doors for privacy. Hand-washing facilities incorporated taps at different heights to suit children of different ages.

⁶ Defined by UNICEF in this context as construction valued at less than USD50,000.

In the schools where toilets were provided separate toilet blocks were provided for males and females. Hand-washing facilities, where provided, have taps placed at different heights to facilitate use by students of different ages. Female and male committee members, staff and students were consulted in the design of all schools.

2.3 Efficiency

Rating: 3.5 / 6

This evaluation criteria aims to determine whether the project is being managed to get the most out of the input of funds, staff and other resources. Efficiency has been rated ‘less than adequate quality’ at 3.5 out of 6 points. The project was completed on time, with value for money demonstrated for the majority of schools. However, there were quality and procurement risks with six minor-construction schools and structural defects on major and minor construction schools (the latter can be fixed). Value for money could not be demonstrated for the 27.5% of non-construction related grant funds. The selection of some schools was not the ‘best fit’ due to over- and under-investment at some schools.

The Terms of Reference asked the following questions related to efficiency.

- (i) Did the overall project represent value for money in the construction of schools?*
- (ii) To what extent was the bidding and procurement processes undertaken in an efficient and transparent manner, representing value for money?*
- (iii) Was the delivery approach, including the selection of schools, monitoring and engagement of stakeholders, including school management committees the ‘best fit’ for the context?*
- (iv) Was the project completed on time/on schedule and was there sufficient capacity of GoSL, UNICEF and DFAT to address major issues/challenges that arose during the duration of the project?*

(i) Did the overall project represent value for money in the construction of schools?

The assessment of value for money can be approached in two ways, at the macro overall project level, or at the micro individual activity level. At the macro level, value for money could be demonstrated due to the lack of accountability of the 27.5% of the grant funds which could not be directly attributed to the design, construction or supervision of the 23 project schools. At the micro level, a number of the delivery approaches represented value for money.

The main output of the project is the reconstruction of the 23 schools, and this represents only USD7,327,198 or 72.5% of the total DFAT grant to UNICEF of USD10.1 million (refer Table A4). It is not clear from the three UNICEF Financial Reports which were provided after the ET left the country, or the other project documentation provided what the remaining 27.5% of the budget was spent on, other than the project management of the school reconstruction. As stated above, there was not a clear scope of services for the funding of UNICEF for either Phase 1 or 2. In the proposals, UNICEF suggested DFAT could contribute to a whole range of potential activities but no specific details were provided (see Annex E: Evaluation Plan). Analysis of UNICEF financial acquittal reports (Table A4, Annex A) does not show any other specific outputs for the balance of the funding - USD2,772,802 (27.5%).

Analysis of a comparable DFAT infrastructure project in Indonesia using a private sector project manager performing a similar role to UNICEF, suggests that UNICEF’s project management costs for SESCOANSI, if assumed to be the entire USD 2,772,802 (ie total non (CC plus DSC) costs) are high when measured against the construction costs. Table A5 in Annex A indicates that normal project management costs are less than 10% of the construction cost. For SESCOANSI, UNICEF’s effective project management costs (headquarters plus country office) are 40% of construction costs - nearly USD2.0 million more than would be expected to be paid to a private sector project manager. Unless the expenditure of the USD2.0 million can be linked to specific outputs in the agreements, it must be concluded that the use of UNICEF as a project manager for SESCOANSI did not represent value for

money. However, some discount for expediency on the basis of urgency may be appropriate in the choice of UNICEF, as the process of scoping and tendering for a private sector project manager can take up to six months.

The assessment of value for money at the micro (individual activity or school level) offers better analysis. For infrastructure projects, open competitive tendering is considered a key indicator, of achieving value for money for construction, as it should provide the lowest price available in the market for the required services. In this project, 13 of the 23 schools were constructed by one of five construction contractors selected by two open competitive tender processes managed by UNICEF. One tender was arranged for the three Phase 1 schools and a second tendering process was undertaken for the 10 remaining schools in Phase 2. The schools were packaged into six construction packages containing two or three schools in close proximity to each other.

Design of the schools and supervision of the construction contractors (DSC) was sub-contracted out, and also subject to two separate tendering processes managed by UNICEF. In this case, the field was much narrower with contracts being awarded to only two firms. One firm was awarded all three schools reconstructed in Phase 1, and was separately awarded five schools in Phase 2. The second contractor was also awarded five schools in Phase 2.

Discussions with the UNICEF Procurement officer, as well as observation of the procurement documentation, suggested that the procurement process used by UNICEF followed international good practice.

In addition to open tendering, other necessary conditions for value for money include design is optimum, cost effective and fit-for-purpose. One must also consider life-cycle costs in making the assessment. Minimum construction cost may not produce the minimum maintenance costs and hence the minimum life-cycle costing.

To represent value-for-money, the design of the buildings needs to be efficient, fit-for-purpose and make optimum use of space and materials. In reviewing the new designs for the buildings and classrooms, the MoE design guidelines have been met and improved upon in most situations. The new designs generally have larger windows which improve natural light and ventilation. Feedback from teachers and students indicated that new designs were preferred – they were lighter, cooler and provided an improved teaching environment.

Although the focus of the project funding was on the rehabilitation or construction of the buildings to provide safe and pleasant teaching spaces which included the provision of basic furniture (tables and chairs for teachers and students in the classrooms), no equipment was provided for laboratories or other specialised instructional rooms. Feedback received from teaching staff was a request that basic equipment be provided for the laboratories to enable them to be immediately used for their intended purpose.

Six of the minor-construction schools were separately managed by the Northern Province education authorities. The works included rehabilitation of classrooms or construction of one or two new classrooms. The Zonal Education Office, supported by the District Education Office, prepared the design for the works based on MoE standards. The ZEO technical officer was responsible for construction monitoring, oversighted by the UNICEF field office engineers. The Provincial Education Office was responsible for the procurement of the local construction contractors, using the GoSL procurement systems.

It was not possible to review the provincial application of the GoSL procurement processes during the evaluation visit and UNICEF advised that it was not in its scope to conduct due diligence on GoSL systems. Therefore, it must be assumed that the government systems resulted in the lowest market price for the works contracted and, consequently, provided value for money. Prima facie, the

contracted school works did appear to demonstrate good value for money in terms of the number of constructed/rehabilitated rooms for the budget, provided that the quality of construction is in accordance with the design. However, given the poor quality assurance systems in place for these works, it cannot be assumed they were necessarily constructed in accordance with the design.

One example which suggests value for money based on minimum construction costs is Muruganantha Primary school, where one administration room and five new classrooms were constructed for a budget of LKR 6,463,111 (USD49,870). However, the failure to adequately monitor the construction and provide independent evidence that the building is constructed in accordance with the design means that construction quality is unknown and as such doesn't represent value for money. Construction included a concrete stair to the first floor where provision has been made to add a further five classrooms when funds become available. While the MoE standard design drawings for a two-storey classroom block were used, almost no construction quality assurance documentation was collected to demonstrate that the building conformed with the design. No testing of materials was undertaken and no quality checklists or site books maintained. Although the school was not showing any signs of distress at the time of the visit, significant non-destructive testing and structural analysis of the building will be required for safety and quality issues before the second floor can be constructed.

For the four minor-rehabilitation schools managed by the SDS, the scope of the works and amount of the grant were determined by the ZEO TO in consultation with the SDS. The ZEO TO provided technical support and monitored the works. All work involved rehabilitation of existing MoE standard school designs. Ad hoc monitoring was also provided by the UNICEF FOE engineers. The minor rehabilitation works are regarded as providing good value for money, given that the estimates for the works are based on local market prices and no management fees were paid. The one example of this mode of rehabilitation visited, Kalmadunagar GTMS, supported this assessment.

In terms of the school building the 13 major construction schools and four SDS built minor construction schools represent value for money when assessed against standard criteria. The six locally constructed can't be assessed as the quality of the construction is unknown and consequently value for money can't be assessed. Overall more than 20% of the funds paid to UNICEF by DFAT cannot be directly attributed to the the school construction based on the documentation provided to the evaluation team and hence overall project value for money cannot be assessed.

(ii) To what extent was the bidding and procurement processes undertaken in an efficient and transparent manner, representing value for money?

Overall, the bidding and procurement processes appear to be undertaken in an efficient and transparent manner. Three different processes were in place, dependent on the size/cost of the construction. UNICEF directly managed the major construction using UNICEF systems and international practice. The Provincial Education Office (POE) managed the minor construction and followed GoSL processes. However, as noted above, there was no independent monitoring of the POE procurement, although the processes appeared appropriate.

Based on the financial information provided by UNICEF, about 72% of the project grant funding was subject to a competitive bidding process for the selection of DSC and CC for physical rehabilitation works. Table 2.1 shows the three different procurement and construction processes. UNICEF used its own contract agreements for the major construction. For the minor construction, the POE used a standard bidding and contract document, prepared by the Ministry of Construction, Engineering Services, Housing and Common Amenities, with added special conditions. These documents are considered appropriate for the type and scale of services and works contracted. As noted above, the four SDS-managed schools were provided with a grant.

Table 2.1: Procurement and construction processes for the schools

Type of assistance	No. of schools	Mode of implementation	Tenders	Monitoring
Major Construction – (greater than USD 50,000)	13 (Design consultant)	Design Consultant & Construction Contractor - Procured by UNICEF using UNICEF systems	Four open competitive processes	Consultant + UNICEF + ZEO
Minor Construction (less than USD 50,000)	6 (MoE standard design)	Construction Contractor - Procured by Prov.Ed.Off. using GoSL systems	GoSL processes	ZEO + UNICEF
Rehabilitation (less than USD 50,000)	4	School Development Society (SDS)		ZEO + UNICEF

Overall, the bidding and procurement processes managed by UNICEF for the 13 major construction schools appear to be undertaken in an efficient and transparent manner. The six minor construction contracts procured by open competitive bidding managed by the Provincial Education Office (POE) followed GoSL processes which appear appropriate, but there was no independent monitoring of the process by UNICEF.

(iii) Was the delivery approach, including the selection of schools, monitoring and engagement of stakeholders, including school management committees, the ‘best fit’ for the context?

The decision to support the Phase 1 proposal from UNICEF for the school reconstruction activities in North Province was an appropriate decision at a time of urgency to support the GoSL with the resettlement of returnees to their homes. UNICEF had been working in the province for some time, including in the education sector and with the Ministry of Education. UNICEF also had a field office in the province.

Despite the success of Phase 1, the support for UNICEF for Phase 2 is more problematic. The one-year duration between Phases 1 and 2 could have been used to better define the Phase 2 scope of works. If this had been done, DFAT could have considered its delivery options such as other specialist UN organisations (e.g. UNOPS), other INGOs or a managing contractor.

Notwithstanding the above, the delivery approach utilised by UNICEF, of competitive bidding processes for 19 of the 23 schools, is considered to have delivered the minimum construction costs, and is in line with the approach of other project managers. What is not clear is the ultimate cost of UNICEF project management. UNICEF headquarters administrative costs are stated as 6% (USD575,121.73) of the total grant values of USD10.1 million. Construction supervision was included in the DSC costs for the 13 major-construction schools, and the Zonal Education Office was responsible for the supervision of the minor-construction schools. It is acknowledged that UNICEF FOE monitored the work of all 23 schools. However, UNICEF financial records do not show what percentage of the 27.5% non-bid works are related to the management of the 23 schools and, hence, the total costs of UNICEF’s (headquarters and in-country) project management fees.

A clear advantage of continuing with UNICEF was its strong linkages with the education sector in the province. UNICEF staff had worked with MoE staff in the province on the blueprint⁷ for the school reconstruction, and with provincial, district, and zonal ministry staff, school principals and staff, and SDS members in preparing the rehabilitation plans. In terms of the engagement of stakeholders, the decision to use UNICEF is regarded as “best fit”.

⁷ Joint Plan for Assistance (JPA) for the Northern Province – 2011.

In terms of selection of schools, data provided to the evaluation team suggests that the numbers of planned students versus actual students have varied widely. This is despite UNICEF's in-depth experience in the planning stage and the first-hand knowledge of many of the schools funded by DFAT. The variance in student numbers has impacted on the robustness of subsequent investment decisions at some of the schools.

The Joint Plan for Assistance (JPA) for the Northern Province listed students enrolled in February 2011, with a five-year forecast to February 2016. In the schools visited by the evaluation team, the change in student enrolments had been extremely variable, with five showing a decrease in numbers and four showing an increase. Table A3 in Annex A sets out the classroom and student data for the nine schools visited. The baseline student numbers used for planning were from the JPA report at February 2011. In the nine schools visited, the JPA five-year forecast was a 53% increase. The actual average increase over the 2 years 8 months from February 2011 has been 14% which is below the forecast rate.

The slower-than-planned increase has potential ramifications for the investment in new classrooms. The MoE Guidelines⁸ recommend 30 students per classroom in Primary Schools (Grades 1 to 5) and 35 students per classroom for Secondary Schools (Grades 6 to 11/Grades 12/13). As shown in Table A3, at three schools, the current student/classroom ratio (SCR) is less than 20, and even if the expected five-year student enrolment targets are achieved, the ratio will still be only between 25 to 29, suggesting a possible over-investment in classroom construction. Two of the schools are small rural primary schools and, in one case (Murripu GTMS), the investment in an additional classroom is supported, despite the low SCR, as it will eliminate multi-grade teaching at the school.

Data provided by UNICEF and summarised in Table 1.1 suggests over-capacity issues at two schools not visited: Gnamimadam GTMS, where nine classrooms were constructed, has only 62 students with a SCR of 8.6; and Kallaru Tamil Vidyalam, where 11 classrooms were constructed, has a SCR of 19.5 but only 8 teachers.

At Kallapadu GTMS⁹ where 16 new classrooms have been provided, the current student enrolment is 186, with the SCR at 11.6. The student enrolment increase predicted in the JPA was 153% over five years but only four additional students have enrolled – a 2.2% increase in the last 2.67 years. Even if the 153% increase is achieved by 2016, the SCR will be 28.8 which is still about 10% below the recommended levels for a school with Grades 1-9. This suggests that the optimum investment at this school would be 10% less classrooms, i.e. 14 new classrooms instead of 16. The predicted increase at Kallapadu was three times the average (53%) for the eight other schools visited. The school had been relocated one kilometre inland to be out of the tsunami zone (which destroyed the original school), and there was a lake between the new and old locations. The evaluation team was told that former Kallapadu students were going to another project school, Mullaitivu RCTMS, which had been constructed nearby and was closer to the original Kallapadu village. Data provided supports this as Mullaitivu had gained 116 students in the same period, and appears to be almost on track to achieve its target of 540 students – a 94% increase on 2011. The Mullaitivu student/classroom ratio is 43.9 and forecast to rise to 60.0 by 2016, suggesting an under-investment in classrooms at that location.

Five of the schools visited had SCR above 43 after the new classrooms have been completed. This suggests that the provision of classrooms may have been better served by reallocating two classrooms from Kallapadu to one of these other congested schools.

⁸ MoE Guidelines Appendix 5 Norms and Specifications

⁹ GTMS – Government Tamil Mixed School

UNICEF was involved in preparing the estimates for the JPA with the MoE, and was then funded by DFAT to implement the plans. This deep involvement may have led to a critical independent assessment of the needs analysis not being undertaken by UNICEF, which may have exposed some of the problems mentioned above. Such an assessment would have been expected if a third party had implemented the project rather than UNICEF.

In terms of diversity, the selection of schools appears appropriate and “best fit” for the context, covering the full range of schools, including primary, secondary and combined, and with significant mixed student populations of Catholics and Tamils. School locations and sizes vary from 2,200 students in an urban combined school to a small rural school of approximately 70 students.

Based on the above analysis of capacity issues, in terms of the selection of schools the use of UNICEF can only be regarded as an “average fit” given that at least three schools have potential capacity issues.

In terms of (i) the engagement of stakeholders (ii) the diversity of schools selected covering the full range of school types, sizes and locations, and (iii) the delivery approach utilised using competitive bidding processes for 19 of the 23 schools, the decision to use UNICEF is regarded as “best fit”. However given the significant under and over capacity at some of the specific schools selected the use of UNICEF can only be regarded as an “average fit”.

(iv) Was the project completed on time/on schedule and was there sufficient capacity of GoSL, UNICEF and DFAT to address major issues/challenges that arose during the duration of the project?

All schools visited were complete and operational. The major-construction schools had been handed over. Some were still in the six-month defects liability period, wherein any defects identified at the hand-over inspection are required to be rectified by the construction contractor. UNICEF advised that no claims for additional payments above the lump sum contract values were made. However, some contractors were given no-cost contract extensions to complete the works beyond the end of the contracted duration. This is common practice in such construction contracts and the contracts are written to enable such extensions of time.

In terms of addressing issues, monthly meetings were held in Colombo between UNICEF and DFAT where progress was reported and any issues were discussed and resolved. This arrangement is reported as being effective by UNICEF and DFAT. UNICEF also provided an annual progress report covering calendar years.

One issue brought to the attention of the evaluation team was a letter of complaint concerning construction quality issues at three school sites being constructed by the same contractor. The letter was addressed to the Provincial Director of Education, and copied to, inter alia, the Australian High Commissioner, UNICEF, the Minister of Education, and Members of Parliament. As the project had no formal complaints handling system, the complaint was unnecessarily exercising the time of senior staff at the High Commission, DFAT and UNICEF. Had a formal complaints handling system been in place, it is likely that the complaint would have been directed to UNICEF who would have sought the appropriate quality assurance documentation from the contractor and the design and supervision consultant to satisfactorily resolve the matter - a course of action that was ultimately followed.

An essential part of an effective complaints handling system is the erection of a project notice board at the front of the site from the start of construction. The noticeboard, as well as showing project details (scope of the project, start and completion dates and contract values) and the names and contact details of the key players (funding and executing agencies, construction contractor and supervising

engineers) most importantly it shows contact points (telephone, internet, email and post) for lodging complaints concerning the project by school and community members. Complaints would normally be directed to the MoE where they should be logged and a system for handling and investigating the complaints established prior to the commencement of construction. As well as facilitating the management of complaints the notice board will also improve transparency in the use of project funds..

Notice boards containing the critical project information as described above were not used on the project. At one of the major school construction sites visited a notice board was constructed but it only contained the names and logos of AusAID and UNICEF and the names and addresses of the design and supervision consultant and the construction contractor.

The project was completed on schedule and evidence suggests that there was sufficient capacity within GoSL, UNICEF and DFAT to address any major issues that arose during implementation. 2.4 Impact

Note: A rating is not required for assessment of impact.

This evaluation criteria aims to determine whether the initiative has produced positive or negative changes (directly or indirectly, intended or unintended). The degree to which the various aspects of impact can be addressed will vary according to the nature and duration of the activity. Whether impact can be assessed, or the way impact can be assessed will need to be determined by the Independent Evaluation team.

2.5 Sustainability

Rating: 3.5 / 6

This evaluation criteria aims to determine whether the initiative is appropriately addressing sustainability so that the benefits of the activity will continue after funding has ceased, with due account of partner government systems, stakeholder ownership and the phase-out strategy. Sustainability has been rated just below 'adequate quality' at 3.5 out of 6 points. The main concern is the lack of a periodic maintenance budget. The quality of the major-construction schools was satisfactory but there is concern over the minor-construction schools, where the quality cannot be ascertained, as low construction quality generally translates to high maintenance.

The Terms of Reference asked the following questions related to sustainability.

- (i) *What is the quality of the school construction?*
- (ii) *Has the government and/or school management committee developed an operation and maintenance plan for newly rehabilitated/constructed school to indicate the likelihood of long-term sustainable returns on the investment.*
- (iii) *Is there a maintenance schedule and appropriate budget available?*

(i) What is the quality of the school construction?

It is difficult to assess construction quality based on a visual inspection during one brief visit to a school. Some schools have several multi-storey buildings. Inspection was limited by time and to areas which were accessible. Visual inspections can only reveal large-scale quality issues, such as if the overall building or any structural elements are suffering any major distress which may indicate an underlying quality issue, or the general state of completion of the works and finishes.

The assessment must rely on construction quality assurance documentation which is designed to provide hard evidence that the building has been constructed in accordance with the approved design. Both the construction contractor and the design and supervision consultant for the 13 major-construction schools have contractual obligations for project quality plans which detail the material testing that must be undertaken and the records to be maintained for inspection by UNICEF and or DFAT.

Overall, the quality of the six major-construction schools visited was satisfactory. None of the schools was showing any visible signs of distress, although many still required some site works such as ,paths and fences to be completed during the defects liability period. While it was dry during the evaluation team visit, it was apparent at some schools sites that there will be a need for additional permanent surface drainage to direct rainwater away from the buildings which has not been included in the contracted scope of works. All schools had been designed by a DSC with construction then monitored, full-time on-site, by the DSC. This arrangement is common industry practice worldwide. The evaluation team viewed a sample of the construction quality records and they appeared complete and adequate, providing confidence that the schools were constructed in accordance to the design. UNICEF engineers provided an additional level of monitoring of the DSC and CC from their field office in Kilinochichi. Despite the three¹⁰ levels of monitoring, the evaluation team found an important structural roof-column connection detail to be non-conforming with the design drawings in many of the schools. This non-conformance was one of the issues raised in the complaints letter. The UNICEF engineers travelling with the evaluation team were made aware of the non-conformances and undertook to have the problems rectified during the defects liability period.

Quality of the remaining 10 minor-construction schools is more problematic. Works at the four SDS-managed schools were monitored by the Zonal Education Office Technical Officer (ZEO TO) and the UNICEF field office engineers. Inspection of one school indicated that the quality was satisfactory, but the problem with the roof truss to column connection was also evident. No documentation was available to validate the quality of the works, although this is not unexpected for the small scale of the works involved.

DFAT policy on the non-use of Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) appears to have been complied with at the 13 schools as quality assurance records provided evidence that the material used was asbestos free.

The remaining six minor-construction schools were constructed by local construction contractors and monitored by the ZEO TO and the District Education Office engineer, as well ad hoc visits from the UNICEF field office engineers. The evaluation team visited two of these schools. At Murippu GTMS, an additional new classroom was added to four existing rehabilitated classrooms. As a MoE standard classroom design, it does not meet the Child Friendly School criteria (e.g. no provision for ramps for disabled access and several steps to be negotiated). The new classroom displayed no signs of distress and overall the construction quality appeared satisfactory, except that the roof-column connection was non-conforming and required rectification. Little construction quality documentation was available at the school or from the monitoring ZEO TO.

As noted above, construction quality is of major concern at the Muruganantha Primary school where a concrete stair has been built to the first floor for a further five classrooms in the future. Discussions with the ZOE TO and the contractor found that almost no construction quality assurance documentation was collected to demonstrate that the building conformed with the design. Although the school was not showing any signs of distress, the building quality is unknown and significant non-

¹⁰ Zonal Education Office, Technical Officers and District Education Office Engineers also visited the school sites from time to time during construction.

destructive testing and structural analysis will be required before the second floor construction can be contemplated.

The quality of the major-construction schools was satisfactory but there is concern over the minor-construction schools where the quality cannot be ascertained as there was weak monitoring and no construction records maintained.

(ii) Has the government and/or school management committee developed an operation and maintenance plan for newly rehabilitated/constructed school to indicate the likelihood of long-term sustainable returns on the investment.

(iii) Is there a maintenance schedule and appropriate budget available?

UNICEF has prepared an operations and maintenance manual for the major-construction schools and has sent it to the MoE for comment. The document is in English and will be translated into Sinhalese for distribution to the schools.

The major-construction schools are well designed and have used good quality durable materials which are all locally available. The quality of the construction is above average in most cases as a result of the full-time, on-site independent monitoring. The structures are, therefore, expected to be very durable and relatively low maintenance. The main routine maintenance activities will be daily cleaning, as well as clearing out gutters and drains. Minor annual maintenance would include replacing fluorescent bulbs, taps and perhaps isolated window or door fittings. Medium-term maintenance would include painting of highly trafficked areas, desludging of septic tanks etc. It is expected that it would be more than 10 years before any significant maintenance would be required, and then mostly likely, in schools near the ocean where metal elements could be affected by salt-laden air. Replacement of major building elements would require specialist skills and equipment, and need to be undertaken by a contractor.

Principals advised that the MOE provided no regular allocation for school maintenance. Discussions with principals and SDS members in all schools visited indicated that routine maintenance would be undertaken by staff, and the SDS would provide financial and technical support for the annual and medium-term maintenance activities. The MoE has no real strategy to ensure long-term major maintenance of the buildings.

A similar situation applies to the minor-construction schools. The difference is that the quality of construction is not assured. For example, if the quality of the concrete and paintwork is not in accordance with the specification, which is possible due to the poor quality assurance and supervision arrangement, then these materials will be less durable and, consequently, higher maintenance with a lower useful life.

As the SDS managed the rehabilitation works on four schools, it is clear that the capacity for minor and medium maintenance exists in the community. Given that the SDS undertook to do the rehabilitation work itself implies high community ownership of the schools, which augers well for ongoing maintenance support.

The main support provided by the MoE will be through the technical support of the ZOE TO and the District Education Office engineer. These resources can be accessed by the SDS via the principal. A caveat on the use of the ZOE TO is that they are not engineers and their skills and capabilities in some areas of maintenance will be limited.

UNICEF has prepared an operations and maintenance manual for the schools which assumes routine and medium-term maintenance will be handled at the school level by the SDS. Nationally the MoE has no strategy and budget to ensure long-term major maintenance of its school buildings assets.

2.6 Gender Equality

Rating: 5 / 6

This evaluation criteria aims to determine whether the initiative is advancing gender equality and promoting women's empowerment through: advancing equal access to gender-responsive education services; and increasing women's voice in decision-making, leadership, and peace-building. Gender equality has been rated 'good quality', at 5 out of 6 points. Women were active participants in decision-making on the school construction and rehabilitation. In most schools, separate WASH facilities for girls and boys have been provided.

The SDS was involved in decision-making, and in all schools visited, the SDS included women as well as men (male membership was higher). The principal generally chaired the SDS, including at the school where the principal was female. There appeared to be no discrimination against women in the SDS decision-making. See also the section above on effectiveness.

In all schools visited, existing or new toilets were provided. Separate toilets were provided for female and male students, and for teachers, and two unisex toilets were in the auditorium. In the larger schools, there were separate female and male toilet blocks which incorporated hand-washing facilities. In a few schools, WASH facilities were provided outside in the school grounds and shared by male and female students. In most cases, the facilities were designed to cater for the different age/height of users.

2.7 Lessons learned – approach and synergies

There are a number of lessons to be learned from the project approach and delivery. The UNICEF's major-construction approach followed best practice, however, the minor-construction approach presented issues in assuring procurement and construction was up to standard. The third approach of using the SDS for minor rehabilitation worked well by empowering the community and ensuring the skills for ongoing maintenance.

Synergies exist between this project and DFAT's support in Sri Lanka for the UNICEF-managed projects – Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) and Basic Education Support Project (BESP) – and its co-financing with the World Bank of the Transforming School Education Program (TSEP).

The Terms of Reference asked the following questions.

- (i) *What are the lessons learned from UNICEF's working modalities and approach and relationship with government for large and small school construction? Are there things that could have been done differently?*
 - (ii) *Is there synergy between this project and other DFAT funded education projects (WASH, BESP and CFEP)? Does the synergy make a difference?*
- (i) What are the lessons learned from UNICEF's working modalities and approach and relationship with government for large and small school construction? Are there things that could have been done differently?**

For large major-construction schools (see Table 1.1), the UNICEF approach of adopting the role of project manager and hiring a DSC to prepare the design for the schools and to supervise a separate construction contractor is standard practice. This approach has been used on other DFAT infrastructure projects, generally through the procurement of a managing contractor (MC) via an open tender process.

UNICEF's procurement procedures were assessed as demonstrating best practice and the agreements used to contract both the DSC and CC were considered appropriate. UNICEF staff in the field office monitored the work of the DSC and CC and provided oversight and liaison between the MoE, the school community and the contractors. Despite the three levels of technical oversight of the construction (DSC, UNICEF, ZEO/PEO), serious structural non-conformances were found, suggesting a lack of construction engineers with large-scale building construction experience.

For the small-scale school rehabilitation and construction, UNICEF delegated procurement, design and supervision to the Provincial Education Office (PEO). PEO undertook an open tender process using GoSL procurement processes. Construction was either by a local CC or by the SDS, with design and preparatory work undertaken by the ZEO TO or the DEO engineer using MoE standard classroom designs. The works were supervised by the ZEO TO and the DEO, supported by UNICEF. Lessons learned from this approach relate to both the design and the quality assurance of the construction. The MoE classroom design does not make provision for disabled access, which is a condition of Child Friendly School (CFS) design. While the door widths are suitable for wheelchair access, there is a step from ground level to the veranda, and no ramps. The UNICEF proposal stated all construction would be consistent with the CFS guidelines of the MoE.

In the case of construction, at both of the sites visited, no documentation was available to verify that the construction was in accordance with the approved design. Lessons learned include the need to clearly define the quality assurance procedures and documentation requirements both for the construction contractor and for the supervising engineer. The ZOE TOs are not engineers and need to be trained in community engagement and construction quality assurance procedures, and supervised by a qualified engineer.

Delegation of the procurement process to the POE should only be done if UNICEF can provide assurance to DFAT that the process is open, fair and transparent, and satisfies the Australian Government's procurement regulations. While the GoSL procedures appear on paper to meet international procurement standards, their application to a particular situation needs to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

The use of the SDS for small-scale rehabilitation works was well received at the school visited and is considered an appropriate modality for these small-scale works. The approach reinforced community ownership of the school, provided some income for community members, and will ensure technical sustainability as the skills required for future maintenance reside in the community.

(ii) Is there synergy between this project and other DFAT funded education projects (WASH, BESP and CFEP)? Does the synergy make a difference?

Support for the SESCOANSI complements DFAT's support in Sri Lanka for the UNICEF-managed projects – Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) and Basic Education Support Project (BESP) – and its co-financing with the World Bank of the Transforming School Education Program (TSEP).

Synergies with UNICEF's WASH enabled the successful rollout of toilets with hand-washing facilities to WASH standards in the major construction schools. One minor construction school received facilities under the WASH program.

In eight of the nine schools visited, staff had received training from the BESP project in Child Friendly Approach (CFA) concepts. Some staff had also received training in community involvement in school development and planning, and at three of the schools teachers had also been trained in children counselling techniques. These synergies bring together the physical construction of the schools with the teaching inside its walls.

2.8 Lasting outcomes

In the Terms of Reference, lasting outcomes were listed as a lower priority, only to be addressed if the information is available. The relevant questions are:

- (i) *How the project has influenced improved access to education for boys and girls and increased capacity of teachers to deliver quality education.*
- (ii) *Were there any changes brought about by the project and are there any unintended positive/negative influence of the project? What are they? And why and how did it happen?*

Information was not available to assess lasting outcomes. However, it is clear that reconstruction and rehabilitation of 23 schools improves access for children and the capacity of teachers. In total, 247 classrooms were completed, providing a safe learning environment for up to 8,600 students. The school construction and rehabilitation involved the school communities and there has been very positive feedback from the teachers and students on their new classrooms. Anecdotal feedback from teachers indicates that attendance has increased and student ownership of their classrooms was high. The number of enrolments across the 23 schools has increased 31 per cent from 9,025 in February 2011 to 11,910 in October 2013.

3.0 Conclusion and recommendations

A mixture of 23 primary, secondary or mixed schools were rehabilitated or reconstructed in two conflict-affected districts of Northern Province in two phases over a period of three years. In total, 247 classrooms were completed, providing a safe learning environment for up to 8,600 students. A further 50 laboratories, libraries and IT rooms were constructed, as well as 10 halls/auditoriums. Teacher and/or principal quarters were provided at eight schools. All major-construction schools were provided, where required, with appropriate WASH facilities that took account of gender and age. Disabled toilets were provided at five schools.

Major construction was undertaken at 13 schools. These designs incorporated Child Friendly School features such as ramps for disabled access, although disabled toilets were built in only five schools. Window sizes were increased which improves natural light and ventilation. Some exterior architectural embellishments were incorporated into the design of the verandas and entrances which may have increased the construction cost slightly, although all materials were standard. A high level of teacher and student satisfaction with the buildings and classrooms was reported. Although the overall construction quality was generally good, and despite full-time independent technical monitoring, a number of structural defects were still apparent during the field visits. These will be rectified during present defects liability period.

Minor construction at six schools used existing standard MoE designs which have not yet been updated for CFS. Construction monitoring was by the ZEO Technical Officers (TO) who are not appropriately trained, and construction quality is problematic as no systematic construction records were maintained. Notwithstanding this, the school communities are reported to be happy with the outcome.

The remaining four schools involved minor rehabilitation works carried out by the School Development Societies, and supervised by the ZEO TO. This work was generally to a satisfactory

standard but poor technical supervision has resulted in structural defects remaining after completion – these will require rectification.

The evaluation team found there was strong and enthusiastic support for the school development and planning across the school community with the SDS, school parents, principals and staff. Feedback from the teachers and students indicated a high acceptance of the classroom designs, with all saying that the rooms were spacious and had good natural light and were well ventilated. Anecdotal feedback from meetings with teachers and students indicated a high acceptance of the school and classroom environment, with most saying attendance had increased and student ownership of their classrooms was high.

The delivery model of using open tendering for the selection of design and supervision consultants and construction contractors for the major construction and most of the minor construction is generally considered the most effective means of achieving value for money. However, value for money is only ultimately obtained if it can be assured that the schools are built to the design and specification in the contract documents. This is problematic for the six minor-construction schools where no independent supervision consultant was engaged.

Approximately 72.5% (USD7,327,198) of the total DFAT grant to UNICEF of USD10.1 million was spent on market-based (tendered) prices for design and construction services. UNICEF's financial acquittal information does not detail how the remaining 27.5% was spent other than on project management.. A range of potential activities for DFAT contribution were mentioned in the UNICEF Phase 1 and 2 proposals but no specific details provided. It is not clear from analysis of UNICEF financial documentation of any other specific outputs delivered for this balance, USD2,772,802 (27.5%). A comparable DFAT infrastructure project indicates that project management costs are less than 10% of the construction cost. However, unless UNICEF can provide details of the other outputs provided, it must be assumed that UNICEF's project management costs represent 40% of construction costs – close to USD2.0 million more than would be expected to be paid to a private sector project manager. Unless the expenditure of the USD2.0 million can be linked to other specific outputs under the agreement, it must be concluded that the use of UNICEF as a project manager for SESCOANSI did not represent value for money. Urgency of a response may have been a factor in the selection of UNICEF for Phase 1 of the project, but this would not have been the case for Phase 2 as adequate time was available to scope and tender for the work.

DFAT Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) requirements relating to environmental issues (e.g. hazards, UXO, flooding and tsunami) and climate change (e.g. storm surge and rainfall intensity) were generally considered during the design process. Some schools reported instances of flooding of the school grounds but the constructed floor levels of the new buildings are above known flood heights.

To ensure that all buildings are safe and satisfy the relevant standards, UNICEF should arrange for a structural engineer to review the six minor-construction schools, and ensure all defects are rectified at all schools before the final inspection.

Overall, the project has achieved the aim of restoring 23 schools in areas where people have been displaced, supporting the success and sustainability of the returnee process. Schools help restore the community to a sense of normalcy after decades of multiple displacements and help reduce the trauma of children.

3.1 Lessons learned for Australian aid initiatives

This evaluation has found a number of lessons learned which are transferable across initiatives and countries. The 14 points below relate to: project design and planning; procurement and construction processes; quality assurance procedures; school facilities; and reporting.

1. A project design document (PDD) with good scoping of activity should be prepared, preferably before the commitment of funds, but at the latest during the inception phase, within the first three months. The inception report should cover the essential elements of a PDD and clearly define the scope, cost, implementation schedule, reporting and monitoring arrangements.
2. There is a necessity for a critical and objective appraisal of government priorities in terms of the siting/locations and size of schools to be funded, to ensure scarce resources are efficiently targeted to locations of greatest need and to avoid investing in over-capacity at any locations.
3. A formalised complaints handling system to manage problems during implementation should be included in the project design. The complaints should be logged by the MoE and tracked by DFAT to ensure that they are satisfactorily addressed.
4. Project noticeboards showing project details (scope of the project, start and completion dates and contract values) as well as the names and contact details of the key players (funding and executing agencies, construction contractor and supervising engineers) must be erected at the front of the site from the start of construction. Contact points (telephone, internet, email and post) for lodging complaints should also be displayed on the noticeboard. This will improve transparency.
5. Delegation of the procurement processes to the use of recipient government systems should only be done by prior approval from DFAT, following an assessment that the necessary safeguards are in place, and assurances that the process will be monitored to ensure that it is open, fair and transparent and satisfies the Australian Government's procurement regulations.
6. Where design or construction is sub-contracted to local firms, it is critical that the sub-contracts contain sufficient quality assurance procedures and documentation requirements, both for the construction contractor and the supervising engineer, to permit the managing contractor to provide certification to DFAT, the recipient government, and the MoE that the buildings have been constructed in accordance with the standards, codes and building regulations of the recipient government.
7. The use of a community-based contracting approach, such as demonstrated by the SDS, is considered an appropriate modality for the small-scale rehabilitation works, so long as adequate technical support and monitoring is provided.
8. It is essential that on a large-scale construction project that the implementing agency has an experienced construction engineer overseeing the technical aspects of the construction.
9. The provision of Temporary Learning Spaces (TLS) should be considered as an interim measure to allow classes to be established and teaching to commence at a school site while the permanent classrooms are being constructed. Such spaces expedite the adjustment of returnees

to a regular schooling routine, minimise the break in learning and reduce the need for accelerated learning courses.

10. Consideration should be given to the provision of basic laboratory equipment in schools where science laboratories have been provided.
11. Zonal Education Office (ZEO) Technical Officers (TO) do not have the necessary skills to design and supervise building construction and rehabilitation. Capacity building and resourcing of the TO in construction supervision and quality assurance, as well as community engagement, should be included in future programs. This will enable the TO to provide some monitoring tasks under the supervision of an engineer, as well as equip them with valuable skills which can be used for school asset management and maintenance after the project is completed.
12. Effort should be made to work with the MoE at the national, provincial and district level to secure a commitment to provide funding for routine and periodic maintenance for the schools, in line with the school maintenance manual prepared by the project.
13. Permanent surface drainage within the school grounds should be included in the construction scope of works.
14. An activity completion report should be prepared by the implementing agency.

3.2 Recommendations

Recommendation 1: In the case of the six minor-construction schools where new classrooms were built and/or significant work was undertaken on structural elements, and the construction was not monitored by a qualified structural engineer, UNICEF should arrange for a structural engineer to review the quality records and engineers' logs and certify in writing that the elements or classrooms in question have adequate strength and are safe, or if not, what corrective actions are required to make it safe.

Recommendation 2: That UNICEF provides a letter to DFAT, along with their final report, confirming in writing that all defects identified by the evaluation and listed at the hand-over inspection, plus other defects discussed by the evaluator with UNICEF field engineers during the evaluation visits, have been rectified and that the schools are safe.

Recommendation 3: At completion of the defects liability period for each school, UNICEF should provide DFAT and the MoE with certification that "the buildings as constructed are safe and satisfy the relevant standards, codes and building regulations in Sri Lanka, and do not contain any asbestos containing materials".

Recommendation 4: That UNICEF provides a detailed acquittal of the balance of the funding 27.5% (approximately USD2,772,802) that was not directly allocated for the design, construction and supervision of the 23 schools.

Recommendation 5: That all future construction activities supported by DFAT in the education sector comply with DFAT's Disability Inclusive Design criteria, and the Ministry of Social Services Sri Lanka policy "Promotion of Accessibility to the Built Environment for Persons with Disabilities" and include, inter alia, toilets for people with disabilities as well as the associated ramps, handrails and doorways suitable for wheelchair access.

Annexes

ANNEX A:	Evaluation supporting information
ANNEX B:	Field visit and stakeholder meeting schedule
ANNEX C:	Persons met
ANNEX D:	Evaluation field notes from visits to schools
ANNEX E:	Draft Summative Evaluation Plan – October 2013
ANNEX F:	Terms of reference

ANNEX A: Evaluation Supporting Information

Table A1: Summary of Total Schools Supported by DFAT in Phases 1 & 2

Phase	Major Works	Minor Works	Number Schools	Number rooms	Number of Students 2013	DFAT Funding AUD
Phase 1: June 2010 – May 2011	3	-	3	32*	1,752*	3,000,000
Phase 2: June 2011 – July 2013	10	10	20	204	7,235	7,123,598
Total	13	10	23	236	8,987	10,132,598
* Kilinochchi MV only						

Table A2: Summary of Schools Assisted and Visited

Type of Assistance	Mode of Implementation	Monitoring	Kilinochchi	Mullaitivu	Total	Total Visited
Major Construction – (greater than USD 50,000)	Design Consultant & Construction Contractor - Procured by UNICEF	Consultant + UNICEF + ZEO	3 + 5 = 8	5	13	
Visited			1 + 1	4		6
Minor Construction (less than USD 50,000)	Construction Contractor - Procured by Prov.Ed.Off.	ZEO + UNICEF	1	5	6	
Visited			1	1		2
Rehabilitation (less than USD 50,000)	School Development Society (SDS)	ZEO + UNICEF	4	-	4	
Visited			1			1
Total Schools in Districts			13	10	23	
Total Schools Visited			4	5		9 (39%)

SESCAANSI ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

Table A3: Visited Schools -Summary Data - Classrooms, Teachers, Students										
No - Visit order --->	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
School Name	Katchilaiamadu G.T.M.S.[1]	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam[2]	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S.[3]	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	Muruganatha Primary Vidyalayam	Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Kalmadhunagar G.T.M.S.	Total 9 Schools
Grades Taught	1 to 13 (A level art stream)	1 to 5	1 to 9	1 to 11	1 to 9	1 to 5	1 to 9	1 – 13 (A-level arts and commerce)	1 to 5	
Teachers (Current)	28	7	23	29	13	12	16	68	7	
Actual Number of students at time of Planning (JPA February 2011)	579	85	279	401	182	222	232	1752	53	3785
Expected number of students (JPA 5-Year forecast 2016)	800	100	540	500	460	400	400	2500	100	5800
Planned Increase of Students over 5 years	221	15	261	99	278	178	168	748	47	2015
Expected percentage Increase over 5 years	38%	18%	94%	25%	153%	80%	72%	43%	89%	53%
Actual Number of students (Current October 2013)	573	54	395	371	186	218	361	2111	52	4321
Number of Students (Current 2013 - Planning 2011)	-6	-31	116	-30	4	-4	129	359	-1	536
Percentage change (Current vs Planning)	-1.0%	-36.5%	41.6%	-7.5%	2.2%	-1.8%	55.6%	20.5%	-1.9%	14.2%
Current Student / Teacher Ratio	20.5	7.7	17.2	12.8	14.3	18.2	22.6	31.0	7.4	
Number of Classrooms	13	4	9	8	16	5	10	24	4	
Number of Activity Rooms (library, computer lab, activity room, agriculture room, home science lab, music room, staff room for education access)	5	0	3	5	3	0	3	8	0	
Total Instructional Rooms (Current)	18	4	12	13	19	5	13	32	4	
Current Student/Classroom Ratio	44.1	13.5	43.9	46.4	11.6	43.6	36.1	88.0	13.0	
Current Student/ Instructional Room Ratio	31.8	13.5	32.9	28.5	9.8	43.6	27.8	66.0	13.0	
5-year Forecast student/ Instructional Room Ratio	44.4	25.0	45.0	38.5	24.2	80.0	30.8	78.1	25.0	
5-year Forecast student/ Classroom Ratio	61.5	25.0	60.0	62.5	28.8	80.0	40.0	104.2	25.0	

Table A4 : UNICEF FINANCIAL ACQUITTAL SUMMARY ANALYSIS												
			Section A: Expenditures apparently relevant to School Reconstruction			Section B : Expenditures not apparently directly relevant to School Reconstruction						Totals Sections A + B USD
Item	Start Period	Finish Period	Construction Contractor Costs (CC)	Design & Supervision Consultant (DSC) Costs	Section A : Totals Rows USD	Travel	Salaries Colombo	Salaries Other	Miscellaneous	Question Relevance	Section B: Totals Rows USD	
UNICEF Financial Report 1	20-Sep-10	15-Dec-11	1,002,878	78,022	1,080,900	13,340	72,930	296,197	5,104	51,667	439,238	1,520,138
UNICEF Financial Report 2	27-Jul-11	28-Nov-11	-	4,802	4,802	-	-	79,999	-	-	79,999	84,802
UNICEF Financial Report 3	01-Jan-12	12-Nov-13	5,868,846	372,650	6,241,496	44,547	575,525	635,586	385,603	-	1,641,260	7,882,756
Totals			6,871,724	455,475	7,327,198	57,887	648,454	1,011,782	390,707	51,667	2,160,497	9,487,695
Percentages			72.4%	4.8%	77.2%	0.6%	6.8%	10.7%	4.1%	0.5%	22.8%	100.0%
Item			Amount USD	Percentage	Balance USD	Item			Amount USD	Percentage		
Total Grant AusAID to UNICEF USD			10,100,000	100.0%	10,100,000	Total Grant AusAID to UNICEF USD			10,100,000	100.0%		
HQ Administrative costs (5.7%)			575,122	5.7%	9,524,878	HQ Administrative costs (6%)			575,122	5.7%		
Total Grant received by UNICEF SLCO			9,524,878	94.3%	9,524,878	Total Grant received by UNICEF SLCO			9,524,878	94.3%		
Minus School Construction costs (CC)			6,871,724	68.0%	2,653,154	Total UNICEF SLCO Financial Reports 1 +2+3			9,487,695	93.9%		
Minus School Design & Supervision Costs (DSC)			455,475	4.5%	2,197,680	Difference UNICEF SLCO (Grant - Financial Reports)			37,183	0.37%		
Total CC + DSC Costs			7,327,198	72.5%	2,197,680							
UNICEF Sri Lanka - non (CC + DSC) costs			2,197,680	21.8%	2,197,680							
Total UNICEF Sri Lanka + HQ (non CC+DSC) costs			2,772,802	27.5%								

Table A5: Comparison of Project Management Costs						
Item	SESCAANSI Actual		SESCAANSI (Indonesian DSC rates)		Indonesia Project (Actual)	
	USD	%	USD	%	AUD	%
Total Grant DFAT to UNICEF	10,100,000		10,100,000			
Construction Contractors (CC) Costs	6,871,724		6,871,724		2,613,500	
Architecture			260,303	3.79%	99,000	3.79%
Structural and Civil Engineering			353,012	5.14%	134,260	5.14%
Mechanical Electrical Plumbing (MEP)			261,617	3.81%	99,500	3.81%
Quantity Surveyor and Cost Manager			275,763	4.01%	104,880	4.01%
Total Design & Supervision Consultants (DSC)	455,475	6.63%	1,150,695	16.75%	437,640	16.75%
Total CC + DSC	7,327,198		8,022,419		3,051,140	
			-			
Project Management (PM)	2,772,802	40.35%	525,864	7.65%	200,000	7.65%
Total DSConsultant + PM Costs	3,228,276		1,676,559	24.40%	637,640	24.40%
Total Costs Construction + DSConsultants + PM	10,100,000		8,548,283	124.40%	3,251,140	
Difference [Grant - CC+DSC+PM]			1,551,717			

Table U1: Grant Details		
Grant Details	USD	Percentage
Total Grants Received by SLCO	9,524,878.27	94.3%
HQ administrative costs (6%)	575,121.73	5.7%
Total grant from DFAT to UNICEF	10,100,000.00	100.0%

Source: UNICEF I Tudawe Email 13 November 2013

Table U2: UNICEF Funds Utilization Reports					
Source Document	Start Date	Finish Date	Total Allocation USD	Funds Committed USD	Funds Available USD
2010 - Report 1	20-Sep-10	15-Dec-11	2,352,191.93	1,520,137.59	832,054.34
2010 - Report 2	27-Jul-11	28-Nov-11	84,802.48	84,801.50	0.98
			2,436,994.41	1,604,939.09	832,055.32
			Programmable Amount	Funds Utilized	Programmable Balance
2011 - Report	01-Jan-12	12-Nov-13	8,004,561.00	7,969,897.00	34,664.00
			Total Allocation	Total Funds Committed / Acquitted	Funds Available
			10,441,555.41	9,574,836.09	866,719.32
Table U1: UNICEF Email 131113					
Total Grants Received by SLCO			9,524,878.27	9,574,836.09	- 49,957.82

ie overspend ?

Source: UNICEF

Table D1: DFAT FMA Reg 9 Approvals for SESCOANSL			
Grant Details	Approval Date		Approval AUD
FMA Reg 9 #1	01-Jun-10		3,000,000.00
FMA Reg 9 #2	28-Apr-11		5,000,000.00
FMA Reg 9 #3	07-Jun-11		2,132,598.00
		Total AUD	10,132,598.00

Source: DFAT

ANNEX B: Field visit and stakeholder meeting schedule: DFAT / UNICEF School Construction Evaluation in the North: 7 – 17 October 2013

A) Field visit agenda (7 – 11 October)

Visit to schools and meeting with stakeholders in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu

Time	Activity /Location	Responsible persons / accompanied by
Sunday, 06 October 2013		
14.00 – 16.00	Finalisation of draft Evaluation Plan and discussions on field logistics	Rani Noerhadhie (DFAT), Indra (Evaluation Officer UNICEF) Sri (Education Officer, UNICEF)
Monday, 07 October 2013		
09.00 – 09.10	Meeting the team at Palaly Airport	Prakash (Head of Zone Office - HoZ), Karthi (Karthikeyini – Education Officer)
09.10 – 09.40	Traveling to visit Secretary's office, Ministry of Education, Cultural Affairs and Sports, Jaffna	
09.40 – 11.10	Meeting with Secretary, Ministry of Education, Cultural Affairs and Sports	Karthi, Chryshanthan (Construction Engineer), Thaya (Thayaparan – WASH Officer)
11.10 – 11.40	Traveling to Provincial Education Office, Northern Province, Jaffna	
11.40 – 13.10	Discussion with Provincial Education team	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya
13.10 – 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 – 15.30	Traveling to the UNICEF office Kilinochchi	
15.30 – 15.45	Refreshing break at the office	
15.45 – 17.30	Discussion / meeting with UNICEF staff (Collective / Individual)	HoZ / Education and WASH colleagues
17.30	Check in at the Hotel	
Tuesday, 08 October 2013		
07.30 – 08.30	Traveling to Katchilaimadhu GTMS (government Tamil Mixed School)	Zarook (Abdul Zarook – Education Officer, KZO)
08.30 – 10.30	Visit at Mu/Katchilaimadhu GTMS	Zarook, Chryshanthan, Radika (WASH Officer)
10.30 – 11.00	Traveling to Murippu GTMS	
11.00 – 13.30	Visit at Mu/Murippu GTMS	Zarook, Chryshanthan, Thaya / Radika
13.30 – 14.00	Lunch (At school)	Vigna for packed lunch
14.00 – 15.00	Traveling to ZEO, Thunukkai	
15.00 – 16.30	Discussion at Zonal Education Office (ZEO) with ZEO team, Thunukkai ZEO team composed of Zonal Director of Education,	Zarook / ZDE and team

Time	Activity /Location	Responsible persons / accompanied by
	Technical Officer, Accountant and Asst. Director of Education Development)	
16.30 – 17.30	Traveling back to Kilinochchi	Zarook
17.30	Check in at Hotel	Zarook
Wednesday, 09 October 2013		
07.00 – 08.30	Traveling to Mullaitivu	Karthi
08.30 – 10.30	Visit at Mu/Mullaitivu RCTMS (Roman Catholic Tamil Mixed School)	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya
10.30 – 10.35	Travelling to Kallappadu GTMS (Refreshment)	
10.35 – 12.35	Visit at Kallappadu GTMS	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya
12.35 – 12.45	Traveling (traveling lunch)	
12.45 – 14.45	Visit at Mu/Silawaththai HBTMS (Hindu Tamil Mixed School)	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya
14.45 – 15.15	Traveling to ZEO, Mullaitivu	
15.15 – 16.45	Discussion at Zonal Education Office (ZEO) with ZEO team, Mullaitivu. ZEO team composed of Zonal Director of Education, Technical Officer, Accountant and Asst. Director of Education Development)	Karthi, ZDE and Team
16.45 – 18.00	Traveling back to Kilinochchi	
18.00	Check in at Hotel	Karthi
Thursday, 10 October, 2013		
07.30 – 08.00	Traveling to Kilinochchi Muruganatha Primary school	Karthi
08.00 – 10.00	Visit at Kn/Muruganatha Primary school (the local contractor alos included in the discussion)	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya
10.00 – 10.15	Traveling (Refreshment)	
10.15 – 12.15	Visit at Kn/Tharmapuram No.1 GTMS	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya
12.15 – 12.30	Traveling to Kn/Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya
12.30 – 14.30	Visit at Kn/Kilinochchi MV (Maha Vidyalayam)	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya
14.30 – 15.00	Travel to Kilinochchi ZEO	
15.00 – 16.00	Discussion at Zonal Education Office (ZEO) with ZEO team, Kilinochchi ZEO team composed of Zonal Director of Education, Technical Officer, Accountant and Asst. Director of Education Development)	Karthi, ZDE and team
16.30 – 17.00	Traveling to UNICEF Kilinochchi Office	HoZ / Chryshanthan
17.00	Check in at Hotel	
Friday, 11 October, 2013		
7.30 – 8.00	Brief discussion at the UNICEF office, Kiolinochchi	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya
8.00 - 10.00	Visit at Kn/Kalmadhunagar GTMS	Karthi / Thaya /

Time	Activity /Location	Responsible persons / accompanied by
		Chryshanthan
11:00	Depart to the airport	

A-1) School Categories:

- Major construction – budget range from SLR 70 to 100 Mn
 - 1) Kn/Vivekanantha Primary school , Kilinochchi
 - 2) Kn/Kilinochchi MV (Maha Vidyalayam). Kilinochchi
 - 3) Mu/Katchilaimadhu GTMS (Government Tamil Mixed School), Mullaitivu
- Medium level construction – budget range from SLR 40 to 70 Mn
 - 1) Kn/Tharmapuram GTMS, Kilinochchi
 - 2) Mu/Mullaitivu RCTMS, Mullaitivu – complained school
 - 3) Mu/Silawaththai HBTMS, Mullaitivu – complained school
 - 4) Mu/Kallappadu GTMS, Mullaitivu – complained school
- Minor level construction – budget range from SLR 10 Mn and below
 - 1) Kn/Muruganandha Primary, Kilinochchi
 - 2) Mu/Murippu TV (Tamil Vidyalayam), Mullaitivu

A-2) School selection criteria:

- Representing three zones (Kilinochchi, Thunukkai and Mullaitivu) and two districts (Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu); 4 from each district
- Include type I, II and III schools
- Student population – include all size (small, medium and big)
- Minimize travel time during school visits.

B) Stakeholder meetings in Colombo (14 – 17 October)

14.10.2013 Monday

10:00 – 12:00 – Meeting with Education team, UNICEF

12:30 – 14:00 – Meeting with Stanley, Supply Officer, UNICEF

14:00 – 16:00 – Meeting with Rasika, Construction Engineer, UNICEF Colombo

15.10.2013 Tuesday

10:30 – 12:00 – Meeting with Design and Supervision Consultant in Colombo

12:00 – 13:00 – Meeting with Construction Company in Colombo

13:30 – 14:30 – Meeting with Swiss Development Cooperation in Colombo

15:00 – 16:00 - Meeting with Malini Fernando, Director School Works Branch at Ministry of Education

16.10.2013 Wednesday (Public Holiday – AHC open)

13:00 - 15:00 – Meeting with Senior Program Managers, DFAT

15:00 – 17:00 – Meeting with Second Secretary and Counsellor, DFAT

17.10.2013 Thursday

9:00 am – Aide Memoire presentation by the consultant at UNICEF

ANNEX C: Persons Met

	1 – A & B	Date : 08.10.2013	School Name : KATCHILAIMADU School
	School Staff, SDS, Parents and Students consulted during inspection		
	Name	Position	Year at School
1.	N.Navaratnarajah	Secretary	6 months
2	M.Amuthachchelvi	Member of School Administration	6 months
3	Mrs.Sivathayanithy Shanmugalingam	Dep.Principal	2 years
4.	Mr.S.Nagenthirarajah	Principal	6 years
5	Mr.K.Ratheeswaran	Teacher	3 years
6	Mr.S.Perananthasivam	Teacher	7 years
7	Mrs.V.Thaneeswaran	Teacher	7 years
8	Miss.A.Amuthiny	Student	
9	Miss.S.Tharmitha	Student	
10	Miss.K.Tharaka	Student	
11	Miss.S.Tharsa	Student	
12	Mas.S.Jesinthan	Student	
13	Mas.V.Loyan	Student	
14	Miss.S.Sivapriya	Teacher (Gr.5)	3 years
15	Mr.K.Karunanathan	School's watcher	Living this place
16	Mr.N.Thavachchelvan	SDS – Vice Secretary	Living this place
17	Mr.N.Chandrakumar	Parent	Living this place
18	Mrs.P.Jeya	Parent	Living this place
19	Mrs.S.Vasantharani	Parent	Living this place

	3 – A	Date : 08.10.2013	School Name : MURIPPU School
	School Staff, SDS, Parents and Students consulted during inspection		
	Name	Position	Year at School
1.	Mr.P.Vivakaran	Member	9 months
2	Mr.P.Thanabalasingam	RDS Ppresident	8 years
3	Mr.S.Arunthavakumar	RDS Secretary	8 years
4.	Mr.V.Karunakaran	Farmer Organization	8 years
5	Ms.M.Thuvikala	Secretary	9 years
6	Mrs.M.Saraswathy	Parent	
7	Mr.P.Balamanoharan	TO	
8	Mr.M.Surobtharan	Teacher	
9	Mr.R.Uthayanthan	Teacher	
10	Mr.K.Sabesan	Teacher	

11	Mr.P.Sivanesan	Teacher	
12	Mr.S.Navasingam	Teacher	
13	Ms.M.Suseela	Teacher	
14	Mr.M.Ramanathan	Principal	
15			

	3 – A	Date : 09.10.2013	School Name : Mu/MULLAITIVU R.C.T.M School
	School Staff, SDS, Parents and Students consulted during inspection		
	Name	Position	Year at School
1.	Rev.St.A.M.J.Reeta	Principal	1 year
2	A.Mary Mettilda		
3	A.Sentharulmalar		
4.	Mr.A.Francis	SDS Secretary	2013
5	T.Bobby Jansan		
6	Mr.P.Shantharuban	SDS	
7	Mr.Prakash Tuladhar	Chief of UNICEF Kilinochchi	
8	Chryshanthan	Construction Engineer-UNICEF	
9	Stanley Attanayake	Supply Officer UNICEF	
10	Sivakumar Asha		
11	Sivasangaralingam Thiyamal		
12	Dominic Rajankumar Selvamalar		
13	Fatima Lishwin		
14	Mrs.Kumuthini Sivam		
15	Edrich Perinsan		
16	Antony Cletes Vinosan Croos		
17	Logina Kamaleswaran		
18	A.Milojene		
19	T.Prins		
20	R.Dorin		
21	Tharsana		
22	MRS.S.Jerosan		
23	Mr.T.Nishanth		
24	J.Tamilanpu		
25	Mr.Patic Jesuthas Sarujan		

	3 – B	Date : 09.10.2013	School Name : Mu/MULLAITIVU R.C.T.M School
	School Staff, SDS, Parents and Students consulted during inspection		
	Name	Position	Year at School
1.	E.Perinsan	Student	
2	Antony Cletes Vinosan Croos	Student	
3	K.Logina	Student	
4.	A.Milojene	Student	

5	T.Prins	Student	
6	R.Dorin	Student	
7	M.Tharsana	Student	
8	J.Tamil Anphu	Student	

	4 -A Date : 09.10.2013	School Name : SILLAWATTAI	
	School Staff, SDS, Parents and Students consulted during inspection		
	Name	Position	Year at School
1.	K.Thirukkumaran	Principal	
2	Stanley Attanayake	UNICEF	
3	Mrs.H.Vimaleswaran	Teacher	
4.	Vijirthabalavan	Teacher	
5	Mrs.G.Subagaran	Teacher	
6	Mrs.I.Santhakumar	Teacher	
7	Mr.T.Kumaranathan	Teacher	
8	Mr.M.Mayutharan	Teacher	
9	Prakash Tuladhar	UNICEF	
10	P.David		
11	S.Navaratnam	SDS Secretary	
12	N.Rajanikanth	Teacher	
13	P.Sivakanesan	Teacher	
14	A.Ajanthan	Teacher	
15	A.Thevanantham	SDS Treasure	
16	L.Sitherakumar		
17	R.Ravikaran		
18	K.Shoba		
19	K.Keemsha		
20	R.Jency		
21	N.Kowsika		
22	S.Thanushiya		
23	K.Panupriya		
24	Thineskaran		
25	Janustan		

	5 – B Date : 09.10.2013	School Name : MULLAITIVU KALLAPADU GTMS
	School Staff, SDS, Parents and Students consulted during inspection	

	Name	Position	Year at School
1.	K.Sankeethan	Student	
2	K.Puvithan	Student	
3	Mrs.S.Premsing	Teacher	
4.	Mrs.L.V.Jesurajah	Teacher	
5	Mrs.M.A.Pransees	Teacher	
6	Mrs.S.Parameswaran	Teacher	
7			

6— A	Date : 10.10.2013	School Name : MURUKANANTHA School	
	School Staff, SDS, Parents and Students consulted during inspection		
	Name	Position	Year at School
1.	Mr.V.Vetkumaran	T.O ZEO Office	
2	Mr.M.Nanthakumar	Old Student	1980
3	Mr.K.Baskaradas	SDS Vice Secretaty	1990
4.	Mr.N.Nagulendran	SDS Member	1985
5	Mr.K.Santhangobal	SDS Secretary	1985
6	Ms.A.Thavamanithevi	Old Student	1972
7	Ms.L.Kailairany	SDS Member	1996
8	Ms.K.Jasintha	SDS Member – Parent	2001
9	Ms.J.Sripriya	SDS	
10	Mr.M.Chandrakumar	SDS	
11	Ms.S.Bavani	Parent	
12	N.Vasanthakumary	Parent	

5A		
DATE: 10/10/2013	SCHOOL NAME: Mu/Kallappadu GTMS, Mulaithivu	
SCHOOL STAFF, SDS, PARENTS AND STUDENTS CONSULATED DURING INSPECTION		
NAME	POSITION	YEARS AT SCHOOLS
S. Ravindraiah	Principal	2 years
M. Jeyakumar	Secretary, SDS	1 year

M. Aanandarajah	Secretary (Vice) , SDS	2 Years
Mrs. M. Sivakumar	Vice Principal	13 Years

The Evaluation Team also had meetings with the MoE staff at the following Offices:

Monday 7 Oct	1000 am	Secretary's Office, Ministry of Education, Cultural Affairs and Sports, Jaffna,
Monday 7 Oct	1210 pm	Provincial Education Office, Jaffna
Tuesday 8 Oct	1500 pm	Zonal Education Office, Thunukkai
Wednesday 9 Oct	0900 am	Government Agent (Mr Venanathayanam)
Wednesday 9 Oct	1810 pm	Zonal Education Office, Mullaitivu
Thursday 10 Oct	1600 pm	Zonal Education Office, Kilinochi

9B

DATE: 11/10/2013		SCHOOL NAME: Kn/Kalmadunagar GTMS, Kilinochchi
SCHOOL STAFF, SDS, PARENTS AND STUDENTS CONSULATED DURING INSPECTION		
NAME	POSITION	YEARS AT SCHOOLS
Mr. T. Premakanthan	Teacher	07
Mrs. K. Thavatheesan	Teacher	10
J. Rathusan	Student	Year-5
V. Rajina	Student	Year-5
K. Kugan	Student	Year-4
J. Tharsika	Student	Year-4
R. Rithusa	Student	Year-3
N. Thamilini	Student	Year-2
A.Kengeswaran	Student	Year-2

9B

DATE: 11/10/2013	SCHOOL NAME: Kn/Kalmadunagar GTMS, Kilinochchi	
SCHOOL STAFF, SDS, PARENTS AND STUDENTS CONSULATED DURING INSPECTION		
NAME	POSITION	YEARS AT SCHOOLS
Mr. T. Premakanthan	Teacher	07
Mrs. K. Thavatheesan	Teacher	10
J. Rathusan	Student	Year-5
V. Rajina	Student	Year-5
K. Kugan	Student	Year-4
J. Tharsika	Student	Year-4
R. Rithusa	Student	Year-3
N. Thamilini	Student	Year-2
A.Kengeswaran	Student	Year-2

Page 61 of 123

8B

DATE: 10/10/2013	SCHOOL NAME: Kn/ Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam, Kilinochchi	
SCHOOL STAFF, SDS, PARENTS AND STUDENTS CONSULATED DURING INSPECTION		
NAME	POSITION	YEARS AT SCHOOLS
Mrs. Chandraranee Thirunavukkarasu	Teacher	10 Years
Mrs. Suganthiny Joyal Piyaseelan	Teacher	13 Years
Mr. R. Aravinthan	Teacher	4 Years
Mrs. Tharsiny Thileeparan	Teacher	7 Years
Mr. T. Selvakumar	Teacher	1 Years
Mrs. B. Kumar	Deputy principal	9 Years
Mr. N. Gunendrararajah	Teacher	1 Year
Mrs. Tharany Sureshkumar	Teacher	8 Year
Mr. Ragunathan Sivalingam	Teacher	7 year
Mas. Pusparasha Ananthan	Student	13 years
Mas. Pakeerathan Kajinthan	Student	12 years
Mas. Sivaplan Paviththiran	Student	9 Years
Mas. Shanmugarasha Kodeswaran	Student	12 Maths
Ms. Sharanga Kukenthiran	Student	12 Biology
Ms. Harshikka Yasotharan	Student	12 Bio
Mas. Rajkumar Dinusan	Student	9 years

6 B

DATE: 10/10/2013	SCHOOL NAME: Kn/Muruganantha Vidyalayam Kilinochchi	
SCHOOL STAFF, SDS, PARENTS AND STUDENTS CONSULATED DURING INSPECTION		
NAME	POSITION	YEARS AT SCHOOLS
Mrs. S. Ahilan	Teacher	08 months
Mrs. T. Karunananthan	Teacher	12 Years
Mrs. N. Rajkumar	Teacher	02 Years
Ms. J. Abinaya	Student	4 Years
Ms. K. Anparasi	Student	4 Years
Ms. J. Yathilaya	Student	5 years
Mas. K. Ahimsan	Student	3 years
Mas. K. Tharukanan	Student	5 Years
Ms. K. Ankavai	Student	5 years

7A

DATE: 10/10/2013	SCHOOL NAME: Kn/ Tharmapuram GTMS, Kilinochchi	
SCHOOL STAFF, SDS, PARENTS AND STUDENTS CONSULATED DURING INSPECTION		
NAME	POSITION	YEARS AT SCHOOLS
K. Vijakumar	SDS secretary	
N. Novel Nirupan	SDS Member	
R. Veeravathanan	Teacher	
Stanley Attanayake	Supply Officer, UNICEF	
S. Tharani	SDS Member	
P. Selvathy	SDS Member	
S. Vijakumar	Parent	

7B

DATE: 10/10/2013	SCHOOL NAME: Kn/Tharmapuram GTMS, Kilinochchi	
SCHOOL STAFF, SDS, PARENTS AND STUDENTS CONSULATED DURING INSPECTION		
NAME	POSITION	YEARS AT SCHOOLS
T. Anusiya	Prefect	
S. Kashthury	Prefect	
S. Sanjutha	Prefect	
V. Shakshi	Prefect	
P. Paviththiran	Prefect	
Mrs. C. Ruthravijendran	Vice Principal	
Mrs. R. Karunanithi	Teacher	
Ms. B. Vijayavarthani	Teacher	
Ms. B. Vibojana	Teacher	

ANNEX D: EVALUATION FIELD NOTES FROM VISITS TO SCHOOLS

SESCAANSL ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

No		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
School Name		Katchilaimadu G.T.M.S. ¹¹	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam ¹²	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S. ¹³	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	Muruganantha Primary Vidyalayam	Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Kalmadhunagar G.T.M.S.
Basic school information	Grade	1 to 13 (A level art stream)	1 to 5	1 to 9	1 to 11	1 - 9	1 - 5	1 - 9	1 – 13 (A-level arts and commerce)	1 - 5
	students	579 (UNICEF hand out 573 = 273 boys + 300 girls) forecast after resettlement 900 students	128 (5 yrs forecast 100)	395 (UNICEF hand out 397) Expectation of increased number to 500 students with confirmed number of new grade 1 intake of 107 students.	371	186	220 (UNICEF hand out 218).	361 (expecting additional 300 students from 1000 schools scheme)	2111 (teacher said that number of students could go up to 2500 next year). UNICEF hand out number of students 1,998	53
	No of disable student		7	3		1 (low vision)	2 (slow learner)		7	
	teachers	28 (10 males, 18 females)	7	23 (UNICEF hand out 24)	29	5			68	7 (including principal)
Construction	info session	June 2010	July 2011	2010	January 2011	2011	June 2012	December 2011	August 2011	Don't remember
	started	June 2012	June 2012	August 2012	August 2012			July 2012	February 2012	Don't remember
	completed	September 2013 (UNICEF hand out stated May 2013)	March 2013	August 2013	January 2013 (handover May 2013)			June 2013	January 2013	January 2013
	contract made by	UNICEF	Zonal office + SDS	UNICEF	UNICEF	UNICEF	Zonal	UNICEF	UNICEF	SDS
	type	reconstruction	Rehabilitation (additional roof, floor, grill doors & windows & fixtures to original foundation and	reconstruction	construction	construction	construction	construction	construction	Rehabilitation (painting, new walls, windows & doors, blackboard repainted, roof + tiles, corridor, and

¹¹ G.T.M.S. = Government Tamil Mixed School

¹² Vidyalayam = School

¹³ R.C.T.M.S. = Roman Catholic Tamil Mixed School

SESCAANSI ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

No		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
School Name		Katchilaimadu G.T.M.S. ¹¹	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam ¹²	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S. ¹³	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	Muruganantha Primary Vidyalayam	Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Kalmadhunagar G.T.M.S.
			some part of the walls).							floor for one classroom.
	Construction cost (LKR)	82,520,678	3,620,039	42,604,829	52,417,954	82,520,678	6,463,111	69,386,793	86,000,000	1,489,390
	process	Intensive consultation with Zonal, UNICEF, SDS, architect, & contractor. Parents, students, and SDS involved in the discussion. School monitor progress & quality of construction. 3 months delay due to re-flooring of auditorium and repair of minor defects.	Plea through media & NGO. SDS initiating discussion with Zonal office. Zonal director asked UNICEF assistance.	Consultation with SDS, parents, students, UNICEF, and Zonal office. Communication with contractor during construction in this school was not very good (Language barrier mentioned as the one of the factor). SDS and parents complained that contractor was not receptive to SDS'/parents' criticism or suggestion for improvements. Principal act as communication conduit between contractor and parents/SDS. Students were consulted by teachers on school design.	UNICEF approached school after receiving priority list from Zonal office. Students provided preference that the building should face courtyard and the design was changed.	Limited discussion with teachers and SDS. Teachers observed construction process and raising concerns to contractor but often not followed up (i.e. ground levelling, on the ground uncovered water piping).	Information session to teachers then teachers informed students. Students and teachers suggested shape of building, size of class, and lighting, also wire mesh for windows. Students suggested murals inside and outside classrooms. Teachers monitor construction to ensure students' safety. Teachers use the opportunity to teach students about construction process & equipment.	Principal informed teachers, parents & students on Dec 2011 that new school will be built. Consultation by architect started in November 2011 with final design approved March 2012. Suggestion given: School U-shape. Blackboard size and height. Consideration for protection against dust and rain. Protection against rain for walkway between building (not built).	Consultation process with principal, teachers, parents, students, and SDS and final plan agreed and made into a model.	Teachers not involved in construction process. SDS and principals were involved.

SESCAANSL ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

No		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
School Name		Katchilaiamadu G.T.M.S. ¹¹	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam ¹²	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S. ¹³	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	Muruganantha Primary Vidyalayam	Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Kalmadhunagar G.T.M.S.
	defects/quality	Cracks already forming in buildings. Water pipes damaged in places causing disruption of water distribution. Facilities far from water tank often did not have water, students have to carry water from nearest source point. Toilet fixtures in principal toilet not attached properly.	Windows in principal office not functioning and bad ceiling and walls paint job. No ramps Roof structure not clamped to supporting columns. Uneven purlin connections. Low quality timber, splinters. Distance between ground level and corridor to high, need additional steps for children.	Parents pointed out that: - the foundation not covered with plasters; - hairline cracks already showing; - Floor tiles shown cracks. - Glass door in auditorium of low quality, fitting not good, door glass falls and shattered. Contractor fixed it but parents felt that it was of the same quality; - contractor did not perform after-construction clearing work - teacher quarter do not have fences and gate. - Low quality concrete block detected during construction.	No drainage. Flood prone area (6 inches of water often occurs during 3 months rainy season) creating stagnant water that have to be removed by health authorities. Zonal office requested that the contractor checks the safety of all sliding doors for all schools built by the contractor.	No drainage. Ramps has raised ledge from the ground (10 cm). Hairline cracks in all buildings. Principal questioning the appropriateness of the design (he mentioned walls are now dirty because children splashes water on the walls). Water piping not covered, teachers felt it could trip students. No wall divider between school and principal & teacher quarters. It was agreed before but not constructed. Ground levelling not performed.	No drainage. No ramp. Corridor in the back of the building started to crack and split from the building. Second floor prepared, Exposed concrete reinforcement steels needs coating to avoid rust.	No drainage Low quality timber for doors. Splits, cracks, curls, faulty fixtures. Glass windows slider not properly seated. Difficult to open or closed window. Sagging purlins all over building, especially in auditorium. Roof structure not clamped to column. Nuts without bolts. Water tank not secured to base. Cracks shown in corridors. Electricity meter outside not secured. Narrow stairway. Pipes in boys toilets leaks. Toilet doors could not close. Faulty toilet fixtures. Faulty doors and windows fixtures.	No drainage. No ramps Roof structure not clamped to column. Low quality timber: slivers, cracks. Water pipe attached to corridor's roof structure.	No drainage
sri-lanka-support-education-sector-conflict-affected-areas-evaluation						Page 70 of 123				

SESCAANSI ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

No		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
School Name		Katchilaimadu G.T.M.S. ¹¹	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam ¹²	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S. ¹³	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	Muruganatha Primary Vidyalayam	Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Kalmadhunagar G.T.M.S.
construction info	building #	4	1	4	3	6	1	7	5	1
	classrooms #	20	5	9 (current classrooms number is 16)	8	18	5	20	24	4
	Administration	1	1	1	no	1	1	1		1
	activity rooms (lab etc) #	7 (library, computer lab, activity room, agriculture room, home science lab, music room, staff room for education access)	no	2 (computer room, library)	4 (library, science lab, agriculture lab, home science lab)	no	No	3 (library, staff room, computer resource centre).		No
	auditorium	1	no	1	1	1	No	1	1	No
	teacher quarters	4 bedrooms, kitchen, living room housing 10 female teachers. Teacher quarter do not have surrounding fence & gate - security issue for single female teachers.	no	1	no	2 (1 principal quarter, 1 teacher quarter).	No	1		No
	canteen	no	no	1	1	no	No	no	1	No

SESCAANSI ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

No		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
School Name		Katchilaiaimadu G.T.M.S. ¹¹	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam ¹²	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S. ¹³	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	Muruganantha Primary Vidyalayam	Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Kalmadhunagar G.T.M.S.
	toilets & other WASH facilities provided by Project	2 disable toilets, 2 staff toilet, 1 toilet in principal room, 2 toilets in auditorium, protection of open dug well.	no	no	3 hand washing facilities	no	No	3 urinals, 2 toilets (boys). 4 toilets for girls. 3 toilets for staff. 1 toilet for principal.	8 for boys, 16 for girls, 2 for teachers, 2 in auditorium.	No
	furniture	N/A	no	Type 2 (grade 3 – 5) 45 desks, 75 chairs. (Principal & teachers mentioned the need for type 3 furniture for grade 6 – 9).	Type 2 (grade 3 – 5)	no	no	Type 2 (grade 3 – 5)	no	no
	others	N/A	well with water pump and water tank	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	Open air theatre.	
other programs	BESP	Start mid 2013 28 teachers (incl. 7 primary teachers) trained in CFA concepts. Teachers and principal training in community involvement in school development & planning. 2 teachers trained on WASH maintenance & hygiene	Start mid 2013 (Information provided in UNICEF hand out is not correct – it's the exact information for Katchilaiaimadu school).	Start Mid 2012 Teacher training – CFA concepts Teachers and principal training in community involvement in school development & planning. 3 teachers trained on basic children counselling techniques.	(From UNICEF hand out but the box mentioned Mullaitivu RCTMS so not sure whether this is the correct information). Start mid-2012. 12 teachers trained on CFA concepts. Teachers and principal training in community involvement in	Start mid 2012	Start mid 2012	N/A	Start mid 2012 14 of 28 teachers trained in CFA approach. Teachers and principal training in community involvement in school development & planning. 3 Teachers trained on basic children counselling	2012, CFA orientation for teachers.

SESCAANSI ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

No		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
School Name		Katchilaiamadu G.T.M.S. ¹¹	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam ¹²	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S. ¹³	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	Muruganantha Primary Vidyalayam	Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Kalmadhunagar G.T.M.S.
		promotion techniquet at school.			school development & planning. 3 teachers trained on basic children counselling techniques.				techniques.	
	WASH	No	1 urinal and 1 toilet for girls (urinal without roof - open - privacy and safety issue) 1 toilet for boys 2 toilets for teachers. No disable toilet.	No	No	No	no	No	No	no
Other donors		N/A	ACTED provided furniture	N/A	N/A	N/A	KOICA (playground), GIZ (2 classrooms)	Government (canteen).	N/A	Private donor
CFS	light	good	good in clear day but dark when raining and cloudy	Good	good	Good	good	Good	good	good
	ventilation	good	good	Good	good	Good	good	Good but ventilation in second floor is problematic. Water come into classroom when its raining.	good	good
	windows	wire mesh (space between wires wide enough for adult hands to go through and open	grills	Grills	grill	Alluminium with wire mesh		First floor glass sliding window (without grill). Second floor wire mesh windows	First floor glass sliding window (without grill). Second floor wire mesh windows	Wire mesh

SESCAANSL ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

No		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
School Name		Katchilaiaimadu G.T.M.S. ¹¹	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam ¹²	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S. ¹³	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	Muruganantha Primary Vidyalayam	Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Kalmadhunagar G.T.M.S.
		door lock).						(without glass).	(without glass).	
	doors	Adequate width, lock can be opened from outside through window grill.	adequate width	adequate width	adequate width	adequate width	adequate width	adequate width but low quality door. Fixtures not working properly.	adequate width	adequate width
	activity corners	small stage for performance 6 activity corners spacious space for 30 students	spacious classroom - able to accommodate activity corners	spacious classroom - able to accommodate activity corners		Spacious classroom (current size 20 – 25 students/class).	Spacious, enough room for activity corners. Murals inside and outside classroom walls.	Adequate space for activity corners.	Standard size, however due to overcapacity of student numbers, classroom size is no longer comfortable. Current class size are 30 to 50 students/class.	spacious
	WASH	toilet/urinal facilities at correct height		toilet/urinal facilities at correct height		No hand washing facility close to student buildings.		Adequate urinal height, adequate varied washbasin height.	Toilets barely meet needs.	
	disability facilities	ramps, disable toilet	no ramp	ramps, disable toilet	Ramps, disable toilet	Ramps has raised edge (approx. 10 cm)	no ramps	ramps, disable toilet	Ramps, 1 disable toilet	no ramps
	DRR	No evidence of DRR measures parents proposed ground levelling to reduce the speed of surface run-off but declined by the contractor (not clear whether UNICEF aware of this request).	no evidence of DRR measures	Flood prone area, no mitigation measures in place. The area is flood prone area and often water logged during heavy rain but no water entering classrooms.	flood prone area, no mitigation measures in place	flood prone area, no mitigation measures in place	No evidence of DRR measure.	Parents cleaned the site before construction and found UXOs. Teachers not sure whether school ground have low risk certificate. No evidence of DRR measure.	No evidence of DRR measure.	No evidence of DRR measure.

SESCAANSL ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

No		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
School Name		Katchilaiamadu G.T.M.S. ¹¹	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam ¹²	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S. ¹³	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	Muruganantha Primary Vidyalayam	Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Kalmadhunagar G.T.M.S.
	furniture	Correct height, comfortable, table dimension enough blackboard at correct height & size, comfortable, easy to read and write. Chair and table comfortable, right size and table wide enough.	Blackboard at correct height and size, comfortable, easy to read and write. Chair and table comfortable, right size and table wide enough.	blackboard at correct height and size, comfortable, easy to read and write	Type 2 (grade 3 – 5). Chair and table comfortable, right size and table wide enough. Blackboard right size and height.	Teachers felt that blackboard no longer suitable; it should be replaced with white board. Teachers want storage facility in classroom to keep student's lunch. Teachers want to have permanent raised stage inside class.	Chair and table comfortable, right size and table wide enough. Blackboard right size and height.	Chairs and table comfortable and the right size. Blackboard the right height and size, easy to write and read.	Blackboard of right size and height.	Chairs and table comfortable and of the right size. Blackboard the right height and size, easy to write and read.
	colour choice by	principal	teachers & parents	principal, teachers, parents, and students	architect	teachers	Students (mural) and teachers.	Principal and contractor	SDS	Don't know
	Electricity or generator	no (school purchase generator)	no	No	No	no	no	No. Electricity available.	no	no
Notes	maintenance	no maintenance budget parents offer free labour for maintenance	no maintenance funding parents contributed to maintenance fund and free labour	parents offer free labour	School received money from WB's quality improvement project LKR 7,000 (principal said that the fund can be used for maintenance).		Using local materials.			Parents volunteer labour.
	Change in teaching learning process		Attendance increased by 50% Attention span increased. Teachers able to display and safely keep teaching aid	Attendance increased. Students are encouraging parents to attend/to be active in school activities (peer	Attendance increased. Students have ownerships of the class/school – more active in maintaining	Student ownerships of classroom high.	Attendance increased. Class activities improved & more varied. Students attitude better.	Too early to tell.	School with good achievement. Attendance increased. School activities increased. Attention span	Student attendance increased. Student's ownerships increased.

SESCAANSL ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

No		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
School Name		Katchilaiaimadu G.T.M.S. ¹¹	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam ¹²	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S. ¹³	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	Muruganantha Primary Vidyalayam	Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Kalmadhunagar G.T.M.S.
			in classroom. Reading and writing capability low but showing indication of increasing level.	pressure). Student initiative to plant flowers and plants.	school. Student's attention/concentration improved. Academic competency improved – reading comprehension and writing.		Hygiene habits better.		increased. Hygiene habit improved.	
	Others	1 stair for 100 students. Parents of primary students taking turns of ensuring safety of students at stairs. Parents proposed to move primary students to ground level but principal did not agree. No emergency exit. No drainage. School fence was in the final drawing but not built. Parents not aware of the reason why it was not constructed.		Wire mesh fence around school was in original drawing but not constructed. Main contractor has not paid sub-contractor. Power points too low, dangerous for small children. No drainage.	Main contractor has not paid sub-contractors (UNICEF explained this is probably because they are withholding 20% of payment). No drainage. School and parents built 2 ft walling to fend off water. Teacher able to display teaching aid. Home science and agriculture labs are used as classrooms.	No water piping. Ground not levelled. Fencing originally designed but changed without information.	Plan to build second floor if funding available.		Windows with glass without grills, teachers feel insecure and afraid that small children could hurt if the glass is broken. Size of the auditorium and the stage are too small for student size. WASH facilities barely met needs. Principal do not use and store goods in new principal and activity rooms, as all windows are covered with glass without grills. Principal and teachers felt that it is not safe to keep schools property in the	Teachers requested: New furniture; Pin board to display students' work without damaging paint job.

SESCAANSI ICR – ETL Response to Comments v2

No		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
School Name		Katchilaiamadu G.T.M.S. ¹¹	Murripu Tamil Vidyalayam ¹²	Mullaitivu R.C.T.M.S. ¹³	Chilawaththai Tamil Vidyalayam	Kallapadu G.T.M.S.	Muruganantha Primary Vidyalayam	Tharmapuram No. 1 G.T.M.S.	Kilinochchi Maha Vidyalayam	Kalmadhunagar G.T.M.S.
									new facility.	
Lessons learned		Temporary Learning Space (TLS) is useful transition area for children to continue education while waiting for the construction to begin and finish. Teachers requesting pinboard to display students work without damaging paint job.								

ANNEX E: Draft Summative Evaluation Plan – October 2013

Australia – Sri Lanka Development Cooperation **Support to the Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka** **(SESCAANSL) - Funded by DFAT and Implemented by UNICEF** **Independent Completion Report, October 2013**

Draft Summative Evaluation Plan – October 2013

Summary

1. DFAT and UNICEF will undertake a joint summative evaluation of Support to The Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka Project implemented by UNICEF and funded by DFAT from June 2011 to June 2013. The evaluation will assess efficiency, effectiveness, lessons learned and relevance of the project. The evaluation will review and analyse what the project has achieved, what has worked, and what did not work and why. This analysis will inform and shape DFAT and UNICEF Sri Lanka current and future programs in education sector post humanitarian response phase. The evaluation will be led by an external consultant, and DFAT and UNICEF will support an impartial and independent process.

Background

2. The long running conflict in Sri Lanka resulted in destruction of infrastructure throughout the Northern Province, including the widespread loss of education facilities through the direct impact of war, lack of maintenance and abandonment. The World Bank estimated in 2009 that as many as 2,000 schools – the bulk of education facilities in the north – were damaged as a result of conflict between 1983 and 2009. Support of the international development community has helped return many schools to a basic, useable state through essential repairs. This includes building Temporary Learning Spaces which provide a basic structure with a roof but no walls.

The Project

3. The activity began as the result of a request from UNICEF in May 2010, for funding for an integrated package of assistance to children affected by conflict. UNICEF was working with the MoE, Provincial authorities and other development/donor actors to identify high priority needs in the north that were not being supported through other means (ie SL Government or donors).

The UNICEF/MoE investigation confirmed that there were key gaps in the education sector particularly relating to the urgent rehabilitation of education facilities, the supply of school furniture, equipment and teaching/learning material.

4. The activity is in line with priorities of the Ministry of Education (MoE) and broader objectives of the Government of Sri Lanka for the recovery of the north and is a part of UNICEF's wider integrated support programme for the return and resettlement of conflict affected children and their families in the Northern Province.
5. This activity is also in line with the Australian Government's strategy to support the stabilisation and recovery of conflict affected communities in the north of Sri Lanka. It contributes to wider DFAT

funded programs implemented through UNICEF (e.g. nutrition, water and sanitation) and other programs that form part of Australia's accelerated aid program to support reconstruction of northern communities.

6. In May 2010, UNICEF launched a humanitarian appeal to fund a three year project (2010 – 2012) titled **UNICEF Integrated Support for the Return and Resettlement of Conflict-Affected Children and Their Families in Sri Lanka's Northern Province (UNICEF Funding Proposal 2010-2012)**. The appeal focused on three main sectors (i) Child Protection, Health and Nutrition, (ii) Education, and (iii) Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene.
7. Later in 2010 UNICEF presented the **Northern Province Education Funding Proposal 2010-2012** to DFAT for funding. The **UNICEF Education Funding Proposal 2010 – 2012** was identical to the original **UNICEF Funding Proposal 2010-2012** but with the components on (i) Child Protection, Health and Nutrition, and (iii) Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene, removed. In response to the UNICEF appeal, DFAT partly funded the education component for the period June 2010 to July 2011 (Phase 1) to the value of AUD3 million to support reconstruction, repair, and refurbishment of three selected schools damaged by the conflict in the northern Kilinochchi district. One of the schools is a large scale secondary school servicing a large area school and the others are more moderately sized.
8. The Education Component in the UNICEF Education Proposal was valued at USD 15,694,500 over the three years 2010 -2012 as set out in Annex 5¹⁴, and reproduced below:

Education				
Items / Activities	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Learning achievement/essential competencies through the Accelerated Learning Programme, teacher and In-service Advisor Training	315,000	315,000	315,000	945,000

Rehabilitation of schools and education structures, construction of semi-permanent learning spaces, and teacher accommodation	1,530,000	3,900,000	3,240,000	8,670,000
Supplies for teaching/learning; school equipment and furniture	2,120,300	1,417,100	1,342,100	4,879,500
Support and training to education system officials to manage transitional/emergency education	50,000	75,000	75,000	200,000
Implementation of Child Friendly School approach in 100 schools through training of school communities on school-based management	20,000	40,000	40,000	100,000
Technical support	300,000	300,000	300,000	900,000
Subtotal Education	4,335,300	6,047,100	5,312,100	15,694,500

9. The proposed UNICEF interventions at the Division level are described in Section 3.3 of the UNICEF proposal

PACKAGE OF INTERVENTIONS AT DS DIVISION AND COMMUNITY LEVEL

Education Infrastructure Rehabilitation and Equipment

- Repair/rehabilitation of 100 schools through:
 - Construction of 100 semi-permanent learning spaces. Each learning space can accommodate approximately five classrooms. As permanent rehabilitation will take

¹⁴ UNICEF Integrated Support for the Return and Resettlement of Conflict-Affected Children and Their Families in Sri Lanka's Northern Province, Funding Proposal 2010 – 2012, UNICEF Sri Lanka (undated)

- time, these temporary spaces are necessary in the first phase of the programme to ensure learning to continue; and
 - Repair/rehabilitation of schools: replacing roofs, rebuilding classrooms walls and windows etc.
- Construction and support for clustered teacher accommodation facilities (one teacher accommodation building serving a group of schools) benefiting 5,000 teachers.
- Distribution of teaching and learning kits, classroom teaching/learning equipment (mobile science labs, furniture, blackboards, visual aids, games, and teaching aids) to targeted schools in resettlement areas.
- Support for transportation of teachers and students (e.g. bicycles, motorized vehicles) to ensure reasonable access to schools.

10. In February 2011 a comprehensive multi-sectoral assessment of the immediate needs in the Northern Province during 2011 was jointly undertaken by the GoSL, the UN agencies, national and international NGOs, international organisations. The assessment was reported in the **Joint Plan for Assistance (JPA) for the Northern Province – 2011**. UNICEF and the Government of Sri Lanka, principally the Northern Province Ministry of Education, conducted the assessment of the education needs which was included in the JPA. The assessment concluded that 347 schools in the Province needed priority rehabilitation ranging from minor repairs to full construction. Given that during 2010 the sector was able to fully address the needs of 118 schools and pre-schools the report concluded that a realistic target for 2011 would be the repair of 150 schools. The Government of Sri Lanka lacks the capacity to renovate the facilities. The rehabilitation of schools is important in order to provide children with the opportunity to return to schools and regain a sense of normalcy after many years of displacement.

11. In response to the findings of the JPA assessment, and based on the success of the first phase and positive feedback from the Government of Sri Lanka and local communities', on 4 May 2011 a **Contribution Agreement**¹⁵ was prepared between DFAT and UNICEF for a further AUD 5.0 million for Phase 2 for additional education sector assistance to cover the twelve month period to 4 May 2012. The "Project Document" to which the additional funding refers is provided at Attachment A of the Contribution Agreement. The "Project Document" does not follow standard DFAT format being only 1.5 pages in length. The education sector "Activities", "Outcomes" and "Budget" from the project document are provided below:

Activities

- Construction / rehabilitation and repair of 30 schools
- Supply of furniture for 10,000 children and 500 teachers
- Provide student stationery for 100,000 children
- Support to strengthen capacity of teachers and education staff under the Child Friendly Schools approach for effective delivery of services
- Supply of essential teaching and learning aids to improve the learning environment

Outcomes

- 100,000 children access education within a conducive learning environment leading to improved learning achievement
- Teachers, principals and education personnel in targeted function effectively with improved essential capacity to implement education programs

¹⁵ Contribution Agreement (DFAT Agreement Number 59321) between DFAT and UNICEF, for AUD 5.0 million, signed by UNICEF 4 May 2011. The Agreement completion date was specified as 4 May 2012. The copy of the CA sighted has not been signed by the DFAT delegate.

United Nations Children's Fund	
Original BUDGET items	\$
School Construction / Rehabilitation	2,400,000
Capacity building and skills development	250,000
Supplies and equipment	800,000
Technical support and operation	520,000
Total	3,970,000

12. DFAT provided additional funding of AUD 2.1 million between July 2011 to 31 July 2013 bringing up the contribution to AUD10.1 million over three years, representing approximately 70% of funding needs identified in the UNICEF Northern Province Education Proposal . The UNICEF education support is focussed on Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu districts of the conflict-affected Northern Province.
13. The project proposed to rehabilitate schools to nationally accepted Child Friendly Schools (CFS) standard providing access to quality learning for children in the North, this is in line with the priority of and is supported by Ministry of Education, Cultural Affairs and Sports – Northern Province, Northern Provincial and Zonal Departments of Education. School reconstruction was expected to contribute to broader stabilisation in northern communities. For example, safe, durable schools were considered an essential service for internally displaced people to return to their communities. Re-opening of schools was expected to encourage teachers to return. It was also thought that the reconstructions work would build community confidence and bring students, teachers and parents together in a constructive way.
14. By the end of July 2013, DFAT funding will have supported the school construction project to rehabilitate or construct or repair 24 schools (3¹⁶ schools in Phase 1 and 21¹⁷ schools in Phase 2) and education structures compliant with Child Friendly School (CFS) requirements. All 24 schools have been completed and handed over to the MoE.
15. The CFS requirements, which also includes adequate WATSAN facilities, adequate facilities for children with disabilities, and adherence to Disaster Risk Reduction standards, will enable at least 10,000 marginalised and conflict-affected children in the north to access education within a conducive learning environment and benefit from safe and durable education facilities leading to improved learning achievement.
16. UNICEF was responsible for the management of all phases of the school reconstruction and rehabilitation program which included: site assessment, preparation of drawings and specification for final school designs, tendering, contracting of sub-contractors, supervision of construction contractors and supervising engineers, maintenance of quality standards, procurement of furniture and equipment, and hand-over, and management of corrective/remedial work if required during six month rectification period.
17. Engineering consultants to prepare the detailed school designs and provide supervision of the construction contractors were also engaged and managed by UNICEF.
18. Ten of the 21 Phase 2 schools required only minor rehabilitation works and in these schools the School Development Societies (DS) managed the rehabilitation supervised by the MoE District engineers, and oversighted by UNICEF.

¹⁶ QAI 2012

¹⁷ UNICEF Progress Report CY2012

Evaluation Purpose and Objectives

19. In accordance with DFAT quality processes and the DAC standards, DFAT undertakes independent completion evaluation / reviews (ICR) to assess the achievements of their programs. The evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, and sustainability of project implementation. Assessment will include, but not limited to, value for money, quality of implementation and the construction, as well as compliance to the child friendly school requirements and standards set by the Government of Sri Lanka. Lessons learned from the evaluation will inform future programming in the education sector and potential future cooperation with UNICEF in other sectors (e.g. health)?
20. The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:
 - i. evaluate the extent to which SESCAANSL achieved its objectives;
 - ii. assess whether the schools were constructed to meet CFS and the other specified requirements;
 - iii. assess the quality of the school construction;
 - iv. assess the appropriateness of the delivery approach for the context ;
 - v. assess whether overall project represents value for money in the re-construction of schools
 - vi. Provide lessons learned and recommendations that will inform and shape future programming in the education sector

Scope of Evaluation

21. The evaluation will take due account of, and be consistent with, DFAT and UNICEF's relevant quality standards and procedures for evaluations. In consultation with relevant stakeholders (Northern Province Department of Education, District Education Offices, Zonal Education Offices, Principals, Teachers, Parents, Students, DFAT and UNICEF), the evaluation will examine a selection of the 24 schools that were fully or partially reconstructed from the start of the project in May 2010 to finish on the 31st July 2013 against the following evaluation criteria: effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, lessons learned and relevance.
22. The evaluation will not look at impact as it is too early to evaluate the longer term effects of the school construction. The evaluation will identify and draw out lessons on what has and what has not worked and the implications to inform future programming. Evaluation will also consider whether there are any lasting outcomes of the project and if the school construction meets CFS requirements along gender, equity, social inclusion (including disability), and Disaster Risk Reduction criteria.
23. As the project was part of a humanitarian response to support post conflict recovery in the Northern Province during a time of large internal migration (that continues today as livelihood's improve), there may be limited comparable quantitative data for the evaluation. Usable quantitative data at the targeted schools is likely to be limited to total student and teacher participation before displacement due to the conflict compared to the first day of the school re-

opened and/or when the school was selected for reconstruction/repair. Many targeted schools may also have data on changes in student attendance pre- and post-conflict. In this regard, the evaluation is expected to use limited quantitative data and rely mostly on qualitative data collection gained from stakeholder interviews and field visits at the 24 targeted schools.

24. Due to the urgency of the need, unlike normal bilateral activities where a project design document (PDD) is prepared, an activity goal, objectives and outcomes were not specified nor was an M&E plan developed and implemented. An Activity Completion report has not been prepared. Instead, the activity was documented through a series of exchanges of documents containing broad education sector needs assessments rather project-specific targets.

Standard Evaluation Criteria

25. DFAT has adopted a series of evaluation questions for the ICR (and other evaluations) based on the DAC evaluation framework. The Team will provide ratings using the recommended six point method to the evaluation criteria¹⁸, guided by, but not be limited to, the questions and considerations outlined below:

A. Effectiveness

- Were the schools constructed to meet the CFS requirements? This should include the following questions:
 - o Whether School Management Committee involved in and influenced the selection of schools, design of the school, and supervision during construction process?
 - o Were Disaster Risk Reduction measures and disability inclusion considered in the schools construction design? and
 - o Were gender differences considered in the school design and were men and women (boys and girls) included in decision making processes?
 - o To what level did men and women (boys and girls) participate in the decision making around school selection, design, and construction?
- What is the likelihood of sustainability?
 - o How is the SDS engaged in the program? Is there any contribution from the local community/SDS to the program?
- What was the quality of the outputs particularly the infrastructures component – are they durable and low operation and maintenance?
- To what extent is the design of the schools appropriate?
 - o How was the design done?
 - o Does the design use appropriate technology?
 - o Has there been analysis on the design of the old schools and the extent to which the new designs adapts the best features of the old design?

¹⁸ Ratings are:

Satisfactory		Less than satisfactory	
6	Very high quality	3	Less than adequate quality
5	Good quality	2	Poor quality
4	Adequate quality	1	Very poor quality

- Is the balance between the design and cost for operational and maintenance right?

B. Efficiency

- Did the overall project represent value for money in the construction of schools?
- To what extent was the bidding and procurement processes undertaken in an efficient and transparent manner, representing value for money?
- Was the delivery approach, including the selection of schools, monitoring and engagement of stakeholders, including school management committees the 'best fit' for the context?
- Was the project completed on time/on schedule and was their sufficient capacity of GoSL, UNICEF and DFAT to address major issues/challenges that arose during the duration of the project?
- How effective was the program's monitoring and evaluation arrangement?
 - Whether the program's governance arrangements, balance between technical and managerial oversight is right?
- Did the implementation make effective use of time and resources to achieve the objective?
 - Was the program designed for optimal value for money?
 - Whether the sub-contracting arrangements are appropriate?
 - Was the balance on the division of roles and responsibility among UNICEF, DFAT and Implementation team right?
- Was risk monitoring and management integrated into design and implementation?

C. Relevance

- Does the project align with the policies and strategies of DFAT, GoSL and UNICEF?
- Has the project been responsive to changes in the priorities of DFAT, UNICEF, and the GOSL to maintain its relevance over the Program life?
- Were the objectives and expected outcomes of the Program appropriate and do they still remain relevant?
- How has the SESCAANSL contributed to GOSL's overall school reconstruction program in Northern Province following to the end of the conflict?

D. Sustainability

- What is the quality of the school construction?
- Has the Government and/or School Management Committee developed an Operation and Maintenance plan for newly rehabilitated/constructed school to indicate the likelihood of long-term sustainable returns on the investment.
- Is there a maintenance schedule and appropriate budget available?

E. Lessons learned

- Lessons learned from UNICEF's working modalities and approach and relationship with government for large and small school construction. Is it an appropriate model, if not, why not? What could be more effective mechanisms based on other experience? Are there things that could have been done differently?
- Is there synergy between this project and other DFAT funded education project (WASH, BESP and CFEP)? Does the synergy make a difference?

- What was the outcome of community engagement in the reconstruction program? What lessons can be learned from the approach?

F. Lasting Outcomes (lower priority, only if the information is available)

- How the project has influenced improved access to education for boys and girls and increased capacity of teachers to deliver quality education.
- Were there any changes brought about by the project and are there any unintended positive/negative influence of the project? What are they? And why and how did it happen?
- To what extent have the program outcomes improved and/or achieved gender equality, including access, benefits and decision making?
- What was the reach and coverage of key program deliverables (number and type of beneficiaries – e.g. students, vulnerable groups including people with disabilities?)

Evaluation Issues

26. Following are some key issues emanating from the document review which the evaluation team should address:

- i) No clear statement of outcomes. None of the documentation reviewed provided a clear statement of the outcomes planned for Phases 1 and 2 of the activity and many documents reported different numbers of schools rehabilitated. There are also many references to “Child Friendly Schools” and “Building back better” but the specifics of the application of these concepts to the actual rehabilitated schools is not explicitly stated and will need to be further investigated during the school visits.
- ii) There is a need to clarify the scope of Phases 1 and 2 to be evaluated by the ICR Team. Latest documentation suggests that DFAT has funded 3 schools in Phase1¹⁹ and 21 schools in Phase 2²⁰ which gives a total of 24 schools. There will also need to justify the changes in scope from the numbers of schools agreed during the funding negotiations - 5 schools in Phase 1 and 30 schools in Phase 2 ie a total of 35 schools – with the actual number of schools delivered (24). In Phase 2, other activities, as indicated in paragraph 11 above, were proposed in the UNICEF scope of works and it must be clarified if these are to be assessed as part of the ICR evaluation.

Evaluation Stakeholders

27. The primary stakeholders for this evaluation are the management of UNICEF and the senior managers of DFAT in Colombo and Canberra. This analysis will inform and shape DFAT and UNICEF Sri Lanka current and future programs in education sector post humanitarian response phase.
28. The analysis and lessons learned, particularly on value for money aspects (especially relative to other implementation modalities considered) and the DFAT resources needed to manage the most cost effective modalities, will contribute to the review and further development of processes for DFAT to improve the effectiveness of future post-disaster recovery assistance within Sri Lanka and, possibly, in other countries.

Evaluation Limitations

29. As with all evaluations it is not cost-effective to have an extended period in the field or for analysis. Consequently it will only be possible to visit a representative sample of the 24 constructed schools.

¹⁹ QAI 2013 Report

²⁰ UNICEF Progress Report CY2012

It is proposed to visit 1 of the 3 schools constructed under Phase 1 and 8 of the 21 schools constructed under Phase 2, half from each of the two focus districts, Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu. In each District three schools with major construction works undertaken by a construction contractor will be visited and one school with minor construction works implemented by the School Development Committee (SDS), with support from UNICEF and the District, will be inspected.

30. As different construction contractors were used for most of the schools this will enable the ICR team to assess differences in construction quality, supervision and monitoring and contractor management issues. Visits to the minor construction sites will provide information on the effectiveness and appropriateness of this approach.
31. As construction of all of the schools to be visited will have been completed at the time of the inspections the assessment of the quality of construction can inevitably only be superficial, limited to a visual inspection of accessible areas. However maximum use will be made of available construction documentation, records and photographs to form a judgement as to whether the buildings were constructed to an acceptable standard and in accordance with the approved drawings and specification.

ICR Team

32. DFAT and UNICEF will undertake a joint summative evaluation of the Project. The evaluation will be led by an external consultant, and DFAT and UNICEF will support an impartial and independent process.
33. DFAT contracted one independent consultant to undertake and lead the ICR:

Andrew Whillas Infrastructure specialist

Implementation, Management and Reporting

34. DFAT and UNICEF representatives will jointly manage the evaluation. In UNICEF terminology, this is called as Evaluation Management Team (EMT). The EMT will provide oversight and management of the evaluation in consultation with the evaluation team on the evaluation processes and findings. The EMT This committee will be supported by the Reference Group. Full details of the DFAT and UNICEF Evaluation Management Team and Reference Group including membership and tasks is provided at **Annex 1**.
35. The Government of Sri Lanka and other stakeholders will be consulted during the evaluation process and, where appropriate, and will be the key source of information for the evaluation. Along with UNICEF and DFAT Sri Lanka office, both parties, in UNICEF terminology, perform the role of a stakeholder reference group.
36. The in country mission will be undertaken during the period 7 -18 October 2013. A **Summary of Evaluation Process and Outputs** with a timeline is presented **Table 1**. The proposed Field visit to Northern Province to inspect a sample of the 24 reconstructed schools will take place during the period 7 – 11 October 2013. The proposed **Field Visit and Stakeholder Meeting schedule** is provided at **Table 2**.
37. The evaluation report will be drafted in accordance with DFAT's guidelines on ICR preparation.

Guidelines for the **Summative Evaluation Report (ICR)** are presented in **Annex 4**.

Evaluation Approach

38. The evaluation team will use a consultative process to obtain the views of all stakeholders. This will be complemented with some structured data obtained from UNICEF, DFAT and from the school sites visited.

Data Collection

39. In the Field

The field activities will include visits to 9 of the 24 schools completed in Phases 1 and 2.

The main tools will be observations of the completed schools using a construction assessment form to compare, to the extent possible, the actual situation with that shown on the as-built drawings and in the operation and maintenance manuals and focus group and key informant discussions (FGD) with stakeholders²¹, particularly the school staff and SDS members, students and parents and Zonal Education Office officials. Where possible, local people who worked on the construction will also be consulted.

In addition, contact will be made with District and Provincial level managers of the Education Department responsible for the reconstruction program.

40. Other Data

The Program has interacted with many different groups involved in the education sector in the conflict zone and in implementing the construction program. These include other donors and the multi-lateral banks, international and local NGOs and the supervising consulting engineers and construction contractors.

41. Additional Data Requirements

The main outstanding information / reports outstanding are:

- (i) Listing (in MS Word or Excel format) of the schools (both Phase 1 and Phase 2) the in program, with details of start and finish dates, budget and full scope of works, design drawings, specifications and actual costs.
- (ii) Construction quality assurance records and photographs; As-built drawings; and maintenance manuals.
- (iii) Documentation relating to the procurement processes used.
- (iv) Information on use of the schools pre and post reconstruction

It is expected that items (i) -(iii) will be able to be viewed at UNICEF Offices in Kilinochichi and Colombo.

42. Key Informants

²¹ The ICR team acknowledges that group meetings will be difficult to organise but expect to be able to interview key informants at all sites.

Table 3 below sets out the main groups / organisations to be contacted and the main areas to be discussed with them. In all cases, they will be asked for their assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, gender aspects and impact of the activities and any lessons that should be incorporated in future activities. More detailed lists of questions for assessing the construction aspects and for use in the school level discussions are provided in **Annexes 2 and 3**.

Table 3 : Key Stakeholders and Discussion Points

Group	Main issues
School staff, teachers, students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interaction with UNICEF during planning, design and construction stages. • Interaction with Zonal, district, provincial and central education management. • Appropriateness of the design and Fitness-for-purpose of the facilities • Quality of construction • Availability of budgets for maintenance.
School Development Societies (SDS) and Parents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interaction with UNICEF and education department staff during planning, design and construction stages. • Interaction with Zonal, district, provincial and central education management. • Appropriateness of the design and Fitness-for-purpose of the facilities • Reconstruction approach – via SDS or construction contractor. • Quality of construction • Availability of budgets for maintenance.
Construction contractors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship with UNICEF and the engineering and supervision consultants • Appropriateness of the school designs and specifications in a post-conflict disaster reconstruction environment • Site preparation arrangements • The use of local unskilled labour for construction • Economies/ benefits (or otherwise) of splitting construction contracts between several contractors • Impact of the conflict on the prices and availability of materials, labour and equipment. Impact on post versus pre-conflict construction costs • QA of construction and procurement processes
Local materials suppliers and contractors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interaction with construction contractor • Impact of the conflict on the prices and availability of materials, labour

Table 3 : Key Stakeholders and Discussion Points

Group	Main issues
	and equipment
Engineering Design and monitoring consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working relationship with UNICEF • Working relationships and the construction contractors • Interaction with schools • View on school designs and construction standards • Value added through use of monitoring consultants
Province/ District / Zonal School administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ownership of planning and implementation processes – involvement at each stage of implementation • Coordination of donor activities and matching GOSL agency priorities • Site allocation (criteria and prioritisation) and preparation • Interaction with UNICEF technical and sector planning staff • Inputs to planning process and responsiveness of UNICEF to proposals • Allocation of funding for equipment, furniture and other items lost in the conflict • Availability of operational budgets for (staff, utilities, etc.) and maintenance budgets for the rehabilitated schools • Comparison of contracted and SDS reconstruction with other modalities • Comparison with GOSL and other donor funded reconstruction activities (district / village level school and health centres)
Other education sector relief agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities in Northern Province of other relief agencies such as Plan International, Save the Children, IMC and Mercy Corps • Balance of resources allocated to direct field activities such as WASH and reconstruction / re-equipping of schools • Coordination of donor activities and matching GOSL agency priorities
DFAT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale for using UNICEF rather than other modalities such as managing contractor • Impacts for management of not having a PDD – advantages and disadvantages • Involvement and contribution of counterpart organisations eg MoE • Experience from other similar disaster and non-disaster health and education reconstruction processes including DFAT management

Table 3 : Key Stakeholders and Discussion Points

Group	Main issues
	<p>inputs and relative MC costs eg Tsunami</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience from reconstruction activities at community level in other sectors, particularly the health sector • UNICEF responsiveness and performance • Value-for-money of the approach • Lessons learned - what has worked, and what did not work and why.
Ministry of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry policies related to school construction including Child Friendly Schools • DFAT and UNICEF's approach compared with MoE's normal construction practices and approaches of other Partners (eg USAID) • Ownership of planning and implementation processes • UNICEF and DFAT responsiveness • Satisfaction with processes and outputs of project – suggestions for improvements • Experience from other similar disaster school reconstruction activities eg Tsunami
UNICEF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFAT responsiveness, inputs and supervision/management processes • Appropriateness of planning and implementation processes • Impacts for management of not having a detailed project design document – advantages and disadvantages • Contributions and interest of national and provincial/district and zonal level education agencies • How did UNICEF ensure that MoE standards, Child Friendly School standards, and DFAT standards such as Disaster Risk Reduction, Disability Inclusive Design, non-use of asbestos, etc were appropriately incorporated into the school designs? • Assessment of contracted reconstruction activities compared to other construction modalities • Comparison of design and construction approaches on DFAT project compared with experience with other donors • Cost-effectiveness of approach- delivered unit costs, management and administrative costs • Lessons learned from project - what has worked, and what did not

Table 3 : Key Stakeholders and Discussion Points

Group	Main issues
	work and why
Other Reconstruction Donors (USAID, etc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectiveness of contractor based or other reconstruction modalities Management and supervision costs of contractor based reconstruction systems

Table 1: Summary of Evaluation Process and Outputs

No	Task	Location	Approximate duration	No of days (up to)	Output	Format	Due by
1	Document review & development of summative evaluation plan	Home based	23 September – 1 October 2013	3	Summative Evaluation Plan	Word document Max. 10 pages	Tuesday 1 October 2013 (first draft)
2	Travelling to Sri Lanka		5 or 6 October 2013	1			
3	In-Country mission	Sri Lanka	7 – 17 October 2013	10			
	<i>Meet with DFAT & UNICEF for in-country briefing and finalisation of summative evaluation plan</i>		<i>7 October 2013</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Final Summative Evaluation Plan</i>	<i>Word document Max. 10 pages</i>	<i>7 October 2013</i>
	<i>Field visit</i>		<i>8 – 11 October 2013</i>	<i>4</i>			
	<i>Colombo: - meetings - Aide Memoire write up</i>		<i>14 – 16 October 2013</i>	<i>3</i>			
	<i>Aide Memoire presentation</i>		<i>17 October 2013</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Aide Memoire (see Attachment 1)</i>		<i>17 October 2013</i>
4	Leaving Sri Lanka		19 October 2013				
5	Aide Memoire finalisation	Home based	21 – 25 October 2013	1	Final Aide Memoire incorporating DFAT, UNICEF and stakeholder comments provided during the presentation	Word document Max 5 pages	25 October 2013
6	Summative Evaluation report write up	Home based	21 – 1 November 2013	5	First draft of Summative Evaluation Report (see Attachment 2)	Word document Max 20 pages, excluding annexes	21 November 2013

No	Task	Location	Approximate duration	No of days (up to)	Output	Format	Due by
7	finalisation of summative evaluation report	Home based	14 – 30 November 2013	4	Final Summative Evaluation Report	Word document Max 20 pages, excluding annexes	By 30 November 2013

Table 2: Field visit and stakeholder meeting schedule (DRAFT)
DFAT / UNICEF Construction Evaluation in the North
7 – 17 October 2013

C) Field visit agenda (7 – 11 October)

Visit to schools and meeting with stakeholders in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu

Time	Activity /Location	Responsible persons / accompanied by
Monday, 07 October 2013		
09.00 – 8.10	Meeting the team at Palaly Airport	Prakash (Head of Zone Office - HoZ), Karthi (Karthikeyini – Education Officer)
09.10 – 9.40	Travelling to visit Secretary's office, Ministry of Education, Cultural Affairs and Sports, Jaffna	
09.40 – 11.10	Meeting with Secretary, Ministry of Education, Cultural Affairs and Sports	Karthi, Chryshanthan (Construction Engineer), Thaya (Thayaparan – WASH Officer)
11.10 – 11.40	Travelling to Provincial Education Office, Northern Province, Jaffna	
11.40 – 13.10	Discussion with Provincial Education team	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya
13.10 – 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 – 15.30	Travelling to the UNICEF office Kilinochchi	
15.30 – 15.45	Refreshing break at the office	
15.45 – 17.30	Discussion / meeting with UNICEF staff (Collective / Individual)	HoZ / Education and WASH colleagues
17.30	Check in at the Hotel	
Tuesday, 08 October 2013		
07.30 – 08.30	Travelling to Katchilaimadhu GTMS (government Tamil Mixed School)	Zarook (Abdul Zarook – Education Officer, KZO)
08.30 – 10.30	Visit at Mu/Katchilaimadhu GTMS	Zarook, Chryshanthan, Radika (WASH Officer)
10.30 – 11.00	Travelling to Murippu GTMS	
11.00 – 13.30	Visit at Mu/Murippu GTMS	Zarook, Chryshanthan, Thaya / Radika
13.30 – 14.00	Lunch (At school)	Vigna for packed lunch
14.00 – 15.00	Travelling to ZEO, Thunukkai	
15.00 – 16.30	Discussion at Zonal Education Office (ZEO) with ZEO team, Thunukkai ZEO team composed of Zonal Director of Education, Technical Officer, Accountant and Asst. Director of Education Development)	Zarook / ZDE and team
16.30 – 17.30	Travelling back to Kilinochchi	Zarook
17.30	Check in at Hotel	Zarook
Wednesday, 09 October 2013		
07.00 – 08.30	Travelling to Mullaitivu	Karthi
08.30 – 10.30	Visit at Mu/Mullaitivu RCTMS (Roman Catholic Tamil Mixed School)	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya / Radika
10.30 – 10.45	Travelling (Refreshment)	
10.45 – 13.00	Visit at Mu/Silawaththai HBTMS (Hindu Tamil Mixed School)	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya / Radika
13.00 – 13.30	Lunch (At school)	Vigna for packed lunch

Time	Activity /Location	Responsible persons / accompanied by
13.30 – 14.00	Travelling to ZEO, Mullaitivu	
14.00 – 14.45	Discussion at Zonal Education Office (ZEO) with ZEO team, Mullaitivu. ZEO team composed of Zonal Director of Education, Technical Officer, Accountant and Asst. Director of Education Development)	Karthi, ZDE and Team
14.45 – 15.00	Travelling to District Secretariat, Mullaitivu	
15.00 – 15.30	Discussion with GA, Mullaitivu	HoZ,
15.30 – 17.00	Travelling back to Kilinochchi	
17.00	Check in at Hotel	Karthi
Thursday, 10 October, 2013		
07.30 – 08.00	Travelling to Kilinochchi Muruganatha Primary school	Karthi
08.00 – 10.30	Visit at Kn/Muruganantha Primary school	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya / Radika
10.30 – 11.00	Travelling (Refreshment)	
11.00 – 13.00	Visit at Kn/Tharmapuram GTMS	Karthi, Chryshanthan, Thaya / Radika
13.00 – 13.30	Lunch (At school)	Vigna for packed lunch
13.30 – 14.15	Travelling to ZEO, Kilinochchi	Karthi
14.15 – 15.45	Discussion at Zonal Education Office (ZEO) with ZEO team, Kilinochchi ZEO team composed of Zonal Director of Education, Technical Officer, Accountant and Asst. Director of Education Development)	Karthi, ZDE and team
15.45 – 16.00	Travelling to UNICEF Kilinochchi Office	
16.00 – 17.30	Discussion with local contractor	HoZ / Chryshanthan
17.30	Check in at Hotel	
Friday, 11 October, 2013		
7.30 – 8.00	Travelling to Vivekanantha school, Kilinochchi	
8.00 - 10.00	Visit at Kn/Vivekanantha Primary Vidyalayam	Karthi / Thaya / Chryshanthan
10.00 – 10.15	Travelling to Kilinochchi MV	
10.15 – 12.15	Visit at Kn/Kilinochchi MV (Maha Vidyalayam)	Karthi / Thaya / Chryshanthan
12.15 – 13.00	Lunch	
13.00 – 14.00	Traveling to Palaly airport	

A-1) School Categories:

- Major construction – budget range from SLR 70 to 100 Mn

4) Kn/Vivekanantha Primary school , Kilinochchi

5) Kn/Kilinochchi MV (Maha Vidyalayam). Kilinochchi

6) Mu/Katchilaimadhu GTMS (Government Tamil Mixed School), Mullaitivu

- Medium level construction – budget range from SLR 40 to 70 Mn

5) Kn/Tharmapuram GTMS, Kilinochchi

- 6) Mu/Mullaitivu RCTMS, Mullaitivu
- 7) Mu/Silawatthai HBTMS, Mullaitivu – school that was complained
 - Minor level construction – budget range from SLR 10 Mn and below
- 3) Kn/Muruganandha Primary, Kilinochchi
- 4) Mu/Murippu TV (Tamil Vidyalayam), Mullaitivu

A-2) School selection criteria:

- Representing three zones (Kilinochchi, Thunukkai and Mullaitivu) and two districts (Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu); 4 from each district
- Include type I, II and III schools
- Student population – include all size (small, medium and big)
- Minimize travel time during school visits.

D) Stakeholder meetings in Colombo (14 – 17 October)

14.10.2013 Monday

13:30 – 15:00 – Meeting with Stanley, Supply Officer, UNICEF

15:00 – 16:30 – Meeting at Education section, UNICEF Colombo

15.10.2013 Tuesday

9:00 – 10:30 – Meeting with Malini Fernando, Director School Works Branch at Ministry of Education (TBC)

11:00 – 13:00 – Meeting with Rasika, UNICEF (TBC)

14:30 – 16:00 – Meeting at Construction Company in Colombo (TBC)

16.10.2013 Wednesday (Public Holiday)

17.10.2013 Thursday

9:00 am – Aide memoire presentation by the consultant at UNICEF

ANNEX 1

DFAT and UNICEF Evaluation Management Team and Reference Group - Membership and Tasks

Evaluation Management Team (EMT)

Membership:

- DFAT (Co-chair) Janelle Denton, Second Secretary (DFAT nominee)
- UNICEF Country Representative (Co-chair) - Antonia De Meo, Deputy Representative UNICEF (OIC Rep)
- DFAT Officer – Rani Noerhadhie, Senior Program Officer
- Evaluation Specialist, DFAT – Jacinta Overs, South Asia Performance and Quality Manager
- Evaluation Specialist - Indra Tudawe, UNICEF
- External subject matter specialist - TBD
- Government partner – Northern Province Secretary of Education
- External evaluation Specialist (where needed)

Tasks:

- Agree on the key questions, focus and scope to be addressed by the evaluation at the onset.
- Formally establish a stakeholder reference group.
- Endorse the terms of reference, which meets United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) standards.
- Endorse selection of consultants.
- Endorse evaluation plan.
- Endorse summative evaluation final report ensuring the inputs from the reference group are included.
- Finalise management response with the program implementers.
- Upload the Evaluation and Management report within specified time framework to global website.
- Ensure that the management response is fully implemented.

Evaluation Reference Group

Membership

- DFAT (Co-chair) – Rani Noerhadhie, Senior Program Officer
- UNICEF Evaluation Specialist (Co-Chair) – Indra Tudawe, UNICEF
- DFAT Officer – Dilhari Pathirana, Senior Program Officer
- UNICEF Monitoring Officer – Keshani Hiranthika -
- UNICEF Education Officer - Arulrajah Sriskandarajah
- UNICEF Chief of Field Office – Prakash Tuladhar
- Government counterpart of the initiative – Provincial Director Planning (government nomination)
- External subject matter Expert – TBD

Tasks:

- Finalise TOR which meets United National Evaluation Guidelines (UNEG) standards and DFAT evaluation standards for submission to EMT for endorsement.
- Identify consultants and submit to EMT for endorsement.
- Establish clear Management arrangements from the outset including evaluation plan for EMT endorsement.
- Endorse evaluation design and methods with consultant evaluators.
- Endorse tools and instruments to be used in evaluation.

- Accompany consultant on field visits if needed.
- Provide final comments on the Draft Final Report submitted to EMT.
- Final report ratified and submitted to EMT, where recommendations are rejected or only partially accepted, the rationale should be noted.

DFAT Independent Consultant /Team Leader - Terms of Reference

(a) Independent consultant (Team Leader)

The Consultant is responsible for:

- Development of the Evaluation Plan.
- Leading the evaluation process in accordance with the TOR through assessment of documentations, and discussions with partners.
- Work in cooperation with UNICEF team
- Write up and present Aid Memoir of early findings to the Stakeholder Reference Group
- Finalisation of aide memoire.
- Writing the draft Summative Evaluation Report and incorporate comments in the report at the consultant's discretion.
- Finalisation of Summative Evaluation Report. The Team Leader will have the independence of deciding the result of the evaluation.

UNICEF evaluation team (as part of the reference group):

- Provide input to the development of the evaluation plan
- Participate in the overall evaluation process
- Provide information and data as needed and input to the evaluation process
- Provide input to the write up and assist the team leader in the presentation of the aide memoire and early findings to the stakeholder reference group.
- Provide input to the summative evaluation report

Expertise specification:

19. The Team Leader would be expected to meet the following minimum requirements:

Essential:

- At least 10 years of development experience.
- Having the experience of reviewing and evaluating education sector and construction project in humanitarian assistance context.
- Knowledge of school construction, education sector, humanitarian assistance.

Desirable

- Preferably have engineering background.
- South Asia contextual knowledge, preferably Sri Lanka.
- Knowledge of Sri Lanka government system.
- Familiar with UN agencies ways of working, preferably UNICEF.
- Familiar with DFAT program and policies.

Annex 2 Draft of Construction Related Information To Be Collected

1. What consultation was there with staff and other stakeholders during the reconstruction process, from planning, design, and during construction by UNICEF, the District Education Office, the Contractor, and Supervising Consulting Engineer?
2. Comparison of original schools design with reconstructed schools:
 - (a) Numbers students and teachers before and after construction disaggregated by gender
 - (b) Functioning SDS
 - (c) Physical; area, scope, functional layout, number of rooms, equipment, toilets, WASH facilities, date of construction, etc.
 - (d) Reasons for any significant differences between original and reconstructed schools
 - (e) Child Friendly School (CFS) features incorporated into the reconstructed schools. Compare with original school. CFS features not incorporated and why?
3. Basic documentation for reconstructed school; scope; key dates for each stage of implementation; final costs for preparatory works; design, supervision and construction; names of responsible entities.
4. Review of completeness of As-built drawings and Operation and Maintenance manuals.
5. Evidence of certification of designs for compliance with Sri Lankan Standards, Codes and Building regulations
6. Evidence that the school was constructed reasonably in accordance with the approved design eg QA records, use of non-ACM materials etc.
7. Spot-checks, to the extent possible, of key aspects of the completed schools against the as-built drawings. Comment on the scope, safety, quality and durability of the completed structures.
8. Check for compliance with GoA policies on; use of ACMs; disability access; use of sustainably harvested timber, Disaster risk reduction; etc.
9. Training of staff in operation and maintenance;
10. Staff assessments of functionality of new versus old schools; improvements and disadvantages.
 - Are the facilities suitable for their intended purposes?
 - Are there any issues with the quality of construction?
 - Have there been any maintenance issues?
 - What is the best and worst aspect of the new facilities?
 - Any suggestions for improvements
11. Use of appropriate technology. Are the skills for the maintenance of the structure, and any furniture provided, available locally?
12. What arrangements have been made for use of the school in a future emergency situation? Is there an emergency generator, water supply, communications, etc.?

Annex 3: Areas to be discussed with Community Level Stakeholders

1. What consultation was there with SDS and or staff and other stakeholders during the reconstruction process, from planning, design, and during construction by UNICEF, the District Education Office, the Contractor, and Supervising Consulting Engineer?

SDS²² Model for Minor rehabilitation works

2. What is the membership (title and gender) of the SDS ?
3. Briefly describe the repair works undertaken by the SDS.
4. Was the SDS given the choice of managing the repairs themselves versus UNICEF contracting the works out? Was the SDS involved in the decision to contract or use the SDS?
5. Did UNICEF undertake any form of assessment of the capacity of the SDS to undertake the repair works prior to providing the funding?
6. Who did the drawings and specification and budget estimates for the repair works?
7. What type of written agreement (eg Block Grant Agreement) was there between the SDS and UNICEF to undertake the works. Is the agreement clear, appropriate and fair?
8. Was the SDS or the school community required to make any contribution to the rehabilitation works?
9. Was the SDS adequately briefed on the scope of works and the output quality required, including bans on the use of ACMs?
10. Did school/SDS staff have previous experience in managing this type of repair work?
11. Was the amount/scope of the repairs too big for the SDS to comfortably manage?
12. How effectively and clearly were the roles and responsibilities of the UNICEF project team and community/SDS defined?
13. Was there adequate technical support and monitoring visits by UNICEF, District/Zonal Education office?
14. What construction records, photos, quality checklists, financial records, has the SDS retained?
15. Who removed the damaged buildings or cleared and removed debris from site before the commencement of the repairs? Was this completed in a timely manner?
16. Is the school satisfied with the design and of the works? Are the facilities fit for purpose ie CFS school and /or in term of providing a safe building in future earthquake / tsunami events? Can they suggest any improvements?
17. How would they rate the rehabilitated facilities compared with other similar schools: average/ better than average/ worse than average.

²² SDS School Development Society or Committee

18. Is the school satisfied with the quality of the works? Have there been any maintenance issues?
19. Were there any problems experienced during the construction?
20. Did the implementation of the repair works by the SDS adversely affect the educational responsibilities of the members?
21. For minor rehabilitation works how successful was the SDS model, and would you use it again, or recommend it to other schools, if offered?
22. What type of repair works is best suited to the SDS model? What type of repair works is not suitable for SDS implementation?
23. Does the SDS have as-built drawings of the repair works and an Operations and Maintenance Manual?
24. Who will do the maintenance on the school?
25. Does the school have a budget for maintenance?
26. Any other comments?

Construction Contractor Model for Major rehabilitation works

27. What is the membership (title and gender) of the SDS?
28. Briefly describe the repair works undertaken by the Contractor.
29. Was the SDS given the choice of managing the repairs themselves versus UNICEF contracting the works out? Was the SDS involved in the decision to contract or use the SDS? Was the SDS kept informed of the progress of the procurement process?
30. What was the role of the SDS in the rehabilitation process?
31. Was the SDS or the school community required to make any contribution to the rehabilitation works?
32. How effectively and clearly were the roles and responsibilities of the community/SDS vis-a-vis the UNICEF project team, the Supervising Engineer, the District Education Office, defined? Was there a written agreement between UNICEF and the school/SDS to cover the construction process?
33. Was the SDS consulted about the design of the repair works and was the SDS issued with a set of drawings and specification and a construction program for the repair works?
34. Were there regular meetings between the SDS and UNICEF, the ZEO TO, the Supervision Consultants and the Contractor?
35. What type of written agreement was there between the SDS and UNICEF to cover the works being built at the school by the contractor? Is the agreement clear, appropriate and fair?

36. Was the SDS adequately briefed on the scope of works and the output quality required, including bans on the use of ACMs?
37. Do the school/SDS staff have previous experience in managing this type of repair work?
38. Was the amount/scope of the repairs too big for the SDS to comfortably manage?
39. How often did UNICEF, the Zonal Education Office, the Supervision Consultant visit the site?
40. Who removed the damaged buildings or cleared and removed debris from site before the commencement of the repairs? Was this completed in a timely manner?
41. Does the SDS have as-built drawings of the repair works and an Operations and Maintenance Manual?
42. Is the school satisfied with the design and of the works? Are the facilities fit for purpose ie CFS school and /or in term of providing a safe building in future earthquake / tsunami events? Can they suggest any improvements?
43. How would they rate the rehabilitated facilities compared with other similar schools: average/ better than average/ worse than average.
44. Is the school satisfied with the quality of the works? Have there been any maintenance issues?
45. Were there any problems experienced during the construction?
46. Who will do the maintenance on the school?
47. Does the school have a budget for maintenance?
48. Have there been any unforeseen benefits (or negatives) have come from the reconstruction activity?
49. Any other comments?

Annex 4 Summative Evaluation Report Guidelines

- The executive summary should not be more than 4 pages in length, including recommendations.
- It is recommended that the Evaluation Report be 20 pages in length excluding annexes.
- The length should be guided by the primary audience and what their needs are.

REPORT STRUCTURE:Cover Page**Initiative Name****AidWorks Initiative Number****SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT****Author's Name and Organisation****Date**Program Summary Page**Initiative Summary**

Initiative Name			
AidWorks initiative number			
Commencement date		Completion date	
Total Australian \$			
Total other \$			
Delivery organisation(s)			
Implementing Partner(s)			
Country/Region			
Primary Sector			

Acknowledgments

This should include any evaluation team members who were not authors of the report and a brief outline of their role.

Author's Details

Disclaimer:

This report reflects the views of the Evaluation team, rather than those of the Government of Australia or of the Government of **xxxx**.

Table of Content

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
INTRODUCTION.....	17
EVALUATION FINDINGS	19
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	38
ANNEXES.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

Executive Summary page (no more than 4 pages)

Executive Summary

This should be comprehensible as a stand-alone document. The main audience for the executive summary is senior managers and implementing partners.

The executive summary should provide the following information:

- *Background and context (where directly relevant to the findings)*
- *The purpose and focus of the evaluation*
- *A brief outline of the evaluation findings*
- *A brief outline of the lessons and recommendations*
- *Evaluation criteria ratings (as below)*

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

<Copy from the rating summary table from the main body of the document. The Evaluation Manager should delete any criteria which were not included in the evaluation. Edit the explanation for brevity if necessary.>

Evaluation Criteria²³	Rating (1-6)	Explanation
Relevance		
Effectiveness		
Efficiency		
Sustainability		
Gender equality		

²³ If impact is included, a rating is not expected to be applied.

Rating scale

Satisfactory		Less than satisfactory	
6	Very high quality	3	Less than adequate quality
5	Good quality	2	Poor quality
4	Adequate quality	1	Very poor quality

Body of report (maximum 20 pages excluding annexes)

Introduction

Initiative Background

<Provide information about the objectives, design and implementation history of the initiative. Include relevant information on the country context of the activity and how the initiative fits into the country and/or sector strategy.>

Evaluation Purpose and Questions

<Description of the evaluation objective(s) and questions, as defined in the Terms of Reference and Evaluation Plan.>

Evaluation Scope and Methods

<Description of the:

- *methods of the evaluation including sources of evidence and types of analysis used to answer the evaluation questions*
- *duration of the evaluation*
- *assumptions made by the evaluation team*
- *limitations of the method and sources of evidence*
- *for those DFAT criteria not covered in the evaluation, the evaluation manager should provide an explanation of how and when these criteria have been or will be assessed>*

Evaluation Findings

<The main body of the report should directly answer the evaluation questions, as defined in the Terms of Reference and Evaluation Plan. As the report structure should be determined by the evaluation questions, noting that:

- *Quantitative and qualitative evidence to support findings and recommendations needs to be presented as part of the report – referring to annexes or other documents is not sufficient.*
- *Where possible, data should be disaggregated by gender.*
- *Regardless of the structure, findings must specifically address those evaluation criteria (listed below) which were covered in the evaluation. The Evaluation Manager should delete any criteria which were not included in the evaluation.*

- *Assessment of cross-cutting issues and compliance with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action should be integrated into the evaluation criteria.*
- *Monitoring and evaluation, and analysis and learning are cross-cutting issues for assessment against all DFAT evaluation criteria*
- *Further information can be provided in annexes to the main report.*
- *At a minimum, the Terms of Reference and Evaluation Plan should be provided as annexes.>*

Relevance

Rating: <insert rating between 1 and 6>

<To determine whether the initiative is contributing to higher level objectives of the aid program outlined in country and thematic strategies.>

Effectiveness

Rating: <insert rating between 1 and 6>

<To determine whether the initiative is on track to achieve its objectives.>

Efficiency

Rating: <insert rating between 1 and 6>

<To determine whether the initiative is being managed to get the most out of the inputs of funds, staff and other resources, including continual management of risks.>

Impact

Note: A rating is not required for assessment of impact.

<To determine whether the initiative has produced positive or negative changes (directly or indirectly, intended or unintended). The degree to which the various aspects of impact can be addressed will vary according to the nature and duration of the activity. Whether impact can be assessed, or the way impact can be assessed will need to be determined by the Independent Evaluation team.>

Sustainability

Rating: <insert rating between 1 and 6>

<To determine whether the initiative is appropriately addressing sustainability so that the benefits of the activity will continue after funding has ceased, with due account of partner government systems, stakeholder ownership and the phase-out strategy.>

Gender Equality

Rating: <insert rating between 1 and 6>

< To determine whether the initiative is advancing gender equality and promoting women's empowerment through: advancing equal access to gender –responsive health and education services; increasing women's voice in decision-making, leadership, and peace-building; empowering women economically and improving their livelihood security; ending violence against women and girls at home, in their communities, and in disaster and conflict situations)>.

Conclusion and Recommendations

<The conclusion should draw together implications of the findings and provide an overall assessment of the quality and success of the initiative.

Specific lessons for the further implication of the initiative and any broader program lessons should be identified. Lessons can either have broad value across a range of sectors or be specific to the particular sector, theme or country. They should avoid generic statements and, where possible, should provide new insights into how DFAT can do things better in future. Lessons need to be clear, specific, actionable and supported by the analysis in the report.

Where recommendations are made, these should be directly discussed with DFAT program staff so they are appropriately informed by program priorities and constraints.>

Annexes

Further information can be provided in annexes to the main report. At a minimum, the Terms of Reference and Evaluation Plan should be provided as annexes.

<i>Annex 1</i>	<i>Evaluation Terms of Reference</i>
<i>Annex 2</i>	<i>Guiding Questions</i>
<i>Annex 3</i>	<i>List of Meetings and People Consulted</i>
<i>Annex 4</i>	<i>Draft Aide Memoire</i>

ANNEX F: TERMS OF REFERENCE

SCHEDULE 3 – TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference

Summative Joint DFAT and UNICEF Evaluation of the Support to the Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka Funded by DFAT and implemented by UNICEF

Summary

DFAT and UNICEF will undertake a joint summative evaluation of Support to The Education Sector in Conflict Affected Areas in Northern Sri Lanka Project implemented by UNICEF and funded by DFAT from June 2011 to June 2013. The evaluation will assess efficiency, effectiveness, lessons learned and relevance of the project. The evaluation will review and analyse what the project has achieved, what has worked, and what did not work and why. This analysis will inform and shape DFAT and UNICEF Sri Lanka current and future programs in education sector post humanitarian response phase. The evaluation will be led by an external consultant, and DFAT and UNICEF will support an impartial and independent process.

Context and Background

2. The long running conflict in Sri Lanka resulted in destruction of infrastructure throughout the Northern Province, including the widespread loss of education facilities through the direct impact of war, lack of maintenance and abandonment. The World Bank estimated in 2009 that as many as 2,000 schools – the bulk of education facilities in the north – were damaged as a result of conflict between 1983 and 2009. Support of the international development community has helped return many schools to a basic, useable state through essential repairs. This includes building Temporary Learning Spaces which provide a basic structure with a roof but no walls.

The Project

3. In May 2010, UNICEF launched a humanitarian appeal to fund a three year project (2010 – 2012) titled UNICEF Integrated Support for the Return and Resettlement of Conflict-Affected Children and Their Families in Sri Lanka's Northern Province. The appeal focused on three main sectors (i) Child Protection, Health and Nutrition, (ii) Education, and (iii) Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene. In response to this appeal, DFAT funded the education part with a total value of AUD3 million to support reconstruction, repair, and refurbishment of selected schools damaged by conflict from June 2010 to July 2011.

4. UNICEF and the Government of Sri Lanka, principally the Northern Province Ministry of Education, conducted a comprehensive assessment of education needs in the Northern Province in February 2011. The assessment concluded that 140 schools in the Province need priority rehabilitation ranging from minor repairs to full construction²⁴. The Government of Sri Lanka lacks the capacity to renovate the facilities. This is important in order to provide children with the opportunity to return to schools and regain a sense of normalcy after many years of displacement.

²⁴ A multi-sectoral and multi-agencies assessment was conducted to assess the extent of damages of the war. UNICEF and the government assess the education sector, the report is part of the reference documentation.

5. In response to the findings of the assessment, and based on the success of the first phase and positive feedback from the Government of Sri Lanka and local communities', DFAT provided additional funding of AUD7.1 million from July 2011 to 31 July 2013 bringing up the contribution to AUD10.1 million over three years (approximately 70% of funding needs). This support is focussed on Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu districts of the conflict-affected Northern Province. The project intends to rehabilitate schools to nationally accepted Child Friendly Schools (CFS) standard providing access to quality learning for children in the North, this is in line with the priority of and is supported by Ministry of Education, Cultural Affairs and Sports – Northern Province, Northern Provincial and Zonal Departments of Education. School reconstruction was expected to contribute to broader stabilisation in northern communities. For example, safe, durable schools were considered an essential service for internally displaced people to return to their communities. Re-opening of schools was expected to encourage teachers to return. It was also thought that the reconstructions work would build community confidence and bring students, teachers and parents together in a constructive way.

6. By the end of July 2013, DFAT funding will support **the school construction project** to achieve its **objective of rehabilitate or construct or repair 23 schools and education structures compliant with Child Friendly School (CFS) requirements.**

7. The CFS requirements, which also includes adequate WATSAN facilities, adequate facilities for children with disabilities, and adherence to Disaster Risk Reduction standards, will enable at least 10,000 marginalised and conflict-affected children in the north to access education within a conducive learning environment and benefit from safe and durable education facilities leading to improved learning achievement.

Other DFAT and UNICEF Support to Education Sector

8. As part of the humanitarian assistance, complementary to the school reconstruction funding, DFAT also funds UNICEF's Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) project from June 2010 to March 2014 for the improvement of water and sanitation systems and provision of hygiene education for 62,500 children in 250 schools in underserved and selected conflict-affected, lagging provinces.

9. Australia also supported the Basic Education Support Project (BESP) between July 2008 and February 2013 through UNICEF for the development of teacher skills and enhancement of school based management to deliver higher quality education outcomes as well as assistance to children whose education has been disrupted by conflict to achieve basic levels of proficiency through accelerated learning programs. BESP also provided furniture and equipment in reconstructed schools.²⁵

10. These three separate funding to UNICEF forms a comprehensive education sector support in humanitarian context. Australia's support to education sector further complemented by non-humanitarian support to the education sector in 2012 through co-financing the World Bank's Transforming School Education Program (TSEP) until 2016. DFAT funding in TSEP will ensure that the program will provide sufficient assistance to the primary and secondary education and continue mainstreaming and scale up of Child Friendly approach, piloted and adopted by the Government under BESP, in Sri Lanka education system.

11. Both the DFAT and UNICEF Sri Lanka Country programs are shifting focus from humanitarian response to long-term development programs. Results of the evaluation will inform this long-term country program development planning process in particular for school construction and renovation education sector.

²⁵ An Independent Completion Report of BESP was conducted in November 2012 with main recommendation of mainstreaming and scaling up Child Friendly Approach to other schools.

Evaluation Purpose and Objective

12. In accordance to the DAC standards, the evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, and sustainability of project implementation. Assessment will include, but not limited to, value for money, quality of implementation and the construction, as well as compliance to the child friendly school requirements and standards set by the Government of Sri Lanka.

Lessons learnt from the evaluation will inform future programming in education sector.

Scope of Evaluation

13. The evaluation will take due account of, and be consistent with, DFAT and UNICEF's relevant quality standards and procedures for evaluations. In consultation with relevant stakeholders (Northern Province Department of Education, District Education Offices, Zonal Education Offices, Principals, Teachers, Parents, Students, DFAT and UNICEF), the evaluation will examine a selection of the 23 schools that were fully or partially reconstructed from the start of the project in May 2010 to finish on the 31st July 2013 against the following evaluation criteria: effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, lessons learned and relevance.

14. The evaluation will not look at impact as it is too early to evaluate the longer term effects of the school construction. The evaluation will identify and draw out lessons on what has and what has not worked and the implications to inform future programming. Evaluation will also consider whether there are any lasting outcomes of the project and if the school construction meets CFS requirements along gender, equity, social inclusion (including disability), and Disaster Risk Reduction criteria.

15. As the project was part of a humanitarian response to support post conflict recovery in the Northern Province during a time of large internal migration (that continues today as livelihood's improve), there may be limited comparable quantitative data for the evaluation. Usable quantitative data at the targeted schools is likely to be limited to total student and teacher participation before displacement due to the conflict compared to the first day of the school re-opened and/or when the school was selected for reconstruction/repair. Many targeted schools may also have data on changes in student attendance pre- and post-conflict. In this regard, the evaluation is expected to use limited quantitative data and rely mostly on qualitative data collection gained from stakeholder interviews and field visits at the 23 targeted schools.

16. The Team will provide ratings to the evaluation criterias²⁶, guided by, but not be limited to, the questions and considerations outlined below. The team will expand on these in the evaluation matrix (to be included in the evaluation plan):

A. Effectiveness

- Were the schools constructed to meet the CFS requirements? This should include the following questions:
 - o Whether School Management Committee involved in and influenced the selection of schools, design of the school, and supervision during construction process?

²⁶ Ratings are:

Satisfactory		Less than satisfactory	
6	Very high quality	3	Less than adequate quality
5	Good quality	2	Poor quality
4	Adequate quality	1	Very poor quality

- Were Disaster Risk Reduction measures and disability inclusion considered in the schools construction design? and
- Were gender differences considered in the school design and were men and women (boys and girls) included in decision making processes?
- To what level did men and women (boys and girls) participate in the decision making around school selection, design, and construction?

B. Efficiency

- Did the overall project represent value for money in the construction of schools?
- To what extent was the bidding and procurement processes undertaken in an efficient and transparent manner, representing value for money?
- Was the delivery approach, including the selection of schools, monitoring and engagement of stakeholders, including school management committees the 'best fit' for the context?
- Was the project completed on time/on schedule and was their sufficient capacity of GoSL, UNICEF and DFAT to address major issues/challenges that arose during the duration of the project?

C. Relevance

- Does the project align with the policies and strategies of DFAT, GoSL and UNICEF?
- Has the project been responsive to changes in the priorities of DFAT, UNICEF, and the GoSL to maintain its relevance over the Program life?

D. Sustainability

- What is the quality of the school construction?
- Has the Government and/or School Management Committee developed an Operation and Maintenance plan for newly rehabilitated/constructed school to indicate the likelihood of long-term sustainable returns on the investment.
- Is there a maintenance schedule and appropriate budget available?

E. Lessons learned

- Lessons learned from UNICEF's working modalities and approach and relationship with government for large and small school construction. Are there things that could have been done differently?
- Is there synergy between this project and other DFAT funded education project (WASH, BESP and CFEP)? Does the synergy make a difference?

F. Lasting Outcomes (lower priority, only if the information is available)

- How the project has influenced improved access to education for boys and girls and increased capacity of teachers to deliver quality education.
- Were there any changes brought about by the project and are there any unintended positive/negative influence of the project? What are they? And why and how did it happen?

Summative Evaluation Methodology and Outputs

17. The evaluation will follow the following methodology:

17.1. Review of key documents and development of summative evaluation plan²⁷ (home based up to 3 days).

The Consultant will have preliminary discussion about the assignment with DFAT and UNICEF and review key documents relating the project at the commencement of the evaluation and develop the draft summative evaluation plan for DFAT and UNICEF approval. The draft final summative evaluation plan should be submitted for DFAT and UNICEF approval before field visit starts.

The summative **evaluation plan** will include, but not limited to, the following:

- Confirm the users and purpose of the evaluation, especially the decisions it will inform;
- Outline the scope and methodology of the evaluation (including prioritised evaluation questions, methods for answering them, process for information collection and analysis, and identification of any challenges in achieving the evaluation objective);
- Outline any methods for controlling the quality of data;
- Provide an evaluation and consultation schedule including the identification of key stakeholders to be consulted and the nature and purpose of the consultation; activities/research to be undertaken; and draft schedule for the field visits.
- Clearly show what judgements the evaluator will need to make, and on what basis (e.g. an overall judgement regarding whether or not the initiative met its objectives and/or expected outcomes, represented value for money, was effective or ineffective in relation to the DAC criteria).
- Outline of the summative evaluation report for DFAT and UNICEF consideration.

17.2. In-country mission (up to 10 days)

The Consultant will conduct consultation rounds with partners, including the Government of Sri Lanka officials and beneficiaries, both in Colombo and in the field and will do the following:

- During in-country mission the Consultant will discuss and **finalised the summative evaluation plan** with DFAT and UNICEF (1 day). Conduct preliminary consultation rounds in Colombo (up to 1 days), conduct field visit (up to 4 days), follow up consultation round in Colombo (if necessary, up to 1 day), and present preliminary findings (1 day).
- Consultant will: (a) conduct detailed interviews and/or focus group discussions with key stakeholders (including Northern Province Department of Education, District Education Offices, Zonal Education Offices, Principals, Teachers, Parents, Students, DFAT and UNICEF); (b) review school records for information on enrolment, attendance, drop outs, learning achievements etc.
- Towards the end of the in-country mission, the Consultant will write and present an **Aide Memoire** summarising key findings of the evaluation in Colombo. The aide memoire should not be more than 5 pages (guidelines provided in Attachment 1).
- The aide memoire will be presented to DFAT and the stakeholder reference group.
- The Consultant will finalise the Aide Memoire within one week of the end of the in-country mission taking into account feedback from DFAT and stakeholder during the presentation.

17.3. Finalisation of summative evaluation report (up to 10 days)

²⁷ UNICEF terminology for Evaluation Plan is Inception Plan. To avoid confusion and consistency, in this TOR the document will be called evaluation plan.

The Consultant will finalise the evaluation report from home before 30 November 2013. Process and output of the evaluation is as follows:

- The Consultant will have 5 days to write the report upon receipt of aide memoire comments from DFAT and stakeholders and submit the **draft Summative Evaluation Report** to DFAT (no more than 20 pages, excluding annexes – guidelines provided in Attachment 2) within two weeks of receiving comments on the Aide Memoire.
- The Summative Evaluation Report will be reviewed by DFAT and UNICEF, and others as necessary, for comments and inputs for finalisation.
- The consultant will receive feedback from DFAT no later than three weeks after draft Summative Evaluation Report submission.
- The consultant will finalise **the Summative Evaluation Report** based on the feedback and submit it to DFAT within five days of receiving feedback.

Table 1: Summary of Evaluation Process and Outputs

No	Task	Location	Approximate duration	No of days (up to)	Output	Format	Due by
1	Document review & development of summative evaluation plan	Home based	23 September – 1 October 2013	3	Summative Evaluation Plan	Word document Max. 10 pages	Tuesday 1 October 2013 (first draft)
2	Travelling to Sri Lanka		5 or 6 October 2013	1			
3	In-Country mission	Sri Lanka	7 – 17 October 2013	10			
	<i>Meet with DFAT & UNICEF for in-country briefing and finalisation of summative evaluation plan</i>		<i>7 October 2013</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Final Summative Evaluation Plan</i>	<i>Word document Max. 10 pages</i>	<i>7 October 2013</i>
	<i>Field visit</i>		<i>8 – 11 October 2013</i>	<i>4</i>			
	<i>Colombo: - meetings</i>		<i>14 – 16 October 2013</i>	<i>3</i>			

No	Task	Location	Approximate duration	No of days (up to)	Output	Format	Due by
	- Aide Memoire write up						
	Aide Memoire presentation		17 October 2013	1	Aide Memoire (see Attachment 1)		17 October 2013
4	Leaving Sri Lanka		19 October 2013				
5	Aide Memoire finalisation	Home based	21 – 25 October 2013	1	Final Aide Memoire incorporating DFAT, UNICEF and stakeholder comments provided during the presentation	Word document Max 5 pages	25 October 2013
6	Summative Evaluation report write up	Home based	21 – 1 November 2013	5	First draft of Summative Evaluation Report (see Attachment 2)	Word document Max 20 pages, excluding annexes	21 November 2013
7	finalisation of summative evaluation report	Home based	14 – 30 November 2013	4	Final Summative Evaluation Report	Word document Max 20 pages, excluding annexes	By 30 November 2013

Management Responsibilities:

18. The following detailed the responsibilities of each party:

DFAT is responsible for:

- Overall oversight and management of the evaluation (joint responsibility with UNICEF through EMT)
- Upholding the independence and evaluation standards
- Participation in evaluation discussion and field visit as an observer
- Provision of comments to the aide memoire and draft summative evaluation report.
- Development of dissemination plan and management response based on the final summative evaluation report
- Publication of the summative evaluation report and management response on DFAT website

UNICEF is responsible for:

- Overall oversight and management of the evaluation (joint responsibility with UNICEF through EMT)
- Upholding the independence and evaluation standards
- Provision of documentations as requested by the evaluator
- Facilitation of field visit
- Facilitation of consultation arrangements both in Colombo and field visit
- Participation in evaluation discussion and field visit as observer
- Provision of comments to the aide memoire and draft summative evaluation report
- provide response to the final evaluation report

DFAT and UNICEF representatives will jointly managed the evaluation. In UNICEF terminology, this is called as Evaluation Management Team (EMT). The EMT will provide oversight and management of the evaluation in consultation with the evaluation team on the evaluation processes and findings. The EMT This committee will be supported by the Reference Group.

The Government of Sri Lanka and other stakeholders will be consulted during the evaluation process and, where appropriate, are the source of information for the evaluation. Along with UNICEF and DFAT Sri Lanka office, both parties, in UNICEF terminology, perform the role of a stakeholder reference group.

Independent consultant (Team Leader)

The Consultant is responsible for:

- Development of the Evaluation Plan.
- Leading the evaluation process in accordance with the TOR through assessment of documentations, and discussions with partners.
- Work in cooperation with UNICEF team
- Write up and present Aid Memoir of early findings to the Stakeholder Reference Group
- Finalisation of aide memoire.
- Writing the draft Summative Evaluation Report and incorporate comments in the report at the consultant's discretion.
- Finalisation of Summative Evaluation Report. The Team Leader will have the independence of deciding the result of the evaluation.

UNICEF evaluation team (as part of the reference group):

- Provide input to the development of the evaluation plan
- Participate in the overall evaluation process

- Provide information and data as needed and input to the evaluation process
- Provide input to the write up and assist the team leader in the presentation of the aide memoire and early findings to the stakeholder reference group.
- Provide input to the summative evaluation report

Expertise specification:

19. The Team Leader would be expected to meet the following minimum requirements:

Essential:

- At least 10 years of development experience.
- Having the experience of reviewing and evaluating education sector and construction project in humanitarian assistance context.
- Knowledge of school construction, education sector, humanitarian assistance.

Desirable

- Preferably have engineering background.
- South Asia contextual knowledge, preferably Sri Lanka.
- Knowledge of Sri Lanka government system.
- Familiar with UN agencies ways of working, preferably UNICEF.
- Familiar with DFAT program and policies.

Key documents:

20. DFAT and UNICEF will provide the following background documentation to the consultant:

1. UNICEF Proposal
2. UNICEF Country Program Document (CPD)
3. UNICEF Country Program Action Plan (CPAP)
4. Child Friendly Schools requirements
5. Joint Support Assessment (JSA) Report
6. Phase 1 Completion Report
7. Phase 1 Quality at Implementation reports
8. Phase 2 Quality at Implementation reports
9. DFAT M&E standards

Attachment 1 – Aide Memoire Guidelines

An Aide Memoire is generally prepared by the evaluation team at the end of an in-country visit to:

- present their initial findings;
- seek verification of facts and assumptions; and
- discuss the feasibility of initial recommendations in the program/country context.

The key audiences for this document are generally the DFAT evaluation manager and initiative manager, the partner government (where relevant) and the other active stakeholders (such as development partners, community groups, etc).

The Aide Memoire should not be more than 5 pages in length and contain at least the following headings:

Evaluation of *[title]* Aide Memoire

Evaluation Background

<Include background on the activity being evaluated, the type of evaluation and the objectives and methods of the evaluation.>

Description of Evaluation Activities

< Outline fieldwork activities undertaken, including key meetings and site visits.>

Initial Findings and Recommendations

< Outline initial findings and recommendations from the fieldwork for discussion/workshopping with the program area and key stakeholders.>

Next Steps

< Outline further steps to finalise the evaluation. This should be decided in consultation with the evaluation manager, and will include peer evaluation of the draft report. >

Acknowledgements

< It is appropriate to acknowledge the logistical support provided by the country office to the in-country mission and thank those consulted for their time and input. >

Annexes

- Evaluation team members
- People/agencies consulted

Attachment 2 – Summative Evaluation Report Guidelines

- The executive summary should not be more than 4 pages in length, including recommendations.
- It is recommended that the Evaluation Report be 20 pages in length excluding annexes.
- The length should be guided by the primary audience and what their needs are.

REPORT STRUCTURE:

13. Cover Page**Initiative Name****AidWorks Initiative Number****SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT****Author's Name and Organisation****Date**14. Program Summary Page**Initiative Summary**

Initiative Name			
AidWorks initiative number			
Commencement date		Completion date	
Total Australian \$			
Total other \$			
Delivery organisation(s)			
Implementing Partner(s)			
Country/Region			
Primary Sector			

Acknowledgments

This should include any evaluation team members who were not authors of the report and a brief outline of their role.

Author's Details

Disclaimer:

This report reflects the views of the Evaluation team, rather than those of the Government of Australia or of the Government of **xxxx**.

15. Table of Content**Contents**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
INTRODUCTION.....	17
EVALUATION FINDINGS	19
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	38
ANNEXES.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

16. Executive Summary page (no more than 4 pages)**Executive Summary**

This should be comprehensible as a stand-alone document. The main audience for the executive summary is senior managers and implementing partners.

The executive summary should provide the following information:

- *Background and context (where directly relevant to the findings)*
- *The purpose and focus of the evaluation*
- *A brief outline of the evaluation findings*
- *A brief outline of the lessons and recommendations*
- *Evaluation criteria ratings (as below)*

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

<Copy from the rating summary table from the main body of the document. The Evaluation Manager should delete any criteria which were not included in the evaluation. Edit the explanation for brevity if necessary.>

Evaluation Criteria²⁸	Rating (1-6)	Explanation
Relevance		
Effectiveness		
Efficiency		
Sustainability		
Gender equality		

Rating scale

Satisfactory	Less than satisfactory
---------------------	-------------------------------

²⁸ If impact is included, a rating is not expected to be applied.

Satisfactory		Less than satisfactory	
6	Very high quality	3	Less than adequate quality
5	Good quality	2	Poor quality
4	Adequate quality	1	Very poor quality

Body of report (maximum 20 pages excluding annexes)

Introduction

Initiative Background

<Provide information about the objectives, design and implementation history of the initiative. Include relevant information on the country context of the activity and how the initiative fits into the country and/or sector strategy.>

Evaluation Purpose and Questions

<Description of the evaluation objective(s) and questions, as defined in the Terms of Reference and Evaluation Plan.>

Evaluation Scope and Methods

<Description of the:

- *methods of the evaluation including sources of evidence and types of analysis used to answer the evaluation questions*
- *duration of the evaluation*
- *assumptions made by the evaluation team*
- *limitations of the method and sources of evidence*
- *for those DFAT criteria not covered in the evaluation, the evaluation manager should provide an explanation of how and when these criteria have been or will be assessed>*

Evaluation Findings

<The main body of the report should directly answer the evaluation questions, as defined in the Terms of Reference and Evaluation Plan. As the report structure should be determined by the evaluation questions, noting that:

- *Quantitative and qualitative evidence to support findings and recommendations needs to be presented as part of the report – referring to annexes or other documents is not sufficient.*
- *Where possible, data should be disaggregated by gender.*
- *Regardless of the structure, findings must specifically address those evaluation criteria (listed below) which were covered in the evaluation. The Evaluation Manager should delete any criteria which were not included in the evaluation.*

- *Assessment of cross-cutting issues and compliance with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action should be integrated into the evaluation criteria.*
- *Monitoring and evaluation, and analysis and learning are cross-cutting issues for assessment against all DFAT evaluation criteria*
- *Further information can be provided in annexes to the main report.*
- *At a minimum, the Terms of Reference and Evaluation Plan should be provided as annexes.>*

Relevance

Rating: <insert rating between 1 and 6>

<To determine whether the initiative is contributing to higher level objectives of the aid program outlined in country and thematic strategies.>

Effectiveness

Rating: <insert rating between 1 and 6>

<To determine whether the initiative is on track to achieve its objectives.>

Efficiency

Rating: <insert rating between 1 and 6>

<To determine whether the initiative is being managed to get the most out of the inputs of funds, staff and other resources, including continual management of risks.>

Impact

Note: A rating is not required for assessment of impact.

<To determine whether the initiative has produced positive or negative changes (directly or indirectly, intended or unintended). The degree to which the various aspects of impact can be addressed will vary according to the nature and duration of the activity. Whether impact can be assessed, or the way impact can be assessed will need to be determined by the Independent Evaluation team.>

Sustainability

Rating: <insert rating between 1 and 6>

<To determine whether the initiative is appropriately addressing sustainability so that the benefits of the activity will continue after funding has ceased, with due account of partner government systems, stakeholder ownership and the phase-out strategy.>

Gender Equality

Rating: <insert rating between 1 and 6>

< To determine whether the initiative is advancing gender equality and promoting women's empowerment through: advancing equal access to gender –responsive health and education services; increasing women's voice in decision-making, leadership, and peace-building; empowering women economically and improving their livelihood security; ending violence against women and girls at home, in their communities, and in disaster and conflict situations)>.

Conclusion and Recommendations

<The conclusion should draw together implications of the findings and provide an overall assessment of the quality and success of the initiative.

Specific lessons for the further implication of the initiative and any broader program lessons should be identified. Lessons can either have broad value across a range of sectors or be specific to the particular sector, theme or country. They should avoid generic statements and, where possible, should provide new insights into how DFAT can do things better in future. Lessons need to be clear, specific, actionable and supported by the analysis in the report.

Where recommendations are made, these should be directly discussed with DFAT program staff so they are appropriately informed by program priorities and constraints.>

Annexes

Further information can be provided in annexes to the main report. At a minimum, the Terms of Reference and Evaluation Plan should be provided as annexes.

Attachment -3 Evaluation Management Team and Reference Group membership and tasks

17. Evaluation Management Team (EMT)

Membership:

- DFAT (Co-chair) Janelle Denton, Second Secretary (DFAT nominee)
- UNICEF Country Representative (Co-chair) - Antonia De Meo, Deputy Representative UNICEF (OIC Rep)
- DFAT Officer – Rani Noerhadhie, Senior Program Officer
- Evaluation Specialist, DFAT – Jacinta Overs, South Asia Performance and Quality Manager
- Evaluation Specialist - Indra Tudawe, UNICEF
- External subject matter specialist - TBD
- Government partner – Northern Province Secretary of Education
- External evaluation Specialist (where needed)

Tasks:

- Agree on the key questions, focus and scope to be addressed by the evaluation at the onset.
- Formally establish a stakeholder reference group.
- Endorse the terms of reference, which meets United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) standards.
- Endorse selection of consultants.
- Endorse evaluation plan.
- Endorse summative evaluation final report ensuring the inputs from the reference group are included.
- Finalise management response with the program implementers.
- Upload the Evaluation and Management report within specified time framework to global website.
- Ensure that the management response is fully implemented.

18. Evaluation Reference Group

Membership

- DFAT (Co-chair) – Rani Noerhadhie, Senior Program Officer
- UNICEF Evaluation Specialist (Co-Chair) – Indra Tudawe, UNICEF
- DFAT Officer – Dilhari Pathirana, Senior Program Officer
- UNICEF Monitoring Officer – Keshani Hiranthika -
- UNICEF Education Officer - Arulrajah Sriskandarajah
- UNICEF Chief of Field Office – Prakash Tuladhar
- Government counterpart of the initiative – Provincial Director Planning (government nomination)
- External subject matter Expert – TBD

Tasks:

- Finalise TOR which meets United National Evaluation Guidelines (UNEG) standards and DFAT evaluation standards for submission to EMT for endorsement.
- Identify consultants and submit to EMT for endorsement.
- Establish clear Management arrangements from the outset including evaluation plan for EMT endorsement.
- Endorse evaluation design and methods with consultant evaluators.
- Endorse tools and instruments to be used in evaluation.
- Accompany consultant on field visits if needed.
- Provide final comments on the Draft Final Report submitted to EMT.
- Final report ratified and submitted to EMT, where recommendations are rejected or only partially accepted, the rationale should be noted.