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Annex I - Methodology

Approach

The evaluation employed a sequential mixed-methods approach - that is, it drew on both quantitative and qualitative methods - to combine more comprehensive coverage with in-depth analysis. The approach aimed to: strengthen validity through triangulation; enable the use of results of one method to help develop the instrument of the other; and, extend the comprehensiveness of the findings and generate new insights.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection included document reviews, interviews with key informants, surveys, field visits and beneficiary focus groups and participatory ranking exercises. The information, collected in each instance according to the programming priorities of EEPCT, was used to identify and link results in terms of EEPCT approaches, processes and outputs.

• Primary and Secondary Literature Review: The evaluation team accessed and integrated primary and secondary literature developed from the EEPCT countries and from the wider field of emergency education. This body of literature ranged from government documents to publications produced by local and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to academic literature. Overall, the evaluation team assessed and integrated over 275 reports, surveys, assessments and other documents during the course of the evaluation.

• UNICEF Self-Assessments: 13 of 39 EEPCT funded Country Offices (COs) responded to the Evaluation Office’s request to provide self-assessments as part of the PREV. COs were asked to describe the local context and the specific aims and objectives that were established for EEPCT. In addition, they were asked to detail the extent to which these aims and objectives were being achieved, and the reasons why they were not. Self-assessments formed the basis of early consultations with UNICEF COs and evaluation teams in the six selected case study countries.

• Key Informant and Stakeholder Interviews: The PREV conducted interviews with relevant UNICEF staff, government officials, Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) staff and other key stakeholders. In case study countries, the PREV evaluation team worked with UNICEF Country Offices (COs) to identify key government (e.g. ministries of education, planning, child development and gender, etc), civil society (e.g. INGOs, national NGOs, academic advisors, etc), donors (e.g. the European Commission, ECHO, DFID, etc) and others who were deemed most knowledgeable of the education sector in general and the EEPCT programme in particular. At the regional and global levels, the PREV evaluation team worked closely with UNICEF’s Education Section and the Evaluation Office to

---

205 UNICEF EO developed, disseminated and collected the Self Assessments. The evaluation team was unable to determine why there was a low response rate, except to say it does not appear to be related to specific contexts such as emergency or fragile contexts. Three non compliant countries reported the absence (home leave) of Senior Education Officers.
identify key UNICEF, NGO, Education Cluster, INEE, Government, and donor staff. Interview questions were guided by the information garnered from the document reviews and the issues highlighted in the PRES. At total of 321 interviews were completed: 83 global-level interviews and 238 case-study interviews (see Annex V for detailed tables regarding key stakeholder interviews).

- **Revised Logframe Exercise:** The PRES noted shortcomings in the EEPCT’s monitoring and reporting and developed a logframe and set of indicators—which was modified by UNICEF Education Section based on the original proposal and used as a component of this evaluation. The Chiefs of UNICEF Education Section and Evaluation Office requested all EEPCT funded countries-territories to use this Revised Logframe to report on the results of their respective country education programmes. The Education Section provided guidance notes to assist COs with this request. 29 of 39 countries submitted responses to this Revised Logframe. It was further noted in the PREV Terms of Reference that the contractually agreed upon original EEPCT logical framework was also to be used as the main reference point in the PREV for accountability purposes and as part of the summative elements of the evaluation.  

- **Staff Survey:** The PRES employed a web based survey through which 153 individuals offered their perspective on EEPCT progress and achievements. While yielding important findings, UNICEF’s Education Section raised questions about the validity of responses garnered in this manner. The PREV therefore worked with the Education Section to identify 50 headquarters, regional and country level staff who were directly involved with the EEPCT programme. Eleven initially identified Education Officers from EEPCT funded countries were not available (on home leave) and thus a second Education Officer from each of these countries was asked to respond instead. In this way, the goal of engaging 50 “knowledgeable UNICEF staff” was met. PREV’s global team then followed up on these surveys with phone interviews and email exchanges to “dig deeper” into staff responses.

- **Partner Staff Survey:** The PREV also developed a similar survey intended for use with 21 Senior Emergency Education Specialists in partner organizations. However, in the course of implementing the partner survey, it became apparent that very few emergency education practitioners knew about the EEPCT programme. As a result, the partner survey and interview exercises were limited to 12 Senior Education Officers with a “working knowledge” of EEPCT.

- **Resilience Blog:** Preliminary discussions identified a “resilient education system” as amongst the least understood concepts employed within EEPCT goals areas. The PREV therefore collaborated with INEE to launch an INEE web site blog discussion on a case definition and indicators for a “resilient education system.” The two week exercise resulted in 27 responses from INEE members in five regions (Africa, Asia, Europe, Middle East and Central America). These data were complied and compared with data on resilient education systems collected from some 112 children, youth, parents and teachers in the six case study countries.

- **Field Visit:** Six countries were selected by UNICEF as sites for case studies. The case study research plan allowed for eight weeks per country. Country research teams employed standardized

---

206 No pattern of non-respondent EEPCT funded countries or reasons for non-compliance could be identified.  
207 Terms of Reference Independent Evaluation of the Progress of the Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition (EEPCT) Programme.  
208 42 of 50 survey respondents also participated in subsequent phone interviews or email exchanges.  
209 The numerous criteria UNICEF employed to select these six countries for case study research are outlined the evaluation’s terms of reference (see footnote above).
surveys and checklists to document programme implementation. Participatory ranking exercises and focus group discussions (FGDs) were employed to examine programme outcomes. The Education in Emergencies (EE) – Development Assistance Criteria (DAC) Scorecard was utilized to provide comparable quantitative and qualitative data across the six case study countries. Efforts were made to ensure beneficiaries — children, parents, educators and local community’s members—were included in implementation and outcome determinations to ensure an upstream flow of findings and recommendations. Attention was paid to structuring field approaches to ensure they were transparent, systematic and replicable.

UNICEF identified nine separate contexts for countries where it is active. The PREV examined countries within each of these contexts through the methods detailed above. Case study countries were selected from six of the nine total contexts. See Table 1 for further details.

Table 1: Overview of Evaluation Methods by Country Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Total # of Countries</th>
<th>Revised Logframe</th>
<th>Self Assessment</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Disaster</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Crisis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Risk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Recovery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management

Two evaluation co-leaders directed the PREV, with support from New York-based support staff (programme officer, finance administrator and statistician). The PREV also employed 26 researchers in the six case study countries. Country case study evaluations were led by a senior CGCA team leader and included three to six national researchers per country. In the case of West Africa, two team leaders were assigned to Liberia and Côte d’Ivoire because of the regional nature of the work there.

New York-based staff and co-team leaders provided oversight and support for the country evaluations, and worked to ensure the data collection process was unified and comparable across teams and countries. Weekly country updates and problem solving discussions took place through Skype, e-mails, and other means.

Limitations

The evaluation team took multiple steps to ensure a high level of consistency and quality was maintained across the research teams in the six case study countries. To achieve this, several materials and plans were made to mirror approaches and actions in each country, including:

---

210 Data collection at the community-beneficiary level related to programme outcomes was limited. See limitations section below.
211 UNICEF EEPCT Programme Analysis.
212 Country programmes can be categorized as in more than one context therefore the total number of country contexts is greater than the total number of countries examined.
A central training was conducted for case study team leaders;

A user guide was developed for each data collection tool;

A consistent approach was developed for data entry, including the creation of a common entry form and supervision of research teams during the field work stage;

Trainings were conducted for national researchers in each country;

Bi-weekly calls between research teams and the evaluation leaders; and

Scheduled data transfer from field sites to Columbia University and a set schedule for feedback and analysis.

At the same time, there were limitations. No progress evaluation design is able to adequately control for economic, political or other external events that occurred during the life of the project. Explanations are also affected by the national and inter-agency nature of the EEPCT programme and the corresponding lack of a precise overall programme theory, missing variables and unclear implementation steps.

The lack of clarity and common understanding of multiple terms within the sector limits a theory based approach to the EEPCT programme itself—and by extension—to this evaluation. This lack of case definition consensus is not just a limitation of EEPCT or PREV, but of the sector at large. For these reasons, the PREV created a blog and undertook field work to demonstrate how a platform-process can be established to clarify ambiguous case definitions, terminology and objectives.

As pointed out in the PRES, many country programmes had not established programme baselines or focused on monitoring and reporting beyond basic input-output levels. PREV case study evaluation teams had intended to address some of these concerns through the use of comparisons (programme and non-programme respondents) and retrospective baselines to determine programme outcome related findings. However, two factors worked against this approach. First, while EEPCT is described globally as a distinct or “coherent” programme, it does not operate as such on the country level. As part of a country education programme, it was not always possible for evaluation teams to identify appropriate comparison groups. This limitation also affected results of the EE-DAC Scorecard exercise where respondents were not directly knowledgeable of EEPCT programme inputs and therefore spoke more generally regarding their knowledge of education programmes. A second factor working against the anticipated evidence based evaluation was that many EEPCT funded programmes, including LAB4LABs and Talent Academies in two case study countries, have not progressed sufficiently to enable such an evaluation (no beneficiaries). Evaluations were therefore limited to reviews of implementation progress through observational checklists and key informant interviews. Finally, school closures (predictable as well as unexpected) required alterations in focus and sampling plans. Security was a concern in two countries that delayed or altered fieldwork and implementation plans. In two countries, UNICEF was unable to provide accurate information on which schools had received assistance and which programmes were operating, resulting in delays and reduced time for field work studies. Programme outcome data is therefore limited.

---

213 This is a significant evaluation finding in itself, which is reported as such in the Findings Section below. As an unintended finding, however, it limited the generation of reliable data in most case study countries.
Nonetheless, given the global nature of EEPCT, and the challenging contexts it operates within, the findings presented here are deemed to be credible. The authors are also careful to point out where the data is insufficient to reach conclusive judgements or offer precise recommendations throughout the text.
Annex II - Revised Logframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Summary</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>2007 (to be used as baseline year – will have absolute numbers/totals), as well as baseline percentage as appropriate</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Is this target achievable within the designated time frame?</th>
<th>If not, what are the main obstacles to reaching the stated target?</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: To help get emergency and post-crisis transition countries back on track for achieving the Education and Gender MDGs.</td>
<td>Number of out of school children (indicate change 2007 to 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE: Restore quality schooling for all children/youths in disrupted societies</td>
<td>Decrease in number of children out of school in target countries by 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in % of children/youth with access to schooling/education opportunities in countries supported by the EEPCT Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use strategic education interventions to reduce development threats, mitigate operational risks and overcome fragility to revitalize education systems</td>
<td>Number and type of strategic education interventions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTPUT 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Improved quality of education response in emergency and fragile, transition systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | 1. Increased % of affected children\(^{214}\) accessing safe and functional learning environments (ECD Centres, Schools, tents, etc.) to resume their education in target countries.  
   **Target:** Global average of 80% for both girls and boys in target countries. |
|  | 2. % decrease in children out of school by gender, for target countries |

\(^{214}\) All indicators to be disaggregated by gender. In addition, where possible data is to be disaggregated further by the most important disparities in a given country (i.e. poverty quintile or rural/urban or geographical location, as appropriate).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target: Average reduction for target countries equals 15% annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Increased % of financing for learning materials (as proxy for improved quality); in national budget and/or external funds for target countries. <em>Target: 15% of education funds are available for non-salary items such as learning materials / school supplies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. % change in primary completion rate (PCR) one year following the onset of an emergency/crisis at regular intervals. <em>Target: Average annual increase in target countries should be on track by 2015.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. % increase in trained primary and secondary teachers in the system (as defined by UNESCO) including pre-service and in-service in target countries. <em>Target: Average annual increase to fulfil national standards set on ratio of trained teachers to pupils by 2015.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## OUTPUT 2
Increased resilience of education service delivery in emergency and fragile, transition systems

6. % of teachers (total) present in school during and following emergencies or crises  
   *Target: 50% teachers and other education personnel*

7. % of school year that schools are open and functioning  
   *Target: 75% of school year that schools are open and functioning*

8. % of schools where there is participation of children, parents and community members in school management/governance  
   *Target: 50% of schools in target areas*

9. Education budget increased as % of the national budget.  
   *Target: Annually increasing trend in allocation to education for this set of countries.*

## OUTPUT 3
Increased education contribution to

10. Education policy and budgets on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) adopted in target countries.  
    *Target: Successful advocacy in Target countries for a policy and budget, with Life skills curriculum established in all*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>conflict prevention and disaster risk reduction.</strong></th>
<th><strong>schools</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> Policy and budget on Education for Conflict Prevention adopted in target countries. <strong>Target:</strong> Successful advocacy in target countries for a policy and budget, and Life skills curriculum in all schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> Education strategies to address the potential threats to peace/stability implemented in target countries. <strong>Target:</strong> Design/implement education interventions to deal with ‘threats’, in parallel with efforts to rebuild the education system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> % change in international education assistance provided to contexts affected by emergencies or crises (adjusted to account for net changes in global education assistance) over specified time range. <strong>Target:</strong> Annually increasing trend in international education assistance to education in emergencies or crises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 4</td>
<td>Evidence-based policies, efficient operating strategies and fit-for-purpose financing instruments to support education in countries affected by fragility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>% of Program countries with a Local Development Partner Group supporting sector planning and financing. <strong>Target:</strong> All Program countries by the end of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>% of countries with a credible sector plan/interim strategy endorsed by FTI. <strong>Target:</strong> All countries within two years of engagement by this programme (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Increase in % of countries using systematic data collection and analysis via EMIS annually to review situation and guide policy. <strong>Target:</strong> All countries within two years of operations by this programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>% of countries with a pooled fund or similar mechanism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Increased % of external funding for education in transition countries channelled through the pooled fund to support the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic indicators for UNICEF Programming (technical enabling work and capacity development)</strong></td>
<td>21. % of UNICEF Education Staff who have undertaken 3 Core trainings (Education Financing, Public Policy, Emergencies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 19. % of countries emerging from crisis in which UNICEF leads donor support for the development of a sector plan for interim funding. Target: *All countries within two years of involvement in this programme* |

| 20. Number of partnerships established at the global, region and national levels disaggregated by type (implementation, monitoring/evaluation/research and advocacy) and EEPCT Programme Designated Goal (1-4) |

| **Target:** All countries emerging from crisis that have not qualified for catalytic funding or that have not yet developed a credible education sector plan. |

| 19. % of countries emerging from crisis in which UNICEF leads donor support for the development of a sector plan for interim funding. Target: *All countries within two years of involvement in this programme* |

| **Target:** All countries emerging from crisis that have not qualified for catalytic funding or that have not yet developed a credible education sector plan. |

| **Progress Evaluation of UNICEF’s Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition Programme: Annexes** | 123 |

| 21. % of UNICEF Education Staff who have undertaken 3 Core trainings (Education Financing, Public Policy, Emergencies) | 123 |
Table for indicator 20: Number of partnerships established at the national levels disaggregated by type (implementation, monitoring/evaluation/research and advocacy) and EEPCT Programme Designated Goal (1-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>implementation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research and advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GUIDANCE NOTES**

**General:**

- Each country should provide the data for each of the indicators for your specific country context. Aggregation will be done at the global level.
- Note that for several indicators, national level and/or programme level data will need to be provided. See guidance below for specific indicators.
- The first year in which EEPCT funds were made available to your country counts as the base-line year. This will be 2007 in some cases, and 2008 in most other cases, and a few in 2009. For the base-line year, please provide absolute numbers/ totals or the base-line percentages, as appropriate for the indicator. In some bases, a yes/no answer rather than a numerical value is required.
- As much as possible, data should be disaggregated by gender. In addition, where possible, data is to be disaggregated further by the most important disparities in your country (e.g. poverty quintile, urban/rural location, geographic area within country affected by crisis, as appropriate); to reflect dis-aggregated data, please add rows as needed.
- For subsequent years, most indicators require you to indicate a percentage change. Please provide any worksheets used for calculations as attachments to the matrix as feasible, so we can review the basis for the reported percentage change.
- 2009 is the last year for which data should be entered at this point. You will be requested to provide data for 2010 and 2011 in later years.
Columns:

- In column "Is this target achievable within the designated time-frame" please indicate "yes" or "no".
- In column "if not, what are the main obstacles for reaching the target", please provide a brief explanation for your country context.
- In column "data source/s" please provide the data source or sources for the indicator reported upon.
- In the "comments" column, indicate any comments you may have on a specific indicator. In cases where you are not able to provide the data within the 5 week time-frame explain whether/how/by when the data may be obtained, and any constraints.

Indicators:

- For the quantitative indicators related to the Programme Goal and Purpose, please provide data for programme and national level as appropriate. In the 'comments' column, please briefly explain the relationship between the programme data and national data. For the programme data, briefly indicate the context for the target area, for example is the target area affected by conflict, natural disaster, or any other relevant issue.
- Under Purpose, briefly list the key strategic interventions undertaken in your country through the EEPCT programme.
- For indicator 1, please provide data for programme and national level as appropriate. In the 'comments' column, please briefly explain the relationship between the programme data and national data. For the programme data, briefly indicate the context for the target area, for example is the target area affected by conflict, natural disaster, or any other relevant issue.
- Indicator 2: same as for indicator 1;
- Indicator 3 will require information from national and donor sources. UNICEF’s own contribution to learning materials also to be counted in;
- Indicator 4: same as for indicator 1;
- Indicator 5: same as for indicator 1;
- Indicator 6, 7 and 8: same as for indicator 1. In case your country reports on a crisis-affected area within the country, please also provide comparative data for non-affected areas if possible.
- Indicator 9: provide national level data, and in the comments section please provide any information that might be useful to understand the country context;
- For indicators 10, 11, 12, please provide a brief explanation of any changes over time in the comments column, for example describe progress from policy to implementation, scale up etc.
- Indicator 13: indicate whether there is an increase in funding nationally in relation to crisis in your country. In cases where you are able to identify increases for your specific programme target area, please indicate that as well.
- Indicator 14: please indicate whether there is a local development partner group in your country support education sector planning and financing (yes/no). In the comments section, please provide any other information that is pertinent, including UNICEF’s role in the group (see also indicator 19);
- Indicator 15: please indicate whether your country has a sector plan/interim strategy endorsed by the FTI (yes/no). In the comments section, please provide additional pertinent information to understand the context.
- Indicator 16: please indicate (yes/no) whether your country uses systematic data collection and analysis via EMIS to review situation and guide policy. In the comments section, please provide other pertinent information related to progress or challenges;
- Indicator 17 and 18: linked to indicator 15. Please indicate whether there is a pooled fund or similar mechanism if your country is emerging from crisis for education sector development (yes/no). Where such an arrangement exists, please provide information of the amount and relative proportion of external funding channeled through the pooled fund.
- For indicator 19, please indicate (yes/no) whether UNICEF is leading donor support for the development of a sector plan for interim or other funding, if your country is emerging from crisis. In the comments section, please provide a brief explanation of sector development efforts and UNICEF's role, including whether UNICEF is in the lead or not.
- For indicator 20 (partnerships), please provide a small separate table of national level partnerships disaggregated by type (implementation, monitoring/evaluation/research and advocacy) and EEPCT Programme Designated Goal (1-4)
- For indicator 21, please provide the total number of education staff in your country, and indicate how many have undertaken the 3 core trainings, for each of the following: Education Financing (e.g. WBI course), Public Policy (e.g. "Maastricht"), Emergencies (e.g. UNICEF education in emergency training, Front-Line Responder Training, and Education Cluster Coordinator training).
## Annex III - Evaluation Tools

### A: DAC-EE Score Card

#### EE-DAC Score Card

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reasons for the Score (+ Positive / - Negative)</th>
<th>Key Recommendations / Strategic Focus (based on gaps identified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has access to education in emergencies or post crisis transition changed since the programme began?</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the quality of education in emergencies or post crisis transition changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has girls’ enrolment in schools changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Relevance/Appropriateness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reasons for the Score (+ Positive / - Negative)</th>
<th>Key Recommendations / Strategic Focus (based on gaps identified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has access to education in emergencies or post crisis transition changed since the programme began?</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the quality of education in emergencies or post crisis transition changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has girls’ enrolment in schools changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reasons for the Score (+ Positive / - Negative)</th>
<th>Key Recommendations / Strategic Focus (based on gaps identified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has access to education in emergencies or post crisis transition changed since the programme began?</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the quality of education in emergencies or post crisis transition changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has girls’ enrolment in schools changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Reasons for the Score ( + Positive / - Negative)</td>
<td>Key Recommendations / Strategic Focus (based on gaps identified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have education system’s ability to recover from emergencies changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Much Better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has government preparedness and early warning knowledge changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How well does the Programme perform activities compared to other similar programmes?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Much Better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Has child safety in schools changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence and Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Has implementation of INEE minimum standards changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Much Better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Has education cluster support of the Ministry of Education coordination role changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability/Connectedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Reasons for the Score ( + Positive / - Negative)</td>
<td>Key Recommendations / Strategic Focus (based on gaps identified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Has education sector’s ability to prepare for and respond to emergencies changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Has government capacity to support education in emergencies and-or post crisis transitions changed since the Programme began?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Has monitoring and evaluation of the education system changed since the Programme began</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex III - B: Participative Ranking Methodology (PRM)

FGD DATA COLLECTION FORM (CHILDREN, YOUTH)

Question: What are the strengths of the programme?

Date: ___________________________ Group: Children / Youth
Community: ___________________________ Gender: Girls / Boys
Moderator: ___________________________ Number of Children in Group: ______
Note taker: ___________________________ Age Range: ___________________________

Key Strengths Identified:

Free list: ___________________________ Rank Order:

1. ___________________________
2. ___________________________
3. ___________________________
4. ___________________________
5. ___________________________
6. ___________________________
7. ___________________________
8. ___________________________
9. ___________________________
10. ___________________________

COMMENTS:
(Write down what the children say using their exact words.)
FGD DATA COLLECTION FORM (CHILDREN, YOUTH)

Question: What are the weaknesses of the programme?

Date: ____________________  Group: Children / Youth
Community: ________________  Gender: Girls / Boys
Moderator: ________________  Number of Children in Group: _______
Note taker: ________________  Age Range: __________________

Key Weaknesses Identified:

Free list:  Rank Order:

________________________________________  1. ________________________________
________________________________________  2. ________________________________
________________________________________  3. ________________________________
________________________________________  4. ________________________________
________________________________________  5. ________________________________
________________________________________  6. ________________________________
________________________________________  7. ________________________________
________________________________________  8. ________________________________
________________________________________  9. ________________________________
________________________________________ 10. ________________________________

COMMENTS:
(Write down what the children say using their exact words.)
FGD DATA COLLECTION FORM (PARENTS, EDUCATORS)

Question: What are the strengths of the programme?

Date: ____________________  Group: Parents / Educators
Community: ________________  Gender: Men / Women / Mixed
Moderator: ________________  Number of Participants: ______
Note taker: ________________

Key Strengths Identified:

Free list: 

__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________

Rank Order:

1. __________________________
2. __________________________
3. __________________________
4. __________________________
5. __________________________
6. __________________________
7. __________________________
8. __________________________
9. __________________________
10. __________________________

COMMENTS:
(Write down what the participants say using their exact words.)
FGD DATA COLLECTION FORM (PARENTS, EDUCATORS)

Question: What are the weaknesses of the programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>____________________</th>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>Parents / Educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community:</td>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Men / Women / Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator:</td>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>Number of Participants:</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note taker:</td>
<td>____________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Weaknesses Identified:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free list:</th>
<th>Rank Order:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. __________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
(Write down what the participants say using their exact words.)
FGD DATA COLLECTION FORM (PARENTS, EDUCATORS)

Question: What makes an education system resilient?

Date: ___________________________  Group: Parents / Educators
Community: _______________________  Gender: Men / Women / Mixed
Moderator: _______________________  Number of Participants: _______
Note taker: _______________________

Key Qualities Identified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free list:</th>
<th>Rank Order:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
(Write down what the participants say using their exact words.)
FGD DATA COLLECTION FORM (YOUTH)

Question: What makes an education system resilient?

Date: ___________________________  Group: Youth
Community: ______________________  Gender: Girls / Boys
Moderator: ______________________  Number of Children in Group: ______
Note taker: ______________________  Age Range: ______________________

Key Qualities Identified:

Free list: ______________________  Rank Order:

1. ______________________________
2. ______________________________
3. ______________________________
4. ______________________________
5. ______________________________
6. ______________________________
7. ______________________________
8. ______________________________
9. ______________________________
10. ______________________________

COMMENTS:
(Write down what the youth say using their exact words.)
Note establish a common time reference for both programme and control groups which could be “since the emergency” or another commonly shared event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much worse</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A-NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Children</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much have your feelings about school changed since the program began, if at all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much has your attendance changed, if at all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much has girls’ participation changed, if at all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much has boys’ participation changed, if at all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much has your sense of safety and security changed, if at all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much has your ability to protect yourself if there is another emergency changed, if at all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much has the amount students help each other changed, if at all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much has students' involvement in problem solving at school changed, if at all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much has the use of fighting to resolve interpersonal differences changed, if at all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
(Write down what the children say using their exact words.)
**FGD DATA COLLECTION FORM (YOUTH)**

Date: ___________________________  Group: Youth
Community: ______________________  Gender: Girls / Boys
Moderator: ______________________  Number of Youth in Group: _____
Note taker: ______________________  Age Range: ________________

Note establish a common time reference for both programme and control groups which could be “since the emergency” or another commonly shared event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Much worse</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A-NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much have your feelings about school changed since the program began, if at all?

How much has your attendance changed, if at all?

How much has girls’ participation changed, if at all?

How much has boys’ participation changed, if at all?

How much has your sense of safety and security changed, if at all?

How much has your ability to protect yourself if there is another emergency changed, if at all?

How much has the amount students help each other changed, if at all?

How much has students’ involvement in problem solving at school changed, if at all?

How much has the use of fighting to resolve interpersonal differences changed, if at all?

How much have your feelings about school changed since the program began, if at all?

**COMMENTS:**

(Write down what the youth say using their exact words.)
**FGD DATA COLLECTION FORM (EDUCATORS)**

Date: ___________________________  Group: Educators
Community: ______________________  Gender: Men / Women / Mixed
Moderator: ________________________  Number of Participants: _______
Note taker: ________________________

*Note: establish a common time reference for both programme and control groups which could be “since the emergency” or another commonly shared event.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much worse</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Much better</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A-NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much has your ability to teach changed, if at all?

How has the provision of teaching and learning materials changed, if at all?

How has the quality of the training changed, if at all?

How has the interaction between children and youth of different groups changed, if at all?

How have reporting and monitoring procedures changed, if at all?

How has the quality of education at the school changed, if at all?

How has the retention rate for girls changed, if at all?

How has the usefulness of the revised Teaching Kits changed, if at all?

How has the usefulness of the revised School in a Box changed, if at all?

How has the usefulness of the revised Early Childhood Kits changed, if at all?

How has the school’s ability to respond to future
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much have your feelings about school changed since the program began, if at all?</td>
<td>COMMENTS: (Write down what the participants say using their exact words.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FGD DATA COLLECTION FORM
(PARENTS/SCHOOL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES/ PARENT TEACHERS ASSOCIATIONS)

Date: ___________________________ Group: ___________________________
Community: ___________________________ Gender: Men / Women / Mixed
Moderator: ___________________________ Number of Participants in Group: _______
Note taker: ___________________________

Note: establish a common time reference for both programme and control groups which could be “since the emergency” or another commonly shared event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents/ School Management Committees/Parent Teachers Associations</th>
<th>Much worse</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A-NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How has community involvement in school emergency planning changed, if at all?

How has the community’s ability to address safety and abuse in the school changed, if at all?

How your confidence in the quality of education at the school changed, if at all?

How has community ownership over school construction changed, if at all?

How much has the amount students help each other changed, if at all?

How much has students’ involvement in problem solving at school changed, if at all?

How much has the use of fighting to resolve interpersonal differences changed, if at all?

How much have your feelings about school changed since the program began, if at all?
COMMENTS:
(Write down what the participants say using their exact words.)
Annex III - C: Adequacy Survey Checklist

These questions should be completed in each country. The research team may use various sources to answer them, should confirm answers with programme staff whenever possible, and should cite sources of information when possible.

Programme Design

1. Before the programme began, was there a situational assessment?
2. Was there a baseline assessment?
3. Was gender considered when planning and implementing programmes? How so?
4. Are gender-related indicators included in the monitoring plan?
5. Were programme indicators and evaluations structured to look only at outputs or also impact?
6. Does the programme have a plan for discontinuation, phase-out or handover?

Programme Implementation

1. Did replenishment kits arrive within programme established time frames?
2. Did educators receive a minimum of quarterly training?
3. Can youth enrolled in ALP programmes pass a basic literacy and numeracy test?
4. Can children/schools/educational institutions demonstrate knowledge of an emergency response plan for their school or educational institutions?
5. Does the country have radio programming and/or other remote educational programmes?
6. Does the country demonstrate a direct contribution to the EFA/MDG indicators?
7. Has technical support has been provided?
   a. What?
   b. By whom? - HQ:
      - RO:
      - Other:

Programme Learning

1. Has the government adopted the CFS model as a government programme?
2. Were good practice reports/trainings issued to partners at the country level?
3. For each programme implemented in this country, have evaluations been done? List dates of evaluations for each programme.
4. Were the results of the evaluation shared? How? With whom?
5. Have the results and recommendations of the evaluations been integrated into programming? How so?
6. How is programme progress and learning from the field level shared with regional and country level? Is this sharing useful and productive?
7. Do donor or government initiatives reference EEPCT?

Financial

1. Is the EEPCT programme delineated in financial and/or programme documents?
2. Has there been an increase in government financial support for EEPCT programmes?
3. Are donor funds transferred to the field office as per project-established time frames?
4. Are CAF funds transferred to field offices per project-established time frames?
5. How much of the 2009 allocation of funds was spent (allocation v. expenditures)?
6. Has EEPCT support reached an appropriate number of beneficiaries, given programme costs (needs vs. coverage)?

**Best Practices/Standards**

1. Do partner agreements reference INEE minimum standards?
2. Do peace education programmes use UNHCR/INEE/UNESCO programme materials?
3. Has the country achieved compliance with the Minimum Operating Security Standards?
4. Do government preparedness plans incorporate UNICEF methods and approaches?
5. Was a SWOT analysis done in country?
   a. If so, did the programme address at least one SWOT recommendation?
**Annex III - D: Interview Questionnaire/ Guide (Adequacy Survey)**

These questions should be asked in each interview.

**Programme Design**

7. Before the programme began, was there a situational assessment?
8. **If yes**, was the programme designed to address identified needs? How?
   **If no**, why not? What was used instead to address needs through programme design?

**Programme Implementation**

8. Have you provided and/or received technical support (such as trainings; capacity building; M&E support; skills development; technical knowledge sharing; etc..)? In what ways and to whom/by whom?
9. Is there a formal preparedness plan for responding in emergencies? For whom is the plan?

**Programme Learning**

8.
9.

**Financial**

1.
2.

**Best Practices/Standards**

1.
2.
Annex III - E: CFS Observational Checklist

To be completed at each school visited by the research team that was constructed through EEPCT. Observations should take place for at least an hour.

**Physical Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES(1)</th>
<th>NO(0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Does the school appear to be child-friendly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>See definition at bottom of checklist</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is the school easily exited in case of emergency? (2 doors per classroom)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Do ALL classrooms have windows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Can ALL the windows be opened without a key?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Does the school contain a separate space for teachers/administrative staff that enables the staff to work separately from students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Is the teachers/administrative staff space in close proximity to the classrooms allowing for monitoring of students’ activities?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Is there water available on school grounds?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borehole/Well (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (5): ___________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Are there separate latrines for boys and girls?

8. Do ALL the latrines have locks on the doors?

9. Is the latrine per pupil ratio appropriate?
   (1 latrine:30 girl students; 1 latrine:60 boy students)

   a) Number of students?
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Number of latrines?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are there separate latrines for teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Separate facilities for men and women?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is there a separate space with water and soap or other cleaning agent for children to wash their hands?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Is there a disaster risk reduction plan? <em>(you may need to ask administrator)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Is it visible/displayed on the school grounds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES(1)</th>
<th>NO(0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Do educators have a structured lessons plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(if not visible, you may have to ask)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Do students spend little time (less than 20%) copying lessons from text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>book or chalkboards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Do educators listen to students and treat them with respect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Do educators call on girls and boys equally?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Do educators help each other in and out of the classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Students – Girls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES(1)</th>
<th>NO(0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do students ask the teacher questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do students share their ideas and opinions in the classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do students treat each other with respect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Students – Boys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES(1)</th>
<th>NO(0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do students ask the teacher questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do students share their ideas and opinions in the classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do students treat each other with respect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHILD FRIENDLY SCHOOLS DEFINITION**

**Short Definition**

A rights-based, child-friendly school has two basic characteristics:

- It is a child-seeking school — actively identifying excluded children to get them enrolled in school and included in learning, treating children as subjects with rights and State as duty-bearers with obligations to fulfill these rights, and demonstrating, promoting, and helping to monitor the rights and well-being of all children in the community.

- It is a child-centred school — acting in the best interests of the child, leading to the realisation of the child’s full potential, and concerned both about the "whole" child (including her health, nutritional status, and well-being) and about what happens to children — in their families and communities - before they enter school and after they leave it.
CHARACTERISTICS OF A RIGHTS-BASED, CHILD-FRIENDLY SCHOOL

1. Reflects and realises the rights of every child -- cooperates with other partners to promote and monitor the well-being and rights of all children; defends and protects all children from abuse and harm (as a sanctuary), both inside and outside the school

2. Sees and understands the whole child, in a broad context -- is concerned with what happens to children before they enter the system (e.g., their readiness for school in terms of health and nutritional status, social and linguistic skills), and once they have left the classroom -- back in their homes, the community, and the workplace

3. Is child-centred -- encourages participation, creativity, self-esteem, and psycho-social well-being; promotes a structured, child-centred curriculum and teaching-learning methods appropriate to the child’s developmental level, abilities, and learning style; and considers the needs of children over the needs of the other actors in the system

4. Is gender-sensitive and girl-friendly -- promotes parity in the enrolment and achievement of girls and boys; reduces constraints to constraints to gender equity and eliminates gender stereotypes; provides facilities, curricula, and learning processes welcoming to girls

5. Promotes quality learning outcomes -- encourages children to think critically, ask questions, express their opinions -- and learn how to learn; helps children master the essential enabling skills of writing, reading, speaking, listening, and mathematics and the general knowledge and skills required for living in the new century -- including useful traditional knowledge and the values of peace, democracy, and the acceptance of diversity

6. Provides education based on the reality of children’s lives -- ensures that curricular content responds to the learning needs of individual children as well as to the general objectives of the education system and the local context and traditional knowledge of families and the community
7. **Is flexible and responds to diversity** -- meets differing circumstances and needs of children (e.g., as determined by gender, culture, social class, ability level)

8. **Acts to ensure inclusion, respect, and equality of opportunity for all children** -- does not stereotype, exclude, or discriminate on the basis of difference

9. **Promotes mental and physical health** -- provides emotional support, encourages healthy behaviours and practices, and guarantees a hygienic, safe, secure, and joyful environment

10. **Provides education that is affordable and accessible** -- especially to children and families most at-risk

11. **Enhances teacher capacity, morale, commitment, and status** -- ensures that its teachers have sufficient pre-service training, in-service support and professional development, status, and income

12. **Is family focused** -- attempts to work with and strengthen families and helps children, parents and teachers establish harmonious, collaborative partnerships

13. **Is community-based** -- strengthens school governance through a decentralised, community-based approach; encourages parents, local government, community organisations, and other institutions of civil society to participate in the management as well as the financing of education; promotes community partnerships and networks focused on the rights and well-being of children
Annex IV: DAC Scorecard

The Emergency Education-DAC Score Card combines the four EEPCT objectives and the five sets of OECD criteria that are being measured. Stakeholders at three levels (National, Subnational and Community levels) rated the EEPCT objectives using the OECD criteria on a scale of 1-5. Following the rating, the interviewee was asked to comment on their assessment, indicating why they assigned a positive (+) or negative (-) rating.

Overall across the six case study countries and stakeholder groups, moderate changes were reported from pre-EEPCT levels to present. As detailed below, most stakeholder groups reported that criteria measured by the EE-DAC scorecard was generally the same (coded as a score of 3 on the scorecard) or better (coded as a score of 4) when compared with the situation prior to the EEPCT program. However, it was not always possible to attribute improvements in the indicators associated with the EEPCT Program because EEPCT funds were merged within national programmes. As a stakeholder in Colombia reported “Progress in infrastructure improvement, flexible learning systems and increased cooperation make it possible to identify improvements in access. However, it is not easy to see if this improvement in access can be attributed specifically to this program.” Overall, differences amongst the three stakeholder groups were not statistically significant.

Relevance/Appropriateness

Examining the relevance and appropriateness of EEPCT funded programmes is necessary to determine “whether the project is in line with local needs and priorities (as well as donor policies).” Relevance was assessed through access to education, quality of education, and girls’ enrolment. Overall stakeholders’ perceived moderate changes occurring in these areas since the beginning of the EEPCT program. Across stakeholder groups and countries the average ranking for relevance/appropriateness was 3.85 (with a score 3 referring to a score of same and 4 meaning better).

Access to Education

Changes in access to education in emergencies or post crisis transition can indicate that programmes implemented have contributed to relevant and appropriate responses.
Stakeholders from the national, sub-national and community levels discussed why they believed access had improved since the start of the EEPCT program. The most common reasons given for this increase were: trained teachers; existence of more schools (construction and repair); accelerated learning programs; necessary supplies; awareness raising campaigns and the elimination of school fees. Challenges mentioned by groups include overcrowding of schools; an insufficient number of trained teachers; lack of transport to school and insufficient supplies.

**Quality of Education**
Stakeholder groups in 6 case study countries perceived that the quality of education in emergencies or post-conflict transition had positively changed since the start of EEPCT program 2007. Reasons mentioned by these groups for the increase in quality include: trained teachers, sufficient supplies, relevant ALP curriculum, improved coordination among actors, and provision of psychosocial support. Problems regarding the quality of education identified by groups include: not enough trained teachers; insufficient training for teachers; and a feeling that the focus on increasing access to education hampered quality.

**Girls’ Enrolment**
The issue of girls enrolment was seen different amongst the 6 case study countries. In Sri Lanka, gender differentials in education were not seen as a significant problem while other examined countries noted the issue of girls’ education to be of greater concern. Methods noted that were seen to improve girls’ enrolment rates include: establishment of girl mothers clubs, awareness campaigns and provision of incentives/scholarships.

**Effectiveness**
In the DAC scorecard, effectiveness is measured by two indicators examining the change in the education system’s ability to recover from emergencies and change in government preparedness and early warning knowledge. Overall, across the 6 case study countries, stakeholders reported moderate improvement (averaging 3.77) in effectiveness of the educational system since the beginning of EEPCT.

**Education System’s Ability to Recover**
Stakeholder groups most often reported the following as improvements in the system’s ability to recover after emergencies: improved policy on education in emergencies; training and capacity building programs on INEE, emergencies, etc; improved coordination between stakeholders; emergency plans in place; and provision of educational supplies after emergencies. Issues mentioned hampering the systems recovery include: lack of emergency plans, lack of Ministry capacity and staff, lack of attention to education by the government, lack of necessary funds and training.

**Government Preparedness and Early Warning Knowledge**
Similarly, stakeholder groups most often reported that improved emergency response plans and guidelines, establishment and integration of curriculum on DDR, and awareness campaigns contributed towards their moderately positive view of improvement in government preparedness and early warning knowledge.

**Efficiency**

Key outcomes examining efficiency are 1) program performance when compared to similar programs and 2) changes in child safety in schools. Overall, across the 6 case study countries, stakeholders reported better efficiency (averaging 4.1) of the educational system since the beginning of EEPCT.

Program Performance

Overall, stakeholder groups reported that the UNIEF education program did well responding to emergency needs (such as supplies and training) in a timely manner and appreciated the flexibility of the program. However, many stakeholders were not familiar with other similar programming, which did not allow them to compare the EEPCT program to others.

Child Safety

Stakeholder groups reported more awareness of and attention to child safety issues, more child safety policies and guidelines in place and infrastructure improvements such as improved school construction and gender specific latrines. Uncleared mines, long distances between homes and schools and lack of security plans in all schools were all challenges to improved child safety reported by these groups.

**Coherence and Coordination**

Coherence and coordination was assessed through implementation of the INEE Minimum Standards and Education Cluster support for the MOE coordination role. Performance on this criteria was variable across case study countries. Angola has not implemented any INEE standards and is not implementing the cluster system therefore scored a -0° for this criterion. Liberia only measured this criterion by assessing the INEE Minimum Standards as the conflict and recovery pre-dates that of the education cluster in this context. Due to these varying reporting measures, an overall score on these criteria was not calculated.

Implementation of INEE Standards
Overall, only national and some sub national stakeholder groups were aware of the INEE Minimum Standards. Positive rankings were due to trainings on the standards and translation to local languages.

Education Cluster Support

Changes to support for the MOE in education cluster include government representatives now providing leadership for the cluster, cluster trainings and more awareness of the cluster system. However, the cluster system was not active in all settings.

**Sustainability and Connectedness**

Sustainability was assessed based on the sector's ability to respond to another emergency, its capacity to support education in emergencies and monitoring and evaluation. Again, moderate improvement (an average score of 3.75) was seen across country programs and stakeholder groups for this category.

![DAC: Sustainability/Connectedness](image)

**Ability to Respond to Emergencies**

Stakeholders most often reported that this improvement was due to the development of emergency preparedness and response plans (EPRP) and improved coordination amongst sector actors. However, stakeholders also reported that capacity was low, specific funding mechanisms for education in emergencies was not available and coordination was lacking in some locations.

**Capacity to Support Education in Emergencies**

Improvement in government capacity was most often reported because of identified emergency education focal point, increase in teachers' salaries and training to empower education officers and teachers. Budgetary concerns and an absence of emergency plans were the most cited reasons for negative scores on this criterion.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

Stakeholder groups reported that monitoring has increased since the establishment of the EEPCT program and that training on monitoring tools has occurred in some locations however there were still many gaps in the quality of the information being collected as part of this process.
### Annex V: Key Stakeholder Interviews (Numbers of Individuals)\(^\text{215}\)

**Global-Level Interviews:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO/Civil Society</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Staff</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case Study-Level Interviews:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-national</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>238</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Individuals Interviewed in Total = 321**

\(^{215}\) Per request interviewees are not listed by name or agency.
### Angola:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-national</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Colombia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-national</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cote d’Ivoire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-national</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Liberia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-national</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philippines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-national</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sri Lanka:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-national</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex VI: Self-Assessment Countries

Angola

Chad

China

Colombia

Cote d’Ivoire

Kenya

Liberia

Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT)

Philippines

Sri Lanka

Uganda
### Annex VII: List of Countries that Reported on the Logical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic (CAR)</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>North Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Timor</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex VIII: Terms of Reference

INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE PROGRESS OF THE EDUCATION IN EMERGENCIES AND POST-CRISIS TRANSITION (EEPCT) PROGRAMME

(1) The Terms of Reference (ToR) are intended to guide the independent Progress Evaluation (PREV) of UNICEF’s Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition (EEPCT) Programme\(^216\). In addition to reflecting the objectives and expectations articulated in this document, the PREV – as well as proposals from short-listed vendors – must reflect all applicable UNICEF and United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) policies, norms, and standards.\(^217\) The evaluation team is also expected to adopt a rights-based approach which seeks to access a full range of inputs, including from female and marginalised stakeholders, and which is highly participatory and, to the extent feasible, empowering. The PREV will be managed by UNICEF’s Evaluation Office with the contribution of a dedicated Reference Group (RG).\(^218\)

(2) These ToR, once finalised in consultation with the Reference Group described below, will be considered firm. That said, the UNICEF Evaluation Office reserves the right to revise some of the requirements at the outset of the evaluation in order to reflect insights provided by the selected vendors through their technical proposal, their inception report, and informal feedback (e.g., on proposed scope, methodology, and so on).

\(^216\) The term Transition is used by the Programme and in this document. UNICEF acknowledges that use of this term has been called into question and “transition” is decreasingly being used, as it is felt by some that it does not have the utility as originally intended. Post-crisis contexts do not feature linear pathways out of crisis to sustainable development. “Transition” might imply this linear pathway to some. In these ToR, the term is used alongside “post-crisis contexts” or “post-crisis recovery”. It is intended to refer to the stage which links emergency to increased stability.


\(^218\) The Reference Group comprises 9 representatives selected from among the following offices and institutions: UNICEF Programme Division, UNICEF Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS), UNICEF Regional Offices, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of The Netherlands, the European Commission, Save the Children, and three technical experts.
1.0 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

In late 2006 the Government of the Netherlands and UNICEF launched the five-year, US$201 million EEPCT programme (concluding in 2011) with the overall objective to “put education in emergency and post-crisis transition countries on a viable path of sustainable progress towards quality basic education for all.” This programme, which is being implemented in 39 countries and territories, emerged out of an awareness of the limitations posed by existing funding modalities, which have tended to overlook emergency-affected and post-crisis contexts, and the importance which local populations themselves have placed on continued education service provision during and following crises. It has increasingly been recognised, meanwhile, that education, in addition to providing a sense of normalcy, can serve as a critical prong in the effort to promote short-term goals related to protection, nutrition, health, and psychosocial recovery, among others, while also laying the groundwork for longer-term economic growth, peacebuilding, disaster risk reduction and governance.

### Indicative Terminology

Terminology remains emergent within UNICEF and the larger EEPCT community. For the purposes of these ToR, key concepts are defined as follows:

**Emergency:** a situation that threatens the lives and well-being of large numbers of a population and requires extraordinary action to ensure their survival, care and protection. (Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action, 2010)

**Early Recovery:** an approach that occurs in parallel with humanitarian response, in order to sustain the results of life-saving interventions, support self-initiated recovery actions by affected populations, take advantage of early entry points for recovery, and reduce vulnerability to future crisis risk. UNICEF actively engages in early recovery and post-crisis inter-agency mechanisms, including needs assessments, recovery strategies, resource mobilization, programme delivery and integrated mission-planning process at all levels, when deployed. (Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action, 2010)

**Transition:** In the aftermath of crisis, there is a period when humanitarian needs must still be met while long-term rehabilitation and reconstruction have yet to be fully realized — the post-crisis transition period. Post-crisis transitions are characterized as such by shifting emphases, from saving lives to preventing the recurrence of crisis, and harnessing conditions for future development in a way that transforms as it repairs. (UNICEF post-crisis transition strategy in support of the medium-term strategic plan, 2006)

**Fragility-affected/Fragile States:** States lacking capacity (capability, effectiveness) and willingness (will, legitimacy) to perform key government functions for the benefit of all. (OECD/DAC: Service Delivery in Fragile Situations: Key concepts, findings and lessons, 2008)

---

219 See Proposal on Education in Emergencies and Post Crisis Transition, Sept 2006
The EEPCT Programme was developed in order to improve education service provision in emergency contexts and post-crisis environments and to support achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It is primarily a transition programme that supports education through interventions that restore access, improve quality, rebuild systems, reduce fragility and ameliorate threats to education systems so that countries can get “back on track” with normal progress for achieving their education and development goals. Pursuant to its overall objectives, the EEPCT Programme has four Designated Goals, as follow:

**Designated Goal 1** – Improved quality of education response in emergencies and post-crisis transition countries;

**Designated Goal 2** – Increased resilience of education sector service delivery in chronic crises, arrested development and deteriorating contexts;

**Designated Goal 3** – Increased education sector contribution to better Prediction, Prevention and Preparedness for emergencies due to natural disasters and conflict; and

**Designated Goal 4** – Evidence-based policies, efficient operational strategies and fit-for-purpose financing instruments for education in emergencies and post-crisis situations.

In keeping with the intended flexibility of the programme, these Designated Goals have been translated into a wide range of activities, including but not limited to the following: (i) expansion/intensification of service delivery through scaling-up of established approaches; (ii) capacity building and development of education systems at multiple levels to promote resilience and disaster preparedness; (iii) piloting of newly developed interventions and approaches; (iv) mainstreaming of successful interventions and approaches such as Child Friendly Schools and Accelerated Learning Programmes; (v) leadership and coordination, including through support to and expansion of the cluster approach to education; (vi) policy advocacy, including on issues of financing modalities for education in emergencies and transitions; (vii) social mobilisation; and (viii) monitoring and evaluation.

The EEPCT Programme is a core component of UNICEF’s strategic vision. Partnerships are an important element of this Programme, which has been instrumental, particularly, in promoting one of the four key strategic partnerships for UNICEF in education: the IASC Education Cluster. The other partnerships are UNGEI, EFA-FTI, and UNESCO GAP. UNICEF Education Strategy 2007 Progress Evaluation of UNICEF’s Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition Programme: Annexes

---

**UNICEF Programming for Humanitarian Action**

In UNICEF, experience-informed policies have concurred to articulate a sophisticated framework for humanitarian action, which spans from the preparedness phase to continued response and early...
recovery, recognising the link between crisis response and development. UNICEF adopts a Human Rights-based approach that puts children and women in the centre of humanitarian action as active participants, advocates for their rights and addresses inequalities and disparities. The framework includes a focus on the preparedness phase and on early recovery as a crosscutting programmatic effort at all stages of humanitarian action, comprising strategies for national capacity strengthening, community-level action, as well as the principles of inter-agency accountability and partnership. This framework, concretised in the Core Commitments for Children (CCCs in Humanitarian Action, which was recently revised in 2010), guides UNICEF interventions in the wake of humanitarian situations. Recognising that post-crisis transition contexts offer particular challenges as well as opportunities, UNICEF has also developed and is guided by a post-crisis transition strategy.

(4) The First Consolidated Donor Report to the Government of The Netherlands was prepared in August 2008; the second Consolidated Report was submitted at the end of June 2009. Additional information regarding the Programme may be found at the following websites:

http://www.unicef.org/emerg/index.html

http://www.educationandtransition.org/

2.0 EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

(5) Context and overall purpose of the evaluation. By identifying and assessing advances in the strategic goals of the programme, the purpose of the PREV will be to enable systematic reflection that results in concrete programme improvements. As a formative rather than summative evaluation, the PREV should aim to facilitate a process of learning and improvement while also enhancing accountability of UNICEF and the EEPCT Programme to its numerous stakeholders. This progress evaluation will be used by UNICEF, its partners and other stakeholders to learn lessons more broadly on education interventions in emergencies, transition, and fragility-affected contexts, and it is intended to influence future programming. The results and recommendations will also assist agencies and donors in making more informed decisions, including donors’ decision-making at the end of the Programme funding cycle surrounding the reformulation of investment strategies.

(6) Objectives: The main objectives of the evaluation include:

1) taking stock of the first three years of implementation to determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the EEPCT Programme’s relevance/appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence/coordination, and, to the degree measurable, indicative impact and sustainability in relation to its objectives;

2) evaluating both the intermediate results achieved and the processes set in motion by the programme, with a view to critically reflect on the Programme’s value-added to the education
sector and to education service provision in emergencies and post-crisis transitions as well as UNICEF specific added value\textsuperscript{222} to the Programme

3) gathering relevant and applicable lessons learned on education interventions in emergencies, transition, and fragility-affected contexts;

4) providing recommendations to improve future programming and support more-informed decision-making by UNICEF headquarters, regional and country offices, and relevant stakeholders.

(7) The PREV will build upon a Programme Review and Evaluability Study (PRES) of the EEPCT Programme, which was independently conducted between October 2009 and February 2010. The PRES represented the first phase of a phased approach to EEPCT evaluative work, with the purpose of preparing for the 2010 Progress Evaluation. Through close fact-finding consultation with the programme manager and main partners the programme review aimed at assessing the design and initial direction of the Programme. The PRES provided an initial review of the Programme’s design and implementation while outlining a programme results framework. This framework, currently being reviewed by UNICEF, shall guide the formative aspects of the PREV.

It should be noted that the contractually agreed upon original logical framework\textsuperscript{223} of the EEPCT will be used as the main reference point in the PREV for accountability purposes, and as part of the summative elements of the evaluation. At the same time, the Results Framework produced in the PRES is intended to inform a review of the interventions and an assessment of progress towards results so as to contribute to deeper programme learning and suggestions for strengthening the programme during its final year. Given the breadth of indicators within this framework, it may also be an opportunity for wider reflections on assessing results in emergencies and post-crisis more generally beyond the EEPCT programme.

2.1 Evaluation Target Audience and User Groups

(8) The target audience of the evaluation includes UNICEF senior management and technical staff engaged in the design and implementation of education interventions. Particular emphasis should be placed upon the needs and perspectives of the Country Offices engaged in implementing the EEPCT Programme, though specific findings and recommendations should inform personnel at UNICEF Headquarters and in UNICEF’s Regional Offices who provide overall guidance, programme management and backstopping with regard to the Programme. The target audience includes many of the end-users and beneficiaries of the EEPCT Programme and, hence, of the PREV. They include but are not limited to the following:

**Within UNICEF:**

- The Education Section, and other elements of the Programme Division, including the Early Childhood Development Unit and HATIS
- The Office of Executive Director (OED)
- The Division of Policy and Practice (DPP), including its Adolescent Development and Participation Unit
- The Evaluation Office (EO)

\textsuperscript{222} The “value-added” of UNICEF refers to its specific capacity and strategic positioning, both globally and in-country, to provide leadership in education in emergencies in post-crisis transition and provide upstream support.

\textsuperscript{223} European Community Contribution Agreement DCI/educ/2008/153661, annex 1 b- 2008.
The Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS)
• The Division of Communication (DOC)
• The Public Alliances and Resource Mobilisation Office (PARMO)
• Governmental, UN, and Multi-lateral Affairs (GMA)
• Supply Division (SD)
• Regional and country offices

Among donors:
• Contributing donors: The Government of the Netherlands, European Commission
• Other donors, primarily at the global level, but also at the national levels in case study countries, as appropriate

Among partners:
• International NGOs (including Save the Children-the co-lead agency of the Global Education Cluster, as well as others) UN agencies and other international and regional organisations, especially those engaged in educational policy advice, including the INEE
• UN Country Teams

Among national counterparts:
• Relevant Government authorities and line ministries/departments of education
• National partners and other technical and governance stakeholders

Finally, beneficiaries of the programme including children, parents, students, teachers and administrators.

The input and interests of all such stakeholders should be considered to the extent possible during the PREV.

3.0 SCOPE OF ENQUIRY

(9) The PREV will identify and reflect on progress towards the strategic goals of the Programme, assessing both the intermediate results and the processes set in motion, with a concern to critically reflect on the UNICEF value-added to the field of education in emergencies and post-crisis transition through the EEPCT Programme. The PREV will focus upon the EEPCT Programme’s four Designated Goals in relation to numerous levels of intervention. However, given the aforementioned diversity and range of activities and interventions constituting the EEPCT Programme and the ability of the evaluation team to examine only a select number of countries, the scope will be primarily geared toward global-level outcomes and processes as the main level of analysis. Thus, although individual country evaluation reports will be produced, the evaluation will take an inductive approach – that is, using country-level data to instantiate issues inherent to the programme as a whole – and produce a synthesis report. In addition to the global-level contribution to the field of education in emergencies, for specified national-level programme indicators, data will be collected from all participating countries and territories, but compiled
and analysed globally. Finally, country case studies will serve to illustrate in-detail, specific aspects of the Programme. Put another way, the PREV should focus upon the outcomes (including, wherever possible, impact) of the EEPCT Programme upon the global thematic area of education in emergencies and transitions – and the ability of UNICEF and the international community to deliver a more effective education response to crises – rather than upon intervention-by-intervention or country-by-country results. Doing so will require a close awareness, however, of the Programme’s performance vis-à-vis education systems and beneficiaries in individual countries of operation, and according to the four major objectives that the Programme is broadly expected to achieve.

(10) The scope of the PREV should thus be considered an all-encompassing enquiry which both starts and ends at the global level and which closely considers the cascading of improvements from the sector-wide (global) level pertaining to EEPCT down to regional offices, country offices, education systems and the beneficiary/community level. For instance, understanding the degree of improvement in global education response to crises as a result of the EEPCT Programme will require an understanding of the beneficiary experience rather than simply an examination of coordination mechanisms and toolkits. The PREV should consistently examine global-level results with consideration of the process, outcome, and - as much as possible - impact-level changes for children and education systems at the country and local level, rather than assuming that global outputs such as partnerships, level of funding, guidance, standards and protocols will automatically spur changes for beneficiaries. Similarly, the evaluation, particularly as part of Designated Goal 4, should consider the contribution of lessons learnt and innovations achieved at lower levels (the community level, education system level, and country level) to global approaches to education interventions in emergency contexts and post-crisis transitions.

In examining the Programme results, focused attention will be paid to four areas identified by the PRES as issues of fundamental importance: access to quality education; education system development; disaster risk reduction; and conflict management and sensitivity. These four stand out as some of the pivotal contributions of the Programme, thus in need of focused evaluation.

4.0 KEY CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS FOR THE EVALUATION

(11) The evaluation will concentrate on the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance/appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency and coherence/coordination. Consideration of the two additional standard criteria, impact and sustainability, will be limited to understanding the degree to which “sustainable progress towards quality basic education for all” has been achieved. In this context ‘impact and sustainability’ will be considered in terms of trends and strategic approaches to building alliances, strengthening national capacities/capabilities and promoting scaled-up investments. However, to the extent possible at this stage, any detectable impacts in the forming of long-term outcomes will be explored.

(12) Significant elements of a measure of impact and sustainability in this progress evaluation are considered to be:

224 A proposed results framework is included in the PRES final report, in the process of being finalised
225 Designated Goal 4 is: “Evidence-based policies, efficient operational strategies and fit-for-purpose financing instruments for education in emergencies and post-crisis situations”.
226 For an elaboration of these criteria, please refer to the following: OECD-DAC, Glossary of Evaluation and Results Based Management (RBM) Terms (Paris: OECD-Development Assistance Committee, 2000) and ALNAP, Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria: An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies (London, ALNAP and the Overseas Development Institute, 2006).
• More appropriate and relevant education emergency response to improve quality and enhance impact;

• A change in emphasis on up-stream support\(^\text{227}\), and education system strengthening, especially to transition countries;

• The way prevention and preparedness concerns are incorporated into the overall approach to programming by UNICEF and also by partners; and

• Evidence and knowledge generation, analysis, and its use for policy development and advocacy.

The criteria and pertinent thematic sub-questions listed below should be reflected within the evaluation.

### 4.1 Relevance/Appropriateness

(13) The definition of relevance and appropriateness to be adopted within the PREV shall correspond to that established by ALNAP: “Relevance is concerned with assessing whether the project is in line with local needs and priorities (as well as donor policy). Appropriateness is the tailoring of humanitarian activities to local needs, increasing ownership, accountability and cost-effectiveness accordingly”.\(^\text{228}\) How closely aligned are interventions (and their specific objectives) subsumed under the EEPCT Programme and its four Designated Goals with the wide range of challenges facing education in the multitude of crisis-affected contexts (e.g., conflict-affected, disaster-effected, fragility-affected, chronic crisis, etc.) on the following levels: (i) the global education sector / the education in emergencies sub-sector, (ii) national education systems (within a context of other governmental and non-governmental actors), and (iii) the needs of local populations/beneficiaries?

(14) Secondly, how has the evolution of the Programme helped it remain relevant and appropriate to emerging challenges, or enhance its relevance/appropriateness over time?

(15) The following questions represent the main areas of enquiry for relevance/appropriateness of the Programme:

How relevant/appropriate are EEPCT Programme interventions given the wide range of educational needs of local communities and programmes offered by other actors. For example, to what extent do programmes address specific psychosocial concerns, early childhood development, accelerated learning, peace education and disaster risk reduction?

- How relevant/appropriate are EEPCT Programme interventions given the unique needs of education officials and systems in crisis and post-crisis contexts? For example, do the Programme interventions remain relevant to the different types of professional needs of teachers (full-time/part-time, voluntary/paid, trained/untrained), school management structures as well as the cross ministerial and line ministry levels?

\(^{227}\) As part of its strategic shift processes towards working upstream, UNICEF focuses on the creation of an enabling environment for action and resource leveraging to meet children’s needs. An up-stream approach implies facilitating participatory processes and developing national capacity that will strengthen policy dialogue and formulation, while exposing stakeholders to information, technologies and experiences that UNICEF may bring. It also means that processes that lead to end results are equally important because it is through these processes that capacity building takes place. (UNICEF Evaluation Office, Approach Paper to PPA 2009)

\(^{228}\) ALNAP, Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria, p. 20.
– To what degree do interventions remain relevant and keep pace with changing needs, interests, expectation and priorities of communities and stakeholders?

– To what extent has the EEPCT Programme carved out a unique niche and filled gaps, taking up tasks pertaining to the sector as a whole which were not yet being addressed by other actors?

– How relevant/appropriate is the EEPCT Programme to the range of contexts – conflict, disaster, conflict and disaster, chronic emergency, fragility, early recovery and post-crisis recovery – which are found in the recipient countries?

– Do interventions remain relevant over time and differentiate between the different types of needs and priorities for stakeholders, including different groups of vulnerable population?

– How relevant/appropriate are EEPCT Programme interventions to coordination or coherence challenges within the area of education in emergencies and transitions? 229

– How relevant/appropriate is the EEPCT Programme to the different challenges of financing education in crisis-, or post-crisis contexts? For example, have the funds from the EEPCT programme provided a response that adequately addresses the quantitative challenges (insufficient funds allocated to education in emergencies and transitions) and structural challenges (funding mechanisms not conducive to early recovery and long-term planning)?

– How appropriate are EEPCT Programme interventions to the cyclical development of evidence-based policies, efficient operational strategies and fit-for-purpose financing instruments for education in emergencies and post-crisis?

– How relevant is EEPCT Programme to the needs and challenges within UNICEF pertaining to issues such as responsiveness, accountability and operational flexibility?

– How appropriately is the Programme situated among other education in emergencies and post-crisis transition initiatives at the global level (such as the FTI)?

– How has the relevance of the EEPCT Programme been verified, maintained, and updated throughout its evolving and dynamic implementation process?

– In what areas is the relevance of the EEPCT Programme in need of improvement and/or how can the means for ensuring continued relevance be more fully safeguarded throughout implementation?

4.2 Effectiveness

(16) The definition of effectiveness to be adopted within the PREV shall correspond to that established by ALNAP: “the extent to which an activity achieves its purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs. Implicit within the criterion of effectiveness is timeliness.” 230 The PREV shall establish to what extent has each of the four Designated Goals and key cross-cutting issues of the EEPCT Programme, been effectively fulfilled or pursued to date. Or, to what extent do processes set in motion by the EEPCT Programme appear likely to lead to the fulfilment of those Designed Goals and cross-cutting issues in the near-to-mid term? These questions should be answered at the global and lower levels. Specific Indicators for gauging the effectiveness of the EEPCT Programme are articulated.

229 In light of the forthcoming 2010 Global Cluster Evaluation, specific attention should be placed on evaluating whether interventions are more effective in countries with functioning education clusters (relative to those without them).

230 ALNAP, Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria, p. 20.
in the Programme logical framework and the Results Framework produced by the PRES, currently being reviewed by UNICEF. As part of this broad question, the following, objective-specific issues should be addressed:

- To what extent has the EEPCT Programme contributed to improved quality of education response in emergency or post-crisis countries or territories?
- To what extent has the EEPCT Programme increased the resilience of education sector service delivery during emergencies, chronic crises, in fragile situations, and transitional contexts with specific regard to systems, structures, actors and outcomes (services delivered)?
- To what extent has the EEPCT Programme increased the education sector contribution to better prediction and prevention of and preparedness for emergencies, including disasters, violent conflict, chronic crises (after multiple varieties of crises)?
- To what extent has the EEPCT Programme contributed to the development of evidence-based policies, efficient operational strategies and fit-for-purpose financing instruments for education in emergencies and post-crisis transitions?
- What initial outcomes, positive or negative and intended, or unintended consequences and spill-over effects have resulted from the EEPCT Programme with regard to and beyond the four Designated Goals? Spill-over effects should be addressed, as should outcomes which have implications for sectors of activity outside of but linked to education (e.g., protection, health, WASH, nutrition, and so on).

4.3 Efficiency

(17) The definition of efficiency to be adopted within the PREV shall correspond to that established by ALNAP: “the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – achieved as a result of inputs. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving an output, to see whether the most efficient approach has been used.”

- How efficiently have resources, particularly financial and human resources, been utilised in fulfilment of the EEPCT Programme's four Designated Goals? Where differences are found to exist between them, the efficiency of the EEPCT Programme in relation to each of the Designated Goals should be addressed separately within the evaluation.
  - Could equivalent results have been achieved more efficiently (i.e.: with fewer resources)?
  - Could greater results have been achieved with the same level of resources, or with different allocation criteria and distribution mechanisms with regard to each of the Designated Goals and key cross-cutting issues such as women’s empowerment and gender equity?
  - To what degree and effect have partnerships (including other donors, NGOs, etc as well as national authorities) been mobilised in a manner which contributes to efficiency of the EEPCT Programme?

---

231 Ibid.
4.4 Coherence and Coordination

(18) The evaluation should also consider various issues pertaining to coherence and coordination. For the purposes of the PREV, coherence and coordination are broadly conceived as those components of implementation which contribute to relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the Programme (and other, related, non-UNICEF interventions) in a multi-stakeholder context which includes numerous UN agencies, partner organisations, coordination bodies, bilateral and multilateral aid-funding bodies, and national governance in crisis-affected contexts. Within this category, specific attention should be paid to the following issues, which were noted in the course of the recently completed PRES:

- To what extent has communication regarding the EEPCT Programme within UNICEF been sufficient to generate a common understanding of the Programme’s objectives and strategic intent at multiple offices at various levels (Headquarters, including Copenhagen Supply Division, Regional Offices, Country Offices, Sub-National/District Offices, etc.)?
- To what extent has communication regarding the EEPCT Programme by UNICEF been sufficient to generate a common understanding of the Programme’s objectives and strategic intent at various levels among its partners?
- How has the EEPCT Programme contributed to global coordination of education in emergencies and post-crisis transitions, including the Education Cluster?
- Particular attention should be paid to the Programme’s mutual relation to the Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE) and the Education for All Fast-Track Initiative (EFA-FTI). In particular, to what extent have the evolving processes of the EEPCT Programme and of the FTI partnership interacted and with what outcomes for the countries involved? Are there any lessons learned?
- To the extent that the EEPCT Programme has carved out a unique niche and filled gaps, taking up tasks pertaining to the sector as a whole which were not yet being addressed by other actors, how well has this been coordinated? In other words, has it contributed in a way which other actors were not or could not, thus complementing and not duplicating what others have done at both global and country levels?
- How has the EEPCT Programme contributed to coordination at the country level between UNICEF and other relevant actors, including international and local organisations as well as government institutions (particularly in countries where education clusters have been established)?
- How effectively has the EEPCT Programme coordinated with separate but related sectors of activity, including protection, health, WASH, nutrition, and others? Particular attention should be paid to cross-sector coherence and coordination on the following: (i) intervention design, (ii) intervention implementation and (iii) monitoring, evaluation and learning (including data/information sharing).

4.5 Impact and Sustainability

(19) For the purpose of the PREV ‘impact and sustainability’ are defined as the degree to which “sustainable progress towards quality basic education for all” has been achieved. They will be considered in terms of trends and strategic approaches to building alliances, strengthening national capacities/capabilities and promoting scaled-up investments.
While issues of final impact and sustainability might not yet be measurable in relation to the majority of Programme components, some interventions that have been initiated early on may provide insight into the Programme’s contribution to ‘indicative,’ or anticipated, impact and sustainability. This component of the PREV should consider, for instance, the following questions among others:

- To what extent was sustainability reflected within the design and implementation of the Programme (and its individual interventions)? Findings pertaining to this question should be disaggregated according to the EEPCT Programme’s four Designated Goals and should specifically chart the achievements which resulted from sustainability-oriented measures (or which appear likely to be achieved).

- What has been the impact of early Programme components/interventions which were implemented at the start of the Programme (i.e. in 2007) including those that have involved scaling-up of already existing interventions and established approaches? Is there evidence of the Programme contributing critically to the sustainability of other interventions?

- To what extent has the Programme sought to develop sustainable capabilities and with what results thus far?

- In what way have approaches implemented within the EEPCT Programme been adopted by broader education interventions implemented by and beyond UNICEF?

- To what extent has the EEPCT Programme influenced the availability of donor funding and type of international funding modalities?

- What role has the EEPCT Programme played in national budgeting for education, (for example by promoting increased education sector expenditure)?

If data-based conclusions cannot yet be garnered, indicative observations on anticipated impacts and the prospects for sustainability may be offered (with qualifications concerning the basis for such observations).

### 4.6 Other Themes and Issues

(20) A variety of other issues must be addressed throughout the evaluation. The evaluation team must clarify to what extent it believes the following issues may be included as cross-cutting issues and to what extent they merit stand-alone attention within data collection, analysis, and deliverables.

(21) In particular, the evaluation team will specify how it intends to address the fundamental issues identified by the PRES as pivotal contribution to the Programme. Some of these themes are:

- **Gender** – How effectively has the Programme integrated UNICEF’s commitment to gender equity and women’s empowerment, and what tangible results have been achieved by the EEPCT Programme in
relation to these issues? To what extent have the specific gender needs of girls and boys been integrated into Programme implementation? For example, to what degree has the programme improved women and girls’ abilities to participate effectively in the design, delivery and monitoring of educational interventions at all levels (from the classroom upwards). Have women and girls been enabled to play a greater role in preparedness, prediction and prevention of natural disasters and violence conflict. Or, how have the specific gender impacts of conflict on boys and male youth, from abduction and recruitment into armed groups, to devastation of livelihood opportunities, been incorporated into educational responses?

- **Rights-Based Approach and Participation** – As a matter of policy, UNICEF’s interventions reflect a rights-based approach, including: equality and non-discrimination, inclusion and participation, empowerment, and accountability to assisted populations. The evaluation should consider the degree to which this approach is evident in the EEPCT Programme, and to what tangible effect. Particular attention should be paid to the extent to which beneficiaries’ participation, including children, has informed the EEPCT Programme as well as to the degree to which the Programme has included all relevant stakeholders (including IDPs, refugees, people with disabilities, women, members of minority groups, etc.) in an equitable manner during planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. How, specifically, has equitable inclusion been systematically pursued and with what achievements?

- **Disaster Risk Reduction** – In line with Designated Goals 2 and 3, the evaluation should indicate to what extent the EEPCT Programme has contributed to disaster risk reduction through disaster preparedness and (where applicable) prevention in the education sector. This includes structural mitigation, disaster response planning, DRR education, participation, building alliances between communities and line ministries as well as strengthening relationships and building peace.

- **Sensitivity to Conflict and Fragility** – Given that a substantial number of the countries in which the EEPCT Programme is being implemented have been affected by conflict and/or fragility, examine the means through which conflict-sensitive or fragility-sensitive approaches have been institutionalised and implemented. What, if any, implications has the EEPCT Programme had for conflict-related tensions and/or context-specific components of fragility? Given that attention to issues of conflict sensitivity and fragility may be rooted in a conflict analysis, the evaluation should examine to what degree conflict analyses have been conducted or utilised (having been developed outside of UNICEF) in relation to education programming.

- **Accountability, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning** – To what degree has the EEPCT Programme reflected best practices with regard to results-based accountability (including monitoring, evaluation and learning)? What proportion of EEPCT interventions at any level – global, regional or country – have been rigorously evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental methods? To what degree have EEPCT Programme stakeholders (both within and beyond UNICEF) participated in and benefited from lessons learning exercises/activities (including in-person meetings as well as paper-based or online lessons learning processes)?

### 5.0 INDICATIVE METHODOLOGY

The PREV evaluation team must show, both in the proposal and in the conduct of the assignment, close attention to the utilisation of a rigorous methodology. A recent rapid review of monitoring and evaluation in relation to education in emergencies and transitions noted that it is apparent that rigorousness remains more of an aspiration than a practice. This review specifically highlighted an

---

232 INEE Working Group on Education and Fragility’s work should be consulted for guidance on ‘fragility-sensitive’ approaches as needed.

233 This unpublished, internal document was produced by the Post-war Reconstruction and Development Unit (PRDU), at the University of York as part of the Programme Review cum Evaluability Study (PRES).
over-reliance upon reflective or reflexive methodologies and the unstructured (and unrecorded) analysis of overwhelmingly qualitative data. By contrast, the PREV must be rooted in methods which are transparent, structured, and replicable. The evaluation team will be required to take steps to ensure that (a) comparative analysis of all qualitative or "perceptual" data may be undertaken both within and between case study countries and (b) future evaluations may constructively build upon qualitative as well as quantitative data gathered during the PREV.

(23) The methodology to be adopted should include a theory-based approach to evaluation which is rooted in an understanding of the envisioned intervention logic articulated in the Programme's logical framework. This logic, which has been further developed as part of the Programme Review and Evaluability Study (PRES), will form a key component of the evaluation and, through data collection and documentation review, will be assessed and validated. Finally, to the extent feasible, the methodology should build upon not only the outcomes of the PRES but also on existing norms such as the Core Commitments for Children (CCCs) and the INEE Minimum standards.

5.1 Data Collection

Data should be collected using a participatory approach that utilises a composition of research and data gathering methods. The PREV team will also be in contact with the team of independent experts who recently completed the aforementioned Programme Review and Evaluability Study (PRES) of the EEPCT Programme.

- **Documentation Review** – The full range of reports and publications pertaining to the EEPCT Programme, including the outcomes of the PRES, should be systematically reviewed using a specifically designed tool/framework in the course of the PREV. Given the volume of material which exists at the global, regional, and country levels, a tool/framework/matrix must be developed in order to code and, hence, enable comparison of documentary evidence according to the criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence/coordination, etc.) and levels (global, national, systemic, and community/beneficiary) identified within these ToR; the most important levels of analysis will, however, remain the four EEPCT Programme Designated Goals.

- **Self-evaluation reports** – One of the key findings of the PRES has been to recommend that UNICEF country offices that have participated in the EEPCT Programme should conduct a self evaluation as part of the PREV. UNICEF has decided to request country offices to prepare a self-assessment (SA) document. These should state the aims and objectives, the local context and a description of how the country offices assure the rigour of their monitoring and evaluation processes among other evaluative aspects, as detailed in the PRES report. Only the six countries participating in the case studies have been required to submit a SA document prior to the evaluators' field visit. Non case study countries will only be encouraged to participate in the SA, which results will assist the compilation and analysis of global-level data.

- **Secondary Data Analysis** – Secondary data must also be gathered from governmental education authorities (including, where available, Education Management Information Systems, or EMIS), UNICEF offices, partner organisations (including NGOs and donor agencies not necessarily involved in the EEPCT Programme), and others. Such data will be of fundamental importance in, most notably, understanding the nature of the lower-level impacts (particularly upon communities and beneficiaries) which may otherwise be challenging for the evaluation team to rigorously assess during the relatively

---


236 The proposal as well as eventual Inception Report for the PREV should demonstrate the criteria and structured approach to the documentation review which the evaluation team will adopt.
short period of field work. Secondary data analysis may also be conducted of current data available on the financial allocations of the Programme in order to address the following issues: (i) the relative level of disbursement according to the Programme’s four Designated Goals; and (ii) the efficiency of utilization of resources, particularly financial and human resources (compared to UNICEF’s non-EEPCT interventions and other education stakeholders’ interventions).

- **One-on-One Interviews** – Semi-structured interviews must be conducted with relevant individuals at all levels of the EEPCT Programme, including the following: UNICEF personnel (in particular, management, Education and Emergencies section/offices, and Evaluation Office); partner organisation personnel (IRC, INEE, Save the Children, etc.); relevant government authorities (in EEPCT countries); and other relevant stakeholders (community leaders, local school officials, teachers, and beneficiaries, including parents). Such interviews must be guided by a basic standardised protocol which will be applied, with minor modifications where necessary, in each of the case study countries. Closely linked to this interview protocol will be a standardised coding matrix and guide which will allow responses – despite their diversity – to be compared according to key underlying dimensions. The involvement of several evaluators and the inability of all to be present at each interview render such a tool particularly crucial for the PREV. The anonymity of all interview respondents must be stressed at the outset of all interviews, and care must be taken to avoid raising expectations following upon the PREV.

- **Focus Group Discussions** – Focus groups may be useful in reducing anxiety related to direct attribution and can enable evaluators to validate the degree to which findings are either shared or contested by larger groups of informants. They should be utilised in the following three ways: (i) to identify key issues at the outset of field work, (ii) to validate or test findings at the close of field work, and (iii) to enable rapid data gathering from large groups (such as parents and teacher associations or school children) which may be uncomfortable providing data in a one-on-one setting. Where necessary, participatory rapid appraisal (PRA) methods may be utilised within (or supplant) focus groups, particularly in working with youth.

- **Web-Based Surveys and ‘Blog’** – Short online surveys (in English, French, Spanish, and, if possible, Arabic) should be utilised in order to gain access to information and input from programme countries and non-participating countries, including those that are not among the selected case studies. The purpose of this survey will be to elicit comparable data from all countries using the same metrics in a completely anonymous manner, thereby establishing clearer comparisons among programme countries and between participating and non-participating (counterfactual) countries and ensuring maximum candour. It will enable respondents to provide input anonymously and should be structured around the four EEPCT Programme Designated Goals and the issues identified for inclusion in the PREV. Furthermore, a web log (or ‘blog’) should be established with pages/questions revolving around the various themes being examined in the PREV. At the later stages of the evaluation, the blog may also be utilised as a means of gaining broad-based feedback on initial findings. Given, however, the limited internet access of many field-based personnel (at UNICEF, partner organisations, and government agencies) as well as challenges pertaining to language, the blog should be viewed as a supplemental rather than core data collection tool; it will be of greatest use in communicating with and gaining feedback from personnel based in their organisations’ headquarters, regional offices, and country offices.

- **Key Stakeholder Consultations** – Relevant individuals from key organisations should also be consulted in the course of these evaluations, with the primary purpose of establishing historical and other factual data about the programme (i.e., as opposed to the one-on-one interviews, which will aim to solicit the views and experiences of stakeholders). Such consultations, which should include the team which conducted the recently completed PRES, may take the form of semi-structured interviews or, where appropriate, relatively less structured discussions. Such stakeholders will include at least representatives of the Government of The Netherlands, the European Commission, the World Bank, and other relevant stakeholders (community leaders, local school officials, teachers, and beneficiaries, including parents). Please refer to the PRES final report for a comprehensive list of stakeholders. Such individuals will come from both within UNICEF as well as from partner agencies, particularly Save the Children, the International Rescue Committee and INEE.
the Brookings Institution, the International Institute of Education Planning (IIEP), FTI Secretariat and UNESCO. Key stakeholders, unlike EEPCT Programme partners, need not be involved in the Programme itself but may be well placed to comment upon the contribution of EEPCT-supported interventions to the broader area of education in emergencies and post-crisis transitions. Particularly valuable will be the views of experts in other developmental organisations who are familiar with the EEPCT Programme or who are involved in the design, deliver and evaluation of comparable or related programmes; these shall include but not be limited to individuals involved with the Save the Children campaign ‘Rewrite the Future’, the education in emergency programmes by the World Bank and UNESCO, and those from INEE’s Education and Fragility Working Group.238 An inclusive approach should be pursued when selecting key stakeholder consultations in order to ensure that the results of the PREV reflect a wide range of inputs and that sufficient ownership and buy-in from relevant institutions is enhanced.

- **Participant observations** – Given the lack of baseline data and the complexity of the contexts and the vulnerability of the beneficiary groups involved (refer to the PRES report), participant observation is anticipated to play a critical role in the evaluation, particularly at the classroom, school governance and community levels. Members of the PREV need to have the relevant skills and expertise to conclude from both perceptual and objective (direct observational) data. An observation guide will be developed accordingly.

(24) In order to evaluate numerous components of the Programme, it will be crucial to understand the pre-EEPCT context and, hence, to draw upon counterfactuals. Such counterfactuals may range from benchmarking studies of the field of education in emergencies and transitions to baseline data or non-treatment (or alternative treatment) groups at the school or community level. The recently completed PRES has identified the plausible counterfactuals which the PREV may draw upon, and the evaluation team will be expected to choose the most appropriate counterfactuals for assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the EEPCT Programme.

### 5.1.1. Evaluation Ethics

(25) All data collection must be conducted in an ethical manner which protects respondents, avoids creating anxiety, and safeguards dignity and rights. Methods to be applied to child respondents (those under the age of 18 years) should be clearly identified within the PREV Inception Report and Data Collection Toolkit (see section 6.0) and should be agreed upon between UNICEF and the evaluation team. Furthermore, the evaluation should reflect the following principles: (i) openness, (ii) broad participation, (iii) reliability, and (iv) independence. The final point is particularly critical, and UNICEF’s Evaluation Office will take all necessary steps to ensure that the composition and conduct of the evaluation reflects the principle of independence.

### 5.2 Data Analysis

(26) As previously noted, evaluation data should be analysed in a structured manner, and coding methods should be utilised in order to categorise responses to core interview questions.239 Qualitative and quantitative data analysis software may prove useful in this process, and the specific statistical software and methods to be employed should be identified within the proposal. The analysis will primarily require a deductive approach rooted in the EEPCT Programme’s logic model and results framework; inductive analysis of issues which fall outside of the results framework (such as implementation and process management) will also play a key, though likely secondary, role.

---

238 Relevant contacts for personnel affiliated with these programmes will be communicated to the evaluation team at the start of the PREV.

In addition to evaluating the EEPCT Programme’s four Designated Goals according to the result framework or logic model, the evaluation must also consider what factors facilitate or disrupt the transformation of the initial design into the initial outputs. Doing so will require not only a consideration of the various levels of Programme implementation and evaluation criteria but also of the various phases of implementation (Figure 1).

**FIGURE 1. Layers of Analysis for the PREV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Implementation Implementation</th>
<th>Key PREV Criteria</th>
<th>Phases of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Relevance/ Appropriateness</td>
<td>Overall EEPCT Programme Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Level</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Conversion to Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Level</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Design of Specific Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education System Level</td>
<td>Coherence &amp; Coordination</td>
<td>Implementation &amp; Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or Beneficiary</td>
<td>Indicative Impact &amp;</td>
<td>M&amp;E, Learning, &amp; Prog. Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phases of implementation are particularly important to examine and analyse within the PREV given that it comprises a formative, though not necessarily mid-term, evaluation of the EEPCT Programme. Examining these phases will assist in elucidating what barriers and facilitating features exist in converting the initial Programme design (inputs) into the envisioned results (outputs) and beyond (outcomes). As demonstrated in Figure 1, these may exist in the incorporation of the initial Programme design or its downstream conversion into the Country Programme, specific interventions, management/implementation arrangements, and monitoring and evaluation (and other aspects of learning and programme enhancement).
5.3 Country Case Study Selection

The identification of case study countries is critical in gaining a broad portrait of this complex and evolving intervention and comprises a major component of the methodology. Numerous technical criteria have been considered in the selection of the case study countries, including: (i) the amount of EEPCT funding received, (ii) the amount of EEPCT funding as a proportion of the overall education funding need in the country and/or of the total received from all donors; (iii) duration since receipt of first EEPCT funding tranche, (iv) the range of Designated Goals reflected in the local EEPCT Programme interventions, and (v) nature of the context (emergency, early recovery, recovery, chronic crisis, fragility, etc.). Beyond these technical criteria, it was also considered significant to examine contexts in which reportedly novel interventions were established through the EEPCT Programme and to include a range of geographical locations; the need for geographic representation is rooted primarily in the awareness that end-users, particularly those from within UNICEF, must recognise that voices and issues from within their regions (while not necessarily uniform or fully overlapping) were accounted for.

Based on an analysis of these factors, the following locations have been selected for the PREV:

- **Angola** – This country has received US$2 million in EEPCT funding in two main tranches since 2007 and had spent just under 50 per cent of this funding by 2008. It is a transition country that has suffered large-scale and protracted devastation as a result of war. Activities include ALP, Teacher Training, School Health Promotion, Provision of Learning Kits, DRR programme in schools, ECD assessment, development of ECD policy, and roll out of CFS components and Framework. Three if the four EEPCT Programme Designed Goals are being implemented in this country although there are no recorded evaluation studies.

- **Colombia** – This country has received US$2.9 million in EEPCT funding in four main tranches since 2007. All four Designated Goals are being pursued. Activities include Quality of Education, Adolescent Development and HIV/AIDS Prevention and Protection and Humanitarian Action, Peace Education. The ‘School Going to the Child’ strategy is due to be expanded throughout the country and is scheduled - along with the ‘Return to Happiness’ strategy – for evaluation.

- **Cote d’Ivoire** – This country has received a significant amount of EEPCT funding (US$5 million) in several tranches since 2007. As such, it is one context in which interventions have had an opportunity to develop and for results to start becoming measurable. Furthermore, three of the four EEPCT Programme Designated Goals are being implemented in this country, which has also been home to noteworthy interventions such as Learning Along Borders for Living Across Boundaries (LAB4LAB) and Accelerated Learning Programmes (ALPs). At least two evaluation team members are expected to undertake a two-to-three-day visit to the UNICEF West and Central Africa Regional Office (WCARO) in Dakar, Senegal either at the beginning or tail end of field work in Cote d’Ivoire.

- **Liberia** – This country is unique in that the majority of the EEPCT Programme funds which it received – US$12 million out of US$18.1 million – went to the Liberia Education Pooled Fund. As such, it is one of the few places in which Designated Goal 4’s contribution to the development of fit-for-purpose aid financing mechanisms has been realised. Given the interest which remains surrounding multi-donor education funding in transitional contexts, understanding the Liberian experience will be significant. Furthermore, the country has also been the site of interventions, including LAB4LAB and Talent Academies, which have been labelled by some as innovative and noteworthy.

- **The Philippines** – As a post-conflict and natural disaster context, this country has received US$2.75 million in Programme funding over three tranches since 2007. It is pursuing all four objectives. Core activities include Building Safe Learning Environment, Policy Advocacy and Social Mobilisation, and Disaster Risk Reduction. No evaluation studies are currently planned.
Sri Lanka – Having experienced a protracted conflict, which recently ended, and a major natural
disaster (the 2004 tsunami), Sri Lanka provides challenges for the EEPCT Programme which merit
exploration within the PREV. Furthermore, it is the largest recipient of EEPCT funding in UNICEF’s
South Asia region, at US$3.21 million, and has been home to activities addressing all four of the
Programme’s Designated Goals.

The evaluation team may want to pay particular attention to countries or regions (such as Middle East
and North Africa) that will not be part of case study visits but could provide meaningful insights through
remote analysis such as ad hoc desk reviews, surveys and telephone or written interviews with key
informants.

6.0 OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

The following outputs will be produced by the evaluation team. Each, aside from the Initial Findings
Paper (see below), will be submitted in draft form and will be updated following feedback provided by the
UNICEF Evaluation Office and by the aforementioned Reference Group as appropriate.

- **Inception Report** – The Inception Report will comprise a paper, between 10 and 20 pages (including
  a three-page executive summary but excluding annexes), outlining the methodology to be adopted. In
  particular, it should specify the manner in which each theme and criteria in the evaluation will be
  evaluated. The Inception Report should include plans for mitigating any challenges, for instance
  pertaining to data availability and quality, and should include a discussion of their potential
  implications for the credibility of evaluation findings. It is also an opportunity for further refinement and
  sharpening of the Results Framework. This Report should be sufficiently clear to enable future
  replication of the evaluation team’s approach. Finally, it should include a draft outline for the Final
  Report of the PREV. The Inception Report will be discussed during an initial round of interviews and
  consultations at UNICEF Headquarters and will be finalised based on feedback received from the RG
during this visit to New York.

- **Data Collection Toolkit** – This deliverable will comprise a set of implementation-ready tools which
  will be utilised in data collection (e.g., interview and focus group guides, surveys, desk review
  instruments, matrixes and observational tools). The Data Collection Toolkit must also include drafts
  of any coding matrices or other structured tools which will be used in analysing, most notably,
  qualitative data.

- **Country-Specific Evaluation Reports** – Following each country case study, a country-specific
  evaluation report will be produced. These reports must summarize the intended and actual
  methodologies employed and note the findings of the evaluation report in relation to the
  aforementioned criteria, issues and themes. Options or recommendations for enhancing the EEPCT
  Programme in each context must also be provided and prioritized. To ensure accessibility, each
  country-specific evaluation report should be no longer than 25 pages, excluding annexes, and should
  include a concise executive summary of between two and four pages that clearly conveys the key
  takeaways of the country case study exercise. These reports should be organised according to the
  four Designated Goals of the EEPCT Programme. The country reports will be reviewed by UNICEF
  and revised by the evaluators prior to their finalisation.

- **Initial Findings Paper** – In order to enable the evaluation team to agree internally on findings and to
  share them with UNICEF prior to the drafting of the full evaluation report, an Initial Findings Paper will
  be produced. This document, which should be between 15 and 20 pages (excluding annexes), should
  note overarching findings and specify issues which require clarification by UNICEF personnel or other
  involved stakeholders. To prevent delays in progress on the Final Report, this document is intended
  as a discussion piece (or working document) rather than as part of the official evaluation report;
feedback concerning the Initial Findings paper should be incorporated into the Final Report, but the Initial Findings Paper will not require revision and ‘finalisation’ as do the other evaluation outputs.

- **Draft Final Report** – The Draft Final Report shall comprise an initial draft of the Final Report (see below). It shall correspond fully to the requirements of the Final Report but need not include the PowerPoint presentation.

- **Final Report and Presentation** – The Final Report of the evaluation should present overarching as well as country-specific findings. Its structure should correspond closely to the four Designated Goals of the EEPCT Programme while also accounting for cross-cutting issues. It should be at least 40 pages but no more than 60 pages (excluding annexes) and should include a five-page executive summary. Unlike the Initial Findings Paper, which addresses broad issues and findings, the Final Report will include detailed evidence and examples to corroborate all conclusions presented. Findings as well as recommendations made within the Final Report should adhere to United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards. Most importantly, recommendations should be: (a) clearly devised from evidence presented in the evaluation, (b) “implementation-ready” and prioritized key strategic recommendations rather than presented in overly vague or general terms and (c) targeted towards various operational units within the Programme (e.g., HQ, ROs, COs, partners, etc.). The annexes to the Final Report should include final editions of all country-specific evaluation reports as well as the Inception Report and data collection toolkit. Underlying data for all charts, tables, and figures, particularly where based on survey results, should be provided in an annex.

Finally, the Final Report (though not the draft final report) should be accompanied by a highly professional PowerPoint presentation of 20 to 30 slides, with complete speaking notes, outlining the findings of the PREV. This presentation shall be delivered to Programme stakeholders at a venue to be agreed upon with UNICEF and the donor; such an event may include the EEPCT Programme annual review meeting. (Note: If timing for a presentation at the end of the evaluation – following submission of the Final Report – is not feasible, UNICEF reserves the right to ask the evaluation team to present preliminary findings at either the Initial Findings Paper or Draft Final Report stages of the evaluation.)

(32) All outputs will be written in English and will be provided electronically in Word format (and in one case, as a PPT) to the UNICEF Evaluation Office. At the conclusion of the evaluation, electronic editions of all data must be provided to the UNICEF Evaluation Office except where doing so would unavoidably compromise the anonymity of the respondents/informants. Where feasible, however, anonymity may be safeguarded through the deletion of key pieces of identifying information from official records. Such records may include but are not limited to databases or spreadsheets including data collected via surveys, structured or semi-structured questionnaires, observational checklists, or documentation reviews. Interview notes from unstructured interviews need not be submitted in order to safeguard respondent confidentiality.

### 7.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(33) Each of the team members and stakeholders involved in the PREV shall be guided by the general roles and responsibilities outlined below. These roles and responsibilities should be understood as preliminary and will be refined in consultation with the UNICEF Evaluation Office prior to the submission of the Evaluation Report.

---

240 As per the UNICEF Management Response Guidelines, December 2009.
of the PREV Inception Report. This finalised roles and responsibilities document will comprise a crucial annex to the contract for the PREV.

**Evaluation Team Leader**

- Development of evaluation methodology;
- Participation in field work for the case studies;
- Oversight and management of team members;
- Orientation and training of team members, data collection assistants where applicable;
- Responsible for meeting deadlines and quality of evaluation products;
- Principal authorship of final report;
- Quality assurance of all PREV outputs;
- Design and facilitation of final workshop.

**Evaluation Team Members**

- Complete assignments as directed by the Team Leader in fulfilment of the ToR.

**UNICEF Evaluation Office**

- Providing overall guidance and support to the evaluation team to ensure that the goals of the project ToR are achieved in an adequate and timely manner;
- Undertaking quality assurance to ensure that data collection is undertaken in a manner consistent with the UNEG Norms and Standards and with professional evaluation standards;
- Safeguarding the independence of the evaluation;
- Ensuring that adequate support is provided on the ground by UNICEF offices visited by the team;
- Facilitation of new data collection--e.g. set up intranet questionnaires; protocol support to trips and security clearance/ logistic advice;
- Providing an initial set of comments to project outputs before they are submitted to other stakeholders for comment;
- Liaising with the Education Section, focal points in UNICEF’s country and regional offices, and donors to share the ToR and draft reports, and cull comments on these key project outputs to be shared with the evaluation team;
- Ensuring that the evaluation team takes these comments into account and responds to them in a transparent manner; and
- Undertaking overall contract management.

The Evaluation Office will accompany the evaluation team on its data collection mission in order to fulfil its role in safeguarding the independence, undertaking quality assurance, ensuring adherence to these Terms of Reference, and to assist in logistical and administrative matters as necessary.
**UNICEF Education Section**

- Providing all necessary background information on the EEPCT Programme, both from a substantive and administrative standpoint;
- Facilitating the collection of key documentation requested by the evaluation team in a timely manner;
- Providing substantive comments on the key outputs produced by the evaluation team for the purpose of accuracy and clarity through representation in the Reference Group;
- Assisting the Evaluation Office with access to key stakeholder groups and individual stakeholders, as needed;
- Participating in the interview process as key informants on the programme;
- Participating in the review workshop in which preliminary findings are presented.

**UNICEF Country and Regional Offices**

- Designation of a focal point for support;
- Liaison with and introduction of evaluators to national educational counterparts and other partners;
- Facilitation of logistical support to evaluation team;
- Provision of documents for review;
- Participation in one-on-one interviews and focus group discussions, as requested;
- Review of field visit report for factual errors.

**Reference Group**

- Contribute to the quality and utility of the evaluation by commenting and advising on the PREV at several pre-determined junctures of the evaluation process, i.e. PREV ToR, inception report and draft report.

### 8.0 TENTATIVE EVALUATION SCHEDULE

The evaluation team is expected to establish a detailed timeline within its technical proposal. However, the evaluation team must be available to begin work in May 2010 and must submit its final evaluation report within six months. The draft report will be submitted no later than Friday, 15 October 2010. It is currently anticipated that the majority of field-work for country case studies will be undertaken in July through August 2010; **a minimum of three evaluation team members must participate in each country case study**. Key milestones are as follow:

- **8 June** Submission of draft Inception Report
- **2 July** Submission of final Inception Report and data collection toolkit
- **12 July** Initiation of field work in case study countries and desk-based data collection
- **31 August** Conclusion of field work in case study countries and desk-based data collection

---

241 It should be noted that there may be some constraints with access in countries as some schools may be closed when the field work is anticipated to take place.
20 September  Submission of initial findings report
15 October  Submission of draft evaluation final report
15 November Submission of final evaluation report and PowerPoint presentation

Please note that this tentative schedule does not include three to-be-scheduled meetings and consultations at UNICEF New York and/or in The Netherlands. The initial meeting, which will take place upon the submission of the draft inception report and data collection toolkit, will provide an opportunity for UNICEF Evaluation Office and Programme personnel to provide input on the methods to be employed. It will also allow the evaluation team to meet, consult, and interview key UNICEF headquarters personnel involved in the EEPCT Programme as well as available members of the Reference Group. The second event will take place either prior to or immediately following the submission of the Initial Findings Paper. It will provide an opportunity for additional interviews at UNICEF and partner organisations and for UNICEF personnel to provide clarifications on technical issues or to steer the evaluation team towards individuals or information hitherto not incorporated. The final meeting will take place around the submission of the final evaluation report. It will enable the evaluation team to present its findings, highlight forward-looking recommendations for overcoming challenges, and to answer questions posed by stakeholders (including representatives of the Government of The Netherlands and of the aforementioned Reference Group).

9.0 PERSONNEL SPECIFICATIONS

(34) The evaluation team should include between four and six experts with extensive experience in conducting education-related evaluations, particularly multi-country evaluations, on behalf of major international organisations in emergency and transitional contexts. The PREV should be led by a Team Leader who is a highly credible external senior evaluator with technical competence adequate to lead the work. A team leader conversant with UNICEF’s structure and programmes is an asset.

(35) The team must show the mix of skills adequate to meet the following requirements. Individual members of the team may possess several of the required competencies; as a whole the team must possess all.

Thematic
- Management of multi-stakeholder evaluations, with focus on education in emergencies
- Educational management, coordination, policy planning, programming and implementation
- Humanitarian emergencies (armed conflict and natural disasters) and post-crisis transitions
- Gender in education and/or emergencies

Technical
- Knowledge of education programming with the volume and complexity of the EEPCT Programme
- Expertise in survey designs and observational methods and data analysis as well as interviews and focus groups and desk review
- Experience conducting data collection among children, and familiarity with standards and procedures for protecting children and other human subjects in research
- Expertise in social data information requirements for education programming in international development settings
- Skills in developing analytical frameworks, including gender and vulnerability analysis

**Personal**

- Ability to operate within a wide range of socio-cultural contexts
- Professional conduct and comportment at all times
- Track record of delivering project outputs on time and budget
- Strong commitment to teamwork / experience working within or leading diverse teams
- Willingness to adapt to a dynamic, multi-stakeholder context

(36) One or all of the team members must have a background in one or all of the following: quantitative analysis, qualitative methods, gender and women’s empowerment, disaster risk reduction and conflict-sensitive development. Each team must include at least two team members with fluency or high-level proficiency in French, at least one team member who is fluent or highly proficient in Spanish, and at least one team member who is fluent or highly proficient in Portuguese. The inclusion of a team member with proficiency or fluency in Arabic will be considered advantageous. All team members are expected to have superior written and spoken English-language abilities.

(37) Evaluation teams including individuals with programme management experience and familiarity with UNICEF policies and procedures will be preferred. Preference will also be shown to teams which are gender-balanced and which include evaluators from developing countries.

### 10.0 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Final technical and financial proposals must be submitted by short-listed vendors by 16:00 (EST) on 22 March 2010 to PREV@unicef.org. Proposals, which will form a critical component of the contract to be signed with the selected vendor, must include at least the elements described below.

- **Understanding of the ToRs and Thematic Issues** – This section should **demonstrate** the evaluation team’s understanding of these ToR and of education in emergencies and post-crisis transition. Innovations or improvements on the ToRs may also be highlighted and summarised within this section (though should also be explicated within the methodology section).

- **Experience with Similar Assignments** – The proposal must outline previous experience with similar assignments. For each assignment, applicants are requested to provide the following information to the best of their ability: (i) title of the project, (ii) client/organisation on behalf of whom the evaluation was conducted, (iii) methodology employed, (iv) locations and durations (in days) of any non-desk-based work, and (v) current contact details (telephone and e-mail) for the focal point at the client organisation. Please also clearly highlight how many (and which) of the proposed team members (for this PREV), if any, were involved in the assignment. At least one sample report/publication relevant to the PREV must be annexed to each proposal.
Proposed Approach, Data Collection and Analysis Methodologies – These should be separated according to data collection and analysis. Ethical considerations related to data collection, particularly where children are involved, should be clearly outlined alongside intended strategies for ensuring ethical conduct. Attention should be paid to quantitative or qualitative software packages which will be used; structured means for analysing qualitative data should be outlined in as great a detail as possible. While an indicative methodology has been included within the ToRs, applicants are invited to submit additions and revisions which they believe would strengthen the PREV.

Qualifications and Envisioned Roles of Key Personnel, and Management – In addition to CVs of key personnel (no longer than four pages each), vendors are asked to summarize each team member’s qualifications and to specify exactly which role each will play in the evaluation. Please indicate how many person-days each team member is anticipated to provide; this information must correspond with the ‘envisioned timeline’ (see above) and with the financial proposal. Any time periods between May and November 2010 in which a team member will not be available must be identified in this section. Additionally, indicate clearly the envisioned management arrangements and how the various resources will be coordinated.

Envisioned Timeline – Applicants should specify the envisioned timeline for the evaluation. This timeline must take into consideration the ‘tentative evaluation schedule’ included within these ToRs as well as the availability of all team members. While proposals may present the envisioned timeline in any format, a draft template is included in an annex to these ToRs. The October deadline for submission of the draft final report must not be changed.

Draft Final Report Outline – An outline for the Final Report of the evaluation should be included. It should include all major headings and sub-headings to be included in this report as well as a list of envisaged annexes. UNICEF anticipates that this outline will be revised and updated throughout the evaluation process.

Professional References – UNICEF maintains the right to seek references from clients on behalf of whom the applicants have conducted ‘similar assignments’. However, up-to-date contact details should be provided for two references for each proposed team members; these details should be provided separately from the team members’ CVs.

Compliance Statement – All applications must be accompanied by a statement confirming the vendor’s and team members’ compliance with UNICEF General Terms and Conditions for Institutional/Corporate Contracts.

242 Ethical issues may include the following considerations, among others. The evaluation may have substantial contact with children as informants or objects of study. In all contacts with children, the UNICEF ethical guidelines regarding issues like confidentiality and not exposing the child to danger must be respected. Within the consultants’ reports, individuals should not be identifiable directly or indirectly. Care should be taken when reporting statements or interviews. When in doubt, it is recommended to feedback to the informant and ask them to confirm their statements. All informants will be offered the option of anonymity, for all methods used. No participant other than UNICEF staff may be compelled to cooperate with the evaluation. Dissemination or exposure of results and of any interim products must follow the rules agreed upon in the contract. In general, unauthorized disclosure is prohibited. Any sensitive issues or concerns should be raised with the evaluation management team as soon as they are identified.
Annex A. Template for Envisioned Evaluation Timeline

Evaluation outputs as well as phases of data collection (including field work) and analysis should be included within this template or a similar document. For all deliverables/outputs, the end date will be taken as the anticipated delivery date. Time should be incorporated for the Programme’s numerous stakeholders to provide feedback on all deliverables and for the updating of these documents based on applicable feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Component/Output</th>
<th>Persons Involved</th>
<th>Person-Days (#)</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The number of lines included within this template is not intended to suggest the number of tasks, components, or outputs to be included in the PREV. Applicants may include as many separate items as is necessary to give a comprehensive portrait of the activities to be undertaken by the evaluation team.
Annex B. List of documents provided with the RfPS

1) Consolidated Netherlands Donor Report 2008
2) NL Final Proposal of Education in Emergencies and Post Crisis
3) Working Programme Mapping Matrix
4) UNICEF Evaluation Policy
5) UNICEF Executive Directive on the Evaluation Function