



## **EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**School Rehabilitation and Capacity Building for School  
Maintenance (B1-22b)**

## **DISCLAIMER**

This end-of project evaluation was undertaken by external consultants; Stars Orbit Consultants and Management Development. Findings were shared in a meeting in Amman with staff of UH-HABITAT. The views expressed and conclusions reached in the report remain those of the consultants and do not necessarily reflect the official position of UN-HABITAT.

Presented by:  
Stars Orbit Consultants and Management Development



May 2010

## 1. Table of contents

| Contents   | Page Number |
|--|-------------|
| Abbreviations and acronyms   | 3           |
| Executive Summary  | 4           |
| Introduction   | 6           |
| Project Description  | 6           |
| Evaluation Purpose and Scope   | 7           |
| Evaluation Methodology   | 8           |
| Evaluation Findings <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Achievements and Results</li><li>2. Relevance</li><li>3. Efficiency and Effectiveness</li><li>4. Partnership</li><li>5. Sustainability</li><li>6. Other considerations Relevant to Development</li><li>7. Operational Effectiveness</li></ol>   | 10          |
| Lessons Learned  | 17          |
| Recommendations  | 18          |
| Annexes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>A- Terms of Reference</li><li>B- List of documents reviewed</li><li>C- Field Interviews</li><li>D- Field Evaluation Guidelines</li><li>E- Pictures of Schools with current average rehabilitation works</li><li>F- Pictures of all schools</li><li>G- Field feedback from beneficiaries interviewed for each school visited</li><li>H- SOC Background</li></ol> | 19          |

## **Abbreviations and Acronyms**

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| DoE:        | Directorate of Education                           |
| GOI:        | Government of Iraq                                 |
| ITF:        | Iraq Trust Fund                                    |
| MDG:        | Millennium Development Goals                       |
| MoE:        | Ministry of Education                              |
| NER:        | Net Enrolment Rate                                 |
| NDS:        | National Development Strategy                      |
| SOC:        | Stars Orbit Consultants and Management Development |
| UN-HABITAT: | United Nations Human Settlements Programme         |
| UNICEF:     | United Nations Children's Fund                     |
| UNDG        | United Nations Development Group                   |
| UNEG:       | United Nations Evaluation Guidelines               |
| WatSan:     | Water and Sanitation                               |

## Executive Summary

Until the 1980s, the education system in Iraq was regarded as one of the best in the Middle East. However, nearly two decades of conflict, unstable political conditions and an extremely volatile security situation have taken a considerable toll. Among the many challenges in rebuilding the education system is the rebuilding and enhancement of schools themselves, and the equipping of those schools with teaching materials and trained teachers.

During the period of instability, enrollment numbers at all levels fell dramatically, and in 2000 it was reported by UNICEF that as many as 23 percent of primary school aged children were not attending school, with even lower rates for girls, and in rural areas. Immediately after the conflict in May 2003, only one in six children had textbooks, teachers were unpaid, school facilities were in poor condition, shortages of supplies and equipments were endemic, and the quality of education was in serious decline. Combined with systematic looting and destruction of public property, most schools lacked plumbing, wiring, lighting, desks, windows and doors.

In this context, UN-HABITAT and UNICEF partnered together and launched the school rehabilitation program. UNICEF started in south/centre and had completed the rehabilitation of around 800 schools throughout Iraq by the end of 2003, benefiting around 400,000 students. In addition, they completed a comprehensive rehabilitation of 208 schools, as well as WatSan facilities in 482 additional schools, benefiting 240,000 students by 2005. UN-HABITAT, for its part, completed the rehabilitation of 400 schools in northern Iraq and 260 in south and central Iraq benefiting 230,000 students.

The project under evaluation, entitled School Rehabilitation and Capacity Building for School Maintenance (B1-22b), was one of several similarly structured projects in which UNICEF and UN-HABITAT partnered and distributed work according to their respective strengths. This evaluation will focus on the contributions made by UN-HABITAT within the project framework. The developmental goal of the project was to increase access to primary, intermediate and secondary education for school age children in grades 1 to 12, with an emphasis on rural areas and girls' education, and enhance the capacity of Directorates of Education in targeted governorates, on school maintenance and school sanitation and hygiene promotion. The interventions of UN-HABITAT focused on 70 schools, in the targeted governorates of Missan, Basra, and Thi-Qar. The project was funded through the UNDG-ITF, with a total budget of USD 15,660,938, of which USD 6,631,818 was allocated for the activities to be implemented by UN-HABITAT. The project was originally planned to be implemented over 24 months, but was extended, ultimately running for 32 months, from July 2006 to March 2009.

UN-HABITAT's main implementation partners were UNICEF, the Ministry of Education (MoE), and Directorates of Education (DoEs) in the targeted areas. Other effective partners included local contractors, through whom complementary benefits of employment generation and economic growth were achieved. Direct beneficiaries of the project included students and teachers of the targeted schools, who benefited from a better overall educational environment. A total of 35,000 school age children and youth benefited from these interventions. The rehabilitation works also included the creation of additional classrooms to prevent crowdedness. In addition to school-based beneficiaries, the DoEs' technical staff benefited from the capacity development programme in maintenance of school buildings, which was implemented as an integral part of the project.

The project was in line with the priorities identified in the National Development Strategy for Iraq, 2005-2007 with regard to *achieving primary education for all*. In addition, the project has made a meaningful contribution towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). In particular, the project has supported progress towards MDGs 2—*achieve universal primary education*, and 3—*promote gender equality and empower women*, by supporting the rehabilitation of schools and by placing an explicit emphasis on girls' education.

In relation to the project's objectives and planned results, this evaluation also took into consideration the effects of the unstable security situation in Iraq during the project implementation period, as well as the remote nature of managing, implementing and monitoring the project activities inside Iraq from UN-HABITAT in Amman, Jordan. Despite this challenging implementation context, the project has achieved its core goals and objectives.

### **Recommendations**

1. Plans should be prepared, and sufficient funds should be allocated by the GoI to implement and support similar projects in other schools, especially in the rural areas.
2. GoI should allocate the necessary resources (human and financial) to establish an effective and operational system for preventive maintenance of the schools.
3. An effective system should be established by the GoI, for the regular inspection of the physical condition of the schools, and the carrying out of the necessary repairs and maintenance.
4. GoI should dedicate more teachers to meet the increase in student enrolment which has resulted from the rehabilitation work, and the increase in the number of classrooms.
5. As much as possible, maintenance activities should be scheduled for the summer months, so that they do not disrupt the academic calendar of students.
6. The excellent partnership between UN-HABITAT and GOI which was demonstrated through this project should be maintained and further enhanced in all areas of relevant technical assistance, financial support, and MoE/DoE capacity development.
7. The programme of capacity development of national staff involved in maintenance should be further expanded with the technical assistance of UN-HABITAT and UNICEF.
8. In similar future projects of UN-HABITAT, the increased involvement of local contractors and labor should be encouraged, to support the local communities, create jobs, and reduce unemployment.
9. UN-HABITAT should continue its support for child friendly school environments. Specific practices should be maintained, such as the use of colorful paintings on school walls to attract students, the use of child friendly toilets with no sharp edges for easy access, and child friendly hand basins installed at appropriate heights with stickers to promote hygiene awareness. Furthermore, UN-HABITAT should encourage the GoI to follow these standards as well in their own school construction and rehabilitation projects.

## **1. Introduction**

During the past 30 years, war and political instability has led to the deterioration in all basic services including shelter, health, education, human rights and infrastructure, forcing millions of Iraqis to suffer. Education quality and services provided by the government to most of the Iraqi governorates has declined significantly due to years of neglect and abuse at all levels. Consequently, Iraq's education system is largely dysfunctional, and schools are in a critical state of disrepair.

Among the UN agencies, UN-HABITAT takes the lead role for development of cities and human settlements. The UN-HABITAT Iraq programme is committed to working towards a number of goals among which– 'adequate shelter for all' and 'sustainable human settlements development'. UN-HABITAT is mandated to give priority to services such as education, health, water, and sanitation, in its efforts to improve the condition of human settlements. Over the past 6 years UN-HABITAT has completed a number of school rehabilitation projects resulting in the rehabilitation, extension and furnishing of more than 350 schools and educational facilities, and providing improved learning environments for over 175,000 Iraqi students, with a focus on vulnerable areas with low enrolment rates, and recently, an emphasis on girl students and girls' education.

The project under evaluation was designed in close coordination with the Ministry of Education (MoE) and the Directorates of Education (DoE) in Missan, Basra, and Thi-Qar, to address the urgent need of rehabilitation and enhancement of 70 schools with overcrowded classrooms. For these interventions, UN-HABITAT targeted governorates where it had a strong field presence and partnership base.

The original budget of this project was of USD 15,660,938, of which USD 6,631,818 was allocated for the activities to be implemented by UN-HABITAT. The project was originally planned to be implemented over 24 months, but was extended for another 8 months, ultimately running from July 2006 to March 2009. The reasons for the extensions were as follows:

- GoI delays in developing the list of recommended target schools, and delivering it to UN-HABITAT;
- Time spent in negotiating, agreeing on, and finalizing the list of target schools, to ensure its alignment with project goals and geographical coverage (rural and urban areas);
- Unstable security situation inside Iraq during the implementation period, which seriously hampered the implementation process.

## **2. Project Description**

This project is part of a broader programme implemented collaboratively by UNICEF and UN-HABITAT, aimed at the rehabilitation and extension of 360 schools across Iraq (under projects B1-22 and B1-29). In this project, UN-HABITAT focussed on 70 over-crowded schools in Missan, Basra, and Thi-Qar, and provided both rehabilitation and extension of the physical plant, as well as capacity development for school asset maintenance and management, and school sanitation and hygiene education. The rehabilitation activities were implemented through qualified local Iraqi contractors, involving a competitive bidding process, in close coordination with MoE and DoEs at the governorate level.

The main objective for school rehabilitation is to increase access to primary, intermediate and secondary education for school age children grade 1 to 12 (students age 6 – 18 years old) with emphasis on rural

areas and girls' education, and enhance the capacity of DOE on school maintenance and school sanitation and hygiene promotion, the original project documents stated the following immediate objectives:

1. Improvement of the physical environment of 70 schools in 3 Southern governorates, including water and sanitation facilities.
2. Enhance the capacity of DoEs to undertake the maintenance of schools and promote hygiene practices.
3. Reduce the number of shifts and reduce the number of students in crowded classrooms by adding new classrooms
4. Building capacity of local contractors under several categories and using local materials, which will contribute to improving the economical conditions of the local communities
5. Contribute to the reduction of the number of unemployed people in local remote communities.

### **3. Evaluation Purpose and Scope**

This evaluation has been conducted to examine project's implementation, objectives and results in relation to the original project design. In addition, analysis is provided around the operational and development effectiveness of the project, with a view to providing insights, lessons learned, and recommendations in order to guide future activities of UN-HABITAT and the ITF. Accordingly, the evaluation was structured around criteria outlined in the evaluation terms of reference (copy attached in Annex A):

- Achievements and results, with a focus on:
  - Improvement of physical environment of 70 schools in them abovementioned governorates including water and sanitation facilities, by UN-HABITAT.
  - Enhance the capacity of DOE to undertake the maintenance of school and promote hygiene practices.
  - Reduce the number of shifts and reduce the number of students in crowded classrooms by adding new classrooms
  - Building capacity of local contractors under several categories and use local material which will improve the economical conditions of the local communities
  - Reduce the number of unemployment in local remote communities.
- Relevance
- Efficiency and effectiveness
- Partnership
- Sustainability
- Lessons learned

The results will be used by UN-HABITAT, the Government of Iraq (GoI), the UN Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) Office in New York and other national and international stakeholders specifically the donors contributing to the UNDG ITF.



## 4. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation focused on assessing project results and operational effectiveness, in relation to its logical framework and the results of the project. Accordingly, the team members focused primarily on examining and analyzing the project documentation (see Annex B for list of key documents examined), as well as other data and information collected from field visits. The evaluation thus examined the implementation progress and the project goals to identify if the project met its objectives to reduce the number of students in crowded classrooms by adding new classrooms, improve the physical environment of 70 schools, and enhance the capacity of DoEs to undertake the maintenance of schools.

The evaluation was undertaken in order to meet the following objectives:

1. To assess and showcase the achieved progress and results against stipulated project/ programme results/ objectives on all stakeholders especially beneficiary groups. Also, to identify the unintended positive or negative results of the programme/ project and its effects on beneficiary groups
2. To measure the achievement in providing all planned inputs in timely manner and according to the designed standards and within the project budgets. (To assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the programme/ project interventions)
3. To understand to what extent the projects have contributed to the future coordination, cooperation and partnership between UN-HABITAT and Ministry of Education and its directorates in the project locations.
4. To assess sustainability of the project gains and the roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Education to ensure proper asset management and facility maintenance is taken care of adequately.
5. To generate lessons on good practices based on assessment from the aforementioned evaluation objectives and to provide recommendations to all stakeholders (GoI, UN, donors, civil society) on how to maximize the results from similar initiatives in comparable situations
6. To assess the management arrangements (including procurement procedures, coordination, monitoring) in place by the GoI and/ or the beneficiary communities towards the sustainability of various programme/ project-initiated services and benefits
7. To assess determine ways to improve the project design, with special focus on the content and delivery and provide recommendations to UN-HABITAT and GoI on how to maximize the impact from similar interventions in comparable situation.
8. To understand the extent to which this programme/ project has contributed to forging partnership at various levels with the Government of Iraq, Civil Society and UN/ donors

The evaluation process carried out by the evaluation team consisted of the following:

### ***Desk review and analysis***

The evaluation team reviewed the project document, progress reports, and other documentation in order to extract information, identify trends and issues, develop key questions and criteria for analysis, and compile relevant data during the preparatory phase of the evaluation. The team also reviewed relevant national strategies in order to analyze linkages between the project objectives and national priorities. A list of documents reviewed is provided in Annex B.

### ***Interviews with key stakeholders***

In consultation with UN-HABITAT and GoI partners, the evaluation team identified all stakeholders to be interviewed in the evaluation exercise. Once stakeholders were identified, the evaluation team devised participatory approaches for collecting first-hand information. These included interviews, focus group

discussions and observations, through the application of qualitative and quantitative questionnaires. The list of meetings and interviews with stakeholders is provided in Annex C.

Field visits and meetings were held with partners from a variety of stakeholder groups, including: DoEs, school staff, students' parents, contractors, and other government officials. To the extent possible, a balanced and representative sample of beneficiaries from the four targeted governorates were engaged in the evaluation process, in order to validate the data obtained, and determine if there were trends related to geographical distribution. The field evaluation guidelines and questionnaires are included for reference in Annex D.

It was agreed between UN-HABITAT and the evaluation team that the school sample to be used in the evaluation would include 21 of the schools targeted by UN-HABITAT, representing 30% of the total target number. The 21 schools were selected in coordination with UN-HABITAT, to ensure full geographical coverage of the beneficiary governorates, and to include a representative mix of girls' schools and co-educational schools.

Based on this agreement, a thorough field study was conducted by the evaluation team. In total, the evaluation team made contact with 707 stakeholders and beneficiaries. Five hundred twenty-five (525) of those were students who were involved in focus group discussions at the 21 evaluated schools, and the remaining 182 represented a broad range of stakeholders who participated in person-to-person interviews with the distributed evaluation team in the targeted governorates. For a complete list of meetings and consultations with stakeholders, please refer to Annex C. For field evaluation questionnaires and guidelines, refer to Annex D.

### ***Evaluation Guidelines***

In preparation of the evaluation report due consideration was given to the UNEG evaluation guidelines and the UNDG-ITF guidelines on Development Effectiveness and Operational Effectiveness.

### ***Pre-evaluation meetings:***

Prior to the start of the evaluation, many meetings took place with the purpose of ensuring the effective coordination between UN-HABITAT and the evaluators. These meetings laid the groundwork for the evaluation of the project, the main objectives of these meetings were:

- To launch the evaluation process.
- To ensure the support of the MoE in support of the evaluation process.
- To agree on the Evaluation Terms of References including the evaluation purpose, scope, objectives, methodology and management arrangements.
- To agree on the data collecting methods to be used during the field evaluation.
- To agree on the evaluation sample and geographical coverage.
- To agree on the implementation timetable.
- To discuss and agree on the inception report.

Below is a list of attendees at the meeting<sup>1</sup>:

| <b>UN-HABITAT</b>   | <b>SOC</b>  |
|---|---|
| Eng. Wael Al Ashhab (Project Manager-Infrastructure)<br>Eng. Darbaz Hawizi (Project Officer)<br>Ms. Nihal Kanaan (M&E Specialist) | Mr. Basil Sadik (Director)<br>Dr. Dina Al Tayar (Project Coordinator) |

<sup>1</sup> Meeting was held at the UN-HABITAT Amman Office on April 18, 2010.

## **A. Evaluation Field Activities:**

A detailed evaluation methodology, approach and programme of work were agreed upon between UN-HABITAT and the evaluation team before the start of the evaluation. The evaluation team met in Amman for orientation, briefing and initial interviews with UN-HABITAT staff in Amman followed by similar discussions/briefings by UN-HABITAT focal points based in selected governorates and the national counterparts.

An inception report was prepared by the Evaluation Team outlining the evaluation framework, key challenges, if any, and implementation arrangements including a detailed work plan.

The UN-HABITAT Iraq Office and in-country focal points facilitated the evaluation mission, through participating in in-depth interviews or by providing assorted project documents relevant to the evaluation criteria. For the field data collection, SOC mobilized four evaluation teams covering Missan, Basra, and Thi-Qar, which consisted of one expert field evaluator and one field assistant. The evaluation teams collected information and reported to the field coordinator who is based in Baghdad. Several interviews were made with government staff, UN-HABITAT focal points, and beneficiaries. UN-HABITAT focal points in the four governorates also supported and facilitated the evaluation through providing information about the project implementation and arranging interviews with government officials and visits to the targeted regions. (Please refer to Annex C)

### **Limitations:**

There were no limitations affecting completion of this evaluation, all beneficiaries interviewed assisted the SOC evaluation team and allowed them to take pictures, overlook official documents and facilitated their visits to all areas of the school.

## **5. Evaluation Finding**

### **1. Achievements and Results:**

Overall Contribution to the UN Assistance Strategy Outcomes, MDGs, Iraq NDS Priorities, ICI benchmarks:

#### **UN Assistance Strategy for Iraq:**

The project was part of the reconstruction and development programmes presented in the Joint UN-Iraq Assistance Strategy 2005-2007 and implemented by UN agencies through national partners and counterparts, as well as through the Cluster B approach.

#### **Millennium Development Goals (MDG):**

The project has made a meaningful contribution towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Specifically, the project has supported progress towards the achievement of MDGs 2—achieve universal primary education, and 3—promote gender equality and empower women, by supporting the rehabilitation of schools thereby reducing supply-side barriers to access, increasing the healthy, safety and attractiveness of the school environment, thus encouraging parents to feel comfortable sending their children to school, and by placing an explicit emphasis on girls' education, thus working towards gender parity.

#### **National Development Strategy (NDS), 2005-2007:**

The project is in line with NDS Goal 2, Target 4:

Goal 2: Achieve Universal Literacy and Lifelong Learning: Every person will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. Education levels in a population can be measured by the literacy rate and the rates of highest completed education. According to the ILCS, illiteracy is widespread in Iraq: 39 percent of the rural population is illiterate. Overall 22 percent of the adult population has never attended school. Only 9 percent have secondary school as highest completed education.

Target 4: Ensure that all boys and girls complete a full course of primary and secondary schooling.

### **ICI Benchmarks**

The project relates to ICI Goal 4.4.1, which focuses on the delivery of basic services in order to achieve the Government’s interim 2011 MDGs in an efficient and sustainable way. Education is among the fundamental services required for nation-building, and is explicit in the MDGs, as outlined above.

### **Objective 1:**

| <b>Objective</b>  | <b>Planned/Achieved Objectives</b>   | <b>Actual Results</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| Improvement of the physical environment of 70 schools in 3 Southern governorates, including water and sanitation facilities | Rehabilitation of 70 schools by UN-HABITAT in Basra, Missan and Thi-Qar benefiting about 35,000 school age children and youth. | The evaluation team visits to the selected 21 schools (9 schools in Missan, 4 schools in Thi Qar and 8 Schools in Basra) have confirmed that all 70 schools have undergone comprehensive rehabilitation and extension that included new classrooms, water and sanitation facilities, and in some schools established solid walls to replace those previously made of bamboo. |

### **Evaluation assessment:**

The rehabilitation and extension works in the 21 schools visited provided sound evidence that the interventions of the project have achieved the anticipated results. In general, it was clear that improvement of water networks and sanitation facilities had been completed, which in turn ensured access to potable water and hygienic sanitation facilities for students and teachers. According to those interviewed, these improvements have been an important factor in raising the profile of education in the target communities, and increasing the interest of families in sending their children to school. This has especially been the case with girl students’ who have benefited from the separation of boys’ and girls’ water and sanitation facilities. Observations of the evaluation team for each school visited are provided in Annex G.

Collectively, the interventions of UN-HABITAT and UNICEF under the auspices of this project have benefited some 112,480 students—well over the originally planned target of 80,000 students ( for the academic year 2008/2009, 53,418 students benefited from the rehabilitation of 70 by UN-HABITAT). This is primarily due to the increase in spaces available, and the improvement in physical facilities. The previous crowding of the available classrooms placed a limit on the ability of system to expand quality educational service delivery, but the additional classrooms constructed under this project, together with the other physical improvements to the schools, has created not only space, but also a refreshed community interest in schooling.

A steady increase in the enrollment of new students has been directly attributed to this project, as a result of the school rehabilitation in general, and in particular the extension and improvement in school classrooms, and improvements to water and sanitation facilities. This trend was validated repeatedly through the field visits and interviews held with school directors and teachers. The data collected indicated that some schools reached 300 new enrollments over the two academic years of 2008/2009/2010. The results are clearly shown in the following schools:

| # | Name of School | Location |
|---|----------------|----------|
| 1 | Al-Adab        | Thi Qar  |
| 2 | Al-Hikma       | Thi Qar  |
| 3 | Haber Al-Emmah | Thi Qar  |
| 4 | Al-Farazdaq    | Basrah   |
| 5 | Ibn Khaldoun   | Basrah   |

In all, this project has comprehensively rehabilitated 157 schools (87 by UNICEF and 70 by UN-HABITAT), directly benefiting 112,480 students (56% girls) and 4,822 teachers (67% female). Although specific data is not available, beneficiaries' students and Parents in Al Ameen School (Missan) and Beni Hashem and Al Farazdaq schools (Basra) had confirmed during focus group meetings and one to one interviews that access to safe drinking water and improved sanitation facilities played a positive role in the reduction of water-related diseases among both students and teachers. All 21 visited schools in the field data collection had been rehabilitated effectively and according to plans, up to a high standard of quality. The rehabilitation included complete renovation of school buildings, construction of additional classrooms, improvement of water and sanitation facilities and playgrounds, and construction of surrounding walls. Two schools in Basra; Al-Furqan and Beni Hashem, which had previously been rudimentary bamboo structures, were completely rehabilitated to include water and sanitation facilities.

### **Objective 2:**

| Objective   | Planned/Achieved Objectives   | Actual Results  |
|---|---|---|
| Enhance the capacity of DoEs to undertake the maintenance of schools and promote hygiene practices. | 55 DoE technical staff, 160 head teachers and 320 Parent Teacher Association (PTA) representatives of the rehabilitated schools trained on best practices in the school maintenance programme, as well as on improved sanitation and hygiene practices. | A special maintenance manual was developed by UN-HABITAT for asset management and DoE staff, on school maintenance. Guidelines on school sanitation and hygiene practices was produced and widely distributed. On the job training for technical staff of DoE was also carried out. |

### **Evaluation assessment:**

The project implementation was done in close consultation with DoE in targeted areas; this in itself has contributed to strengthening the capacity of DoE staff, through raising their awareness and experience in working with issues related to rehabilitation and maintenance. The involvement of DoE representatives in decision-making and monitoring of project activities has helped raise their ability to be effective in handling maintenance issues themselves, and when necessary, accessing expertise outside the system. Furthermore, a maintenance strategy was developed with DoEs, and a maintenance manual developed accordingly, helping to institutionalize the concepts within the DoEs. In addition, the project provided

direct on-the-job training to MoE/DoE staff in physical site assessment, and the preparation of bills of quantities (BoQs).

**Objective 3:**

| <b>Objective</b>   | <b>Planned/Achieved Objectives</b>   | <b>Actual Results</b>   |
|--|--|---|
| Reduce the number of shifts and reduce the number of students in crowded classrooms by adding new classrooms | Construction of 300 new classrooms, 8 halls and 3 stores in 86 schools, assisted in the reduction of overcrowded classrooms. | The evaluation results showed that additional classrooms were made available were required. |

**Evaluation assessment:**

The project under evaluation contributed to the reduction of overcrowding in classes by constructing a total of 47 new classrooms.<sup>2</sup>The number of students enrolled in these schools during the 2008/2009 academic year increased from 52,155 to 53,418 (2.4%) from the previous year, while the number of teachers increased from 2,411 to 2,470 (2% increase). As such, with the number of students increasing more rapidly than the number of teachers, student: teacher ratios have not improved during this period, however, at 21.6, the ratio is on par with the standard in most developed countries around the world. Since the key issue to date has been over-crowding, perhaps the key indicator if the impact of the project in this regard is the number of students per *classroom*, not per teacher.

The 47 new classrooms encouraged new enrollments of 1,303 students throughout the provision of more classrooms space in the benefited schools.

**Objective 4:**

| <b>Objective</b>   | <b>Planned/Achieved Objectives</b>  | <b>Actual Results</b>   |
|--|---|---|
| Building capacity of local contractors under several categories and using local materials, which will contribute to improving the economical conditions of the local communities | It is estimated that the project has offered around 225,000 man-days employment for skilled and unskilled laborers. | Nearly all contractors were local residents; building materials for construction were also procured locally.<br><br>A general satisfaction from the beneficiaries was conveyed in evaluation visits with regard to building the capacity of local contractors and supporting the local economy. |

**Evaluation assessment**

The rehabilitation activities of this project were implemented by approximately 55 local contractors in Basra, Missan and Thi-Qar. Through the introduction of sound practices related to contracting and monitoring of the rehabilitation activities, the project played a positive role in improving the capacity of these contractors in planning, implementation and reporting. Interviews with beneficiaries in the three

<sup>2</sup> UNDG-ITF Final Narrative Report (B1-22)

governorates, as well as direct interviews with the contractors; showed that the contractors and their staff were locals and based in the targeted areas.

**Objective 5:**

| <b>Objective</b>  | <b>Planned/Achieved Objectives</b>   | <b>Actual Results</b>   |
|---|--|---|
| Contribute to the reduction of the number of unemployed people in local remote communities. | A large number of people benefited indirectly through their involvement in transportation and loading/unloading of construction materials. | According to evaluation results; UN-HABITAT has efficiently tackled unemployment during the project implementation period. While much of the work generated through this project was temporary, some of the positions, such as new teaching positions, will continue. |

**Evaluation assessment**

It is estimated that the project offered approximately 225,000 man-days of employment for skilled and unskilled laborers during the implementation period. This level of effort was in addition to a large amount of work generated for people who were involved indirectly, in supplying building materials, transportation, and the loading/unloading of construction materials to and from the targeted areas. The project also generated and filled 59 new teaching positions, to respond to the increase in student enrollments.

**2. Relevance:**

The evaluation results support the conclusion that the project design and activities were relevant to the targeted beneficiary groups and consistent with the overall project objectives. The project activities were responsive to the objectives of improving the physical environments, enhancing capacity of DoE technical staff, as well as building the capacity of local contractors, and ultimately reducing the number of overcrowded classrooms. The evidence obtained through the field evaluation has confirmed that the mandated objectives of the project reflected very real and timely needs in the beneficiary communities.

While most of the headmasters interviewed expressed sincere appreciation for the work done by UN-HABITAT, many pointed out that their needs go well beyond the scope of the interventions of the current project. Many headmasters requested a wider scope of rehabilitation that would include additional infrastructure renovation, the placement of water tanks placed on roofs, and electrical work. Many of the visited schools had leaking roofs, little access to water, and major electrical issues.

**3. Efficiency and Effectiveness:**

As a result of thorough review of the project documents and field data, the evaluation concluded that the project was efficiently implemented, and effective in achieving its objectives. School conditions have improved as a direct result of this project, and there has been a steady increase in new enrollments since project inception. This is a result of the rehabilitation/extension works undergone to improve water and sanitation of schools as well as the goal of creating a child friendly school suitable for teaching and learning.

There is solid evidence that the investment in funds allocated by the UNDG-ITF for the work conducted by UN-HABITAT were fully and efficiently utilized to complete the rehabilitation of the targeted schools. The rehabilitation of the targeted 70 schools was completed to the general satisfaction of all

stakeholders interviewed. In addition to completing the work in the targeted number of schools, the number of beneficiary students exceeded (collectively for UN-HABITAT and UNICEF interventions) the initial target of 80,000 to a total of 112,480 students, (for the academic year 2008/2009, 53,418 students benefited from the rehabilitation of 70 by UN-HABITAT).

The project design aimed to tackling overcrowded classrooms and reducing gender gaps among students by increasing girls' enrolment in primary education through the establishment and rehabilitation of separate water and sanitation facilities for girls (project documents shows that 56% of the total project beneficiaries are females).

At closure, the project left the local Iraqi partners with high quality rehabilitated schools, as well as sufficient capacity to properly maintain them. Capacity at the individual and system levels has been effectively developed through this project, and all that remains is for the Iraqi partners to assume their role in the management of maintenance for the facilities.

#### **4. Partnerships**

The main national partners involved in the implementation were the MoE, DoEs in targeted governorates, and local contractors. The role of the local government authorities was to work with UN-HABITAT and UNICEF in outlining and articulating the specifications for the rehabilitation requirements, to implement training activities inside the country, and to ensure the enforcement of maintenance mechanisms. The contractors, on the other hand, were primarily involved in the implementation of the rehabilitation activities, according to specifications laid out by the GoI, and both UN-HABITAT and UNICEF.

The good coordination and continuous cooperation between all key players (MoE/DoE, UN-HABITAT and UNICEF) during the planning and implementation of the project, led to smooth implementation of the major activities. This in turn had a positive impact on the performance and functionality of the rehabilitation and maintenance system. This level of partnership will also lead to an effective decision-making process to assess the best available options for future projects.

According to evaluation results; the DoE technical staffs in targeted areas were closely involved in assessment of the needs, preparation of bills of quantities and the day-to-day supervision of project implementation.

#### **5. Sustainability**

The project has been officially closed by UN-HABITAT, and all responsibility for the school facilities has been taken over by the concerned government authorities. The role of UN-HABITAT during implementation was rehabilitation, capacity development, technical advice to rehabilitate the facilities, and support the development of a maintenance management system. UN-HABITAT was not expected to assume responsibility for maintenance of the schools after hand-over. The latter responsibility is understood to be taken up by the GoI.

The project resulted in transfer of knowledge from those who were trained to other national counterparts. However, all these achievements could be compromised and the investment made could be wasted if the GoI does not take prompt and appropriate action to accelerate implementation of the new maintenance systems, including the allocation of sufficient human and financial resources to ensure the functioning of the schools.

In order to help ensure proper maintenance of the facilities, UN-HABITAT organized a workshop in Erbil in October 2009 (after project handover), to highlight the maintenance problems in schools and provide



training on maintenance-related issues. The workshop findings indicated that the GoI has budgeted only for the rehabilitation of the schools, and not for their maintenance. The linking of these two separate issues has resulted in a lack of regular maintenance of the beneficiary schools. Presently, some of the schools which were rehabilitated are in poor condition. Immediate attention should be given to those schools to maintain a satisfactory environment, and not jeopardize the new enrollments achieved through the project. Currently, there is no plan on the GoI side for the regular maintenance of the schools, and furthermore, qualified janitors are not present in the schools to maintain basic cleanliness.

## **6. Other Considerations Relevant to Development:**

The project addressed several cross-cutting issues:

In terms of the environment, the project has helped improve physical environments and reduce contamination, by targeting the proper disposal of waste water through septic tanks and sewers. Teachers in the targeted areas were also trained in school health, hygiene and sanitation, as well as prevention of transmittable diseases. This has had a positive impact on the environment and reduction of waterborne diseases.

In terms of gender, the project's interventions have been quite explicit. The project was designed to reduce gender gaps and increase girls' enrolment in education through the establishment and rehabilitation of separate WatSan facilities for girls at targeted schools.

In terms of employment creation, the rehabilitation works included approximately 55 contractors as well as indirect job opportunities for people who transported construction materials to the schools.

In terms of teacher participation, teachers were involved in a variety of aspects of the project. The hygiene campaign was based largely on their participation. Other aspects of their involvement included consultation around the rehabilitation of facilities and the creation of child-friendly school environments.

## **7. Operational Effectiveness:**

The project was managed remotely from Amman, by a team consisting of a Project Manager, Project Officer and a senior engineer, with assistance from headquarters as required. The project implementation was done in close coordination with GoI, and the rehabilitation work was supervised by UN-HABITAT site engineers on the site who monitored the implementation progress and documented the progress through weekly reports supported by photographs. Monthly reports were submitted to update UN-HABITAT in Amman on the implementation status of the project components, and focal points were in almost daily contact with DoE to monitor and provide technical advice to staff. The UN-HABITAT office in Amman received feedback on regular basis from Iraq in order to ground and inform decision making.

Process of the communication chain:

- UN-HABITAT maintained an operational office in all target governorates.
- Each officer was managed by a national engineer (team leader).
- Each office was staffed by an additional engineer to provide follow-up
- The officers were responsible for carrying out daily visits to project sites, meeting contractors and supervising their work.
- The officer submitted (to Amman) weekly reports outlining project progress, challenges, achievements, job opportunities, gender issues, and including pictures of the project progress
- Awarding of contracts was done according to UN procurement standards and procedures.

- Payments to contractors were made according to milestones achieved, which were verified with support of pictures from the field.
- A committee comprised of UN-HABITAT and related government departments reviewed the BoQ and checked the actual implementation before project handover.

## 6. Lessons learned

- The involvement of the GoI in the initial stages of needs assessment and project design helped to ensure their support during implementation.
- Remote management can be conducted effectively, through the establishment and implementation of an effective internal monitoring system which closely links governorate offices with the UN-HABITAT office in Amman.
- The construction of ample new classrooms can simultaneously increase student enrollment, and decrease overcrowding.
- Project investments in school rehabilitation may be compromised if the GoI does not commit sufficient financial and human resources to ensure proper maintenance. There is a limited window of opportunity to begin implementing a maintenance regime.
- The use of child friendly building standards during the rehabilitation and extension works had its positive impact on supporting the students to attend school.
- When new classrooms are created, sufficient follow-up is required to ensure that the GoI hires adequate staff to make best use of project investments. This means the hiring of new teachers to take full advantage of the new classrooms, as was done in most, but not all schools.
- The use of local contractors for rehabilitation work had many advantages including: building the capacity of local contractors, supporting the local economy, creating jobs among local workers, ensuring the support and buy-in of the local community, and raising the profile of the importance of education. This in turn, helped to cultivate a sense of community ownership for the completed works, which will have an important role to play in the sustainability of the interventions. Community members who have contributed to the project naturally have a heightened interest in its continued success.
- Good partnership between the GoI and UN-HABITAT helped to overcome the initial delays in implementation. The effort invested by UN-HABITAT in developing good relationships and communication procedures was worthwhile.
- Lengthy governmental procedures in issuing handover certificates continued to delay project implementation/completion. This suggests that the more effective payment system should be implemented in future projects and that proper mechanisms be developed to ensure the timely issuance of hand over certificates after verifying that works have been completed according to plans.

- Rehabilitation and extension works are best undertaken during periods when students are not in class. In some instances, the activities in this project took place during the school year, which caused disturbance and interruptions.

## **7. Recommendations**

1. Plans should be prepared, and sufficient funds should be allocated by the GoI to implement and support similar projects in other schools, especially in the rural areas.

Consistent with the priorities identified in the National Development Strategy, the GoI should develop plans and allocate adequate funds under the development budgets of the next few years, in order to implement projects to address the appalling environmental conditions in the sub-sector of water management, especially in the deprived areas of the southern districts and other neglected rural areas throughout the country.

2. GoI should allocate the necessary resources (human and financial) to establish an effective and operational system for preventive maintenance of the schools.

The future sustainability and proper functioning of this project, and other similar projects implemented in the future, will be much dependent on the allocation of necessary funds to cover the operational costs of maintaining the facilities developed. The concerned local directorates should plan for this to ensure that these pre-requisites are met at all times.

3. An effective system should be established by the GoI, for the regular inspection of the physical condition of the schools, and the carrying out of the necessary repairs and maintenance.

This recommendation is paired with recommendation two above. The evaluation confirmed that currently, there is effective system in place for regular inspection by the DoE, and maintenance of the facilities.

4. GoI should dedicate more teachers to meet the increase in student enrolment which has resulted from the rehabilitation work, and the increase in the number of classrooms.

Although additional classrooms were made available where required, the onus is then on the DoE to take full advantage of the new spaces by employing more teachers. School development needs to be looked at in more holistic terms, whereby needs related to the physical plant are looked at alongside staffing, technical capacity, leadership, and material needs related to teaching and learning. . When one aspect of school development excels beyond the others, a dissonance is often created, which can be counterproductive.

5. In order to reduce disturbance and interruption related to rehabilitation and maintenance, these activities should be conducted outside of the academic calendar. Most of these activities can be planned during seasonal school vacations.

6. The excellent partnership between UN-HABITAT and GOI which was demonstrated through this project should be maintained and further enhanced in all areas of relevant technical assistance, financial support, and MoE/DoE capacity development.

Many of the beneficiaries interviewed have sincerely embraced and appreciated UN-HABITAT's support during the rehabilitation of schools, and are now emphasizing the importance of continued support. It is clear that this has been perceived as an effective partnership, and one which those involved on the Iraqi side are interested in further developing.

7. The programme of capacity development of national staff involved in maintenance should be further expanded with the technical assistance of UN-HABITAT.

It is clear that there continues to be a need within the MoE system for further training and support to institutionalize effective maintenance standards.

8. In similar future projects of UN-HABITAT, the increased involvement of local contractors and labor should be encouraged, to support the local communities, create jobs, and reduce unemployment.
9. UN-HABITAT should continue its support for child friendly school environments. Specific practices should be maintained, such as the use of colorful paintings on school walls to attract students, the use of child friendly toilets with no sharp edges for easy access, and child friendly hand basins installed at appropriate heights with stickers to promote hygiene awareness. Furthermore, UN-HABITAT should encourage the GoI to follow these standards as well in their own school construction and rehabilitation projects

## 8. Annexes

### ANNEX A: Terms of Reference

#### Evaluation of the ITF funded School Rehabilitation Projects Project Number B1-22b

##### 1. Introduction and Context

Iraq has a dual education system; that of the central Government and that of the Kurdish Authorities. This duality in educational planning has produced notable differences in policy and administration, particularly the Kurdistan Regional Government's (KRG's) requirement of 9 years of basic education versus the central Government's requirement of only 6 years of primary education. Despite rising enrolment rates, these remain insufficient to realize MDG2, MDG3 and EFA goals 2 and 5.

More than 1 in 6 schools have been vandalized, damaged or destroyed. Now, while more than 23,000 schools are operating, school buildings total fewer than 17,000 – a gap of nearly 6,000 facilities. Lack of infrastructure and overcrowding lead 1 in 3 schools to deliver lessons in two or even three shifts, and shortages of essential teaching/learning materials are acute. Most schools lack drinkable water, toilets or containers for garbage; lack of access to sanitary facilities in particular places burdens on girls. Access to schools for thousands of children with disabilities remains an unmet need, and IDP children face a serious lack of facilities. Nearly 9 in 10 children under 15 do not attend primary school regularly, mostly because of insecurity or distance to school. Retention is also low and even among those who attend school, only about 40% progress from primary to secondary level; delayed age of enrolment across all educational levels is a further problem.

UN-HABITAT is the lead UN agency for Cities and Human Settlements. Their basic agenda commits Governments to the twin goals of 'adequate shelter for all' and 'sustainable human settlements development'. UN-HABITAT is mandated to give priority to services such as education, health, water and sanitation in its efforts to improve the condition of human settlements. Over the past 4 years it has completed a number of school rehabilitation projects which resulted in rehabilitation, extension and furnishing of more than 350 educational facilities/schools to provide an improved learning environment for over 175,000 Iraqi Students. While some of these projects were bi-laterally funded by Government of Japan in 2004 and 2005, however the last three projects were funded by ITF in joint efforts of UN-HABITAT and UNICEF, with a focus on most vulnerable areas, which had low enrolment rates especially for girls.

While a huge efforts were exerted by the Ministry of Education, UN agencies, the World Bank and a number of NGOs, which contributed to enhancing the teaching learning environment, and reduced the number of schools with multi-shift system and over-crowding classrooms, however there is no evidence that these schools have received any maintenance works afterwards, which in certain cases led to deterioration of the conditions of these schools to unsuitable conditions for the second time, losing the huge investment spent in the last five years.

UN-HABITAT and UNICEF have completed two projects for rehabilitation of 360 schools (B1-22 and B1-29), and currently working in the preparation for the child friendly school designs to be used for construction of 25 schools replacing mud schools in 25 villages. These projects are implemented through qualified local Iraqi contractors through a competitive bidding process, in close coordination with the Ministry of Education and Its directorates in the governorates.

- Timeline: the original duration of this project was 18 month starting from 16/06/2006; however the actual completion date was 31/12/2008.
- Budget: US\$ 6,631,818.
- Key implementing agencies: UN-HABITAT and UNICEF
  
- The main objective for school rehabilitation is to increase access to primary, intermediate and secondary education for school age children grade 1 to 12 with emphasis on rural areas and girls' education, and enhance

the capacity of DOE on school maintenance and school sanitation and hygiene promotion, with the following immediate objectives:

1. Improvement of the physical environment of 70 schools in 3 Southern governorates, including water and sanitation facilities.
  2. Enhance the capacity of DoEs to undertake the maintenance of schools and promote hygiene practices.
  3. Reduce the number of shifts and reduce the number of students in crowded classrooms by adding new classrooms
  4. Building capacity of local contractors under several categories and using local materials, which will contribute to improving the economical conditions of the local communities
  5. Contribute to the reduction of the number of unemployed people in local remote communities.
- The project was designed in close coordination with the Ministry of Education and the Directorates of Education in Missan, Basra, and Thi-Qar, to address the urgent need of rehabilitation and or extension of 70 schools with overcrowded classrooms. UN-HABITAT selected the three governorates since it has established capacity and good network and coordination relations with local authorities, while UNICEF selected the other 15 governorates.
  - Key assumptions and risk mitigation strategies (if any); the following risk factors were anticipated, and relevant action taken:
    1. Further deterioration of the security situation might delay the project implementation, this had actually delayed the delivery of expected outcomes and time extension was approved by ITF SCSO Office.
    2. Further increase in the unit cost school rehabilitation from the current estimate of market price might reduce the number of schools from the target. The average cost was kept within the budget, but school cost varied between different schools based on scope of works, hence the budget was not exceeded, but the number of classrooms was adjusted.
    3. The resumption of school maintenance activities is linked to availability of required funds and skilled workers employed by MOE/DOE. Two participatory workshops were facilitated by UNICEF and UN-HABITAT; however the MOE could not adopt the proposed strategy and allocate specific funds for this purpose.
  - Major divergences in the design and/ or implementation strategy; Based on the priority needs of the Directorates of Education in the three governorates, it was decided to focus on extension of schools by adding more classrooms to tackle the problem of overcrowded classrooms and multi-shift schools, rather than rehabilitation of the existing schools.

## **2. Purpose of the Evaluation:**

Building on its long experience in Iraq, UN-HABITAT has developed comprehensive monitoring system for the rehabilitation and construction of infrastructure at the different stages of implementation until the works are handed over to the beneficiaries, in addition to the ITF reporting system which include a number of regular reports on work progress, to the Education Sector and/or ITF Office. However in line with the UNDGITF intention to review and extract lessons from a number of completed projects by different UN agencies with diverse objective to help the Iraqi people, UN-HABITAT envisaged at this stage to bring about and external evaluator to assess the overall impact of the intervention.

The evaluation will build on the UN Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) audit for this project (B1-22a), which was concluded in September 2009 and the report issued thereafter.

The evaluation aims to assess both qualitative and quantitative results of the investment with the focus on the contribution of the project results/outcomes to improve the school environment and increase the enrollment and reduced the dropout from these schools.

The evaluation findings and lessons learned will be shared with the stakeholders and decision makers in the Ministry of Education at different levels, to make sure that the recommendations are taken into consideration in the formulation of education strategy pertaining school environment and its effect on teaching/learning achievements.

### **3. Evaluation Objectives**

1. To assess and showcase the achieved progress and results against stipulated project/ programme results/ objectives on all stakeholders especially beneficiary groups. Also, to identify the unintended positive or negative results of the programme/ project and its effects on beneficiary groups
2. To measure the achievement in providing all planned inputs in timely manner and according to the designed standards and within the project budgets. (To assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the programme/ project interventions)
3. To understand to what extent the projects have contributed to the future coordination, cooperation and partnership between UN-HABITAT and Ministry of Education and its directorates in the project locations.
4. To assess sustainability of the project gains and the roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Education to ensure proper asset management and facility maintenance is taken care of adequately.
5. To generate lessons on good practices based on assessment from the aforementioned evaluation objectives and to provide recommendations to all stakeholders (GoI, UN, donors, civil society) on how to maximize the results from similar initiatives in comparable situations
6. To assess the management arrangements (including procurement procedures, coordination, monitoring) in place by the GoI and/ or the beneficiary communities towards the sustainability of various programme/ project-initiated services and benefits
7. To assess determine ways to improve the project design, with special focus on the content and delivery and provide recommendations to UN-HABITAT and GoI on how to maximize the impact from similar interventions in comparable situation.
8. To understand the extent to which this programme/ project has contributed to forging partnership at various levels with the Government of Iraq, Civil Society and UN/ donors

### **4. Evaluation Scope**

1. The project was designed in close coordination with the Ministry of Education and the Directorates of Education in Missan, Basra, and Thi-Qar, to address the urgent need of rehabilitation and or extension of 70 schools with overcrowded classrooms. UN-HABITAT selected the three governorates since it has established capacity and good network and coordination relations with local authorities, while UNICEF selected the other 15 governorates.
2. The evaluation will build on the result of the OIOS audit which took place in September 2009 for project B1-22, and benefit from the audit recommendations and findings.
3. While UN-HABITAT and UNICEF have completed relatively high number of schools since 2004, however this evaluation will focus on 70 schools rehabilitated by UN-HABITAT. 70 schools completed under B1-22.
4. The evaluation will focus on the following results:
  - Improvement of physical environment of 70 schools in them abovementioned governorates including water and sanitation facilities, by UN-HABITAT.
  - Enhance the capacity of DOE to undertake the maintenance of school and promote hygiene practices.
  - Reduce the number of shifts and reduce the number of students in crowded classrooms by adding new classrooms
  - Building capacity of local contractors under several categories and use local material which will improve the economical conditions of the local communities
  - Reduce the number of unemployment in local remote communities.

### **5. Key Evaluation Questions**

While addressing the above 5 evaluation objectives, the evaluator shall scrutinize the following major evaluation themes:

### **5.1 Achievements and results**

1. Have the project activities contributed to the realization of following project underlying objectives as perceived by the beneficiaries especially women and vulnerable groups and how?
  - Improvement of the physical condition of the primary and secondary school system in the target areas as a means of increasing enrolment rates and reducing drop out rates and non-attendance.
  - Expand the capacity of the school system in order to reduce overcrowding and multiple shifts.
  - Build the capacity of the small enterprise sector by developing the skills of construction contractors, building material manufacturers and young professionals in architecture and engineering.
  - Strengthen the capacity of the Ministry of Education and the Directorates of Education at the Governorate level to better undertake the management of school rehabilitation and maintenance programmes in Iraq.
2. Have the project outcome contributed to the national education priorities and national priorities identified in NDS, ICI and MDGs
3. Have the project contributed to the reduction in the unemployment rate and provide additional sources of family income by generating jobs in the construction sector through labor intensive methods of building rehabilitation. Provide sex-disaggregated numbers of new long term and short term jobs created as a result of the project?
4. What have been the specific benefits of the project to different beneficiary groups including men, women, children, youth and marginalized population groups?
5. Are there any unintended positive or negative results of the programme/ project and how are those perceived by the stakeholders?
6. What are the factors that hindered programme/ project implementation? What were the actions taken to overcome those?

### **5.2 Efficiency and Effectiveness**

1. To what extent have the different projects activities/outputs were implemented in cost-effective given the Iraqi context?
2. In what way the project outputs/results contributed to improved access to schools, enhanced school conditions and helped in changing the schools into Child Friendly School suitable for teaching and learning
3. Were the results achieved to date at a reasonable cost compared with alternative approaches to accomplishing the same development objectives/ results? Was the budget gender allocated and was any of it allocated specifically to women?
4. To what extent the project and its components have addressed the underlying issues?
5. How did the project engage with stakeholders and beneficiaries in during project planning and implementation?

### **5.3 Relevance**

1. Has the project been responsive to the underlying issues that provided rationale for the programme/ project? How?
2. How the project strategies were tailored to the current project context and in line with the national policies and strategic plans?
3. How did the project contribute to local/ national needs and priorities?
4. Should the direction of future projects be changed to better reflect those needs and priorities?



#### **5.4 Partnership**

1. Who are the partners in this project? How they are selected? How it did it ensure women participation? Has the project forged new partnerships/ strengthened existing partnerships and how?
2. What factors hindered or fostered effective partnership development?
3. To what extent has the project contributed to capacity development of the involved partners?

#### **5.5 Sustainability**

1. What is current status of the project components? Are functions and facilities still maintained? Who is responsible for the management and oversight of project facilities after the project closure?
2. How far the programme/ project activities can be self-sustained from domestic resources – financial, materials and human?
3. What is current status of services provision in the selected facilities? Has the service provision been affected (negatively or positively) after the end of the project cycle and why?
4. Has the project resulted in knowledge transfer from those who were trained and capacitated in different competencies and how?
5. How the project addressed the issues of security during the implementation phase? What risk mitigation measures were undertaken and how successful were they?

#### **5.6 Lessons Learned**

1. What are the good practices that have resulted from this project? How and why some these practices can be labeled as a ‘good practice‘? Substantiate with evidence.
2. What are the key lessons learned from the project implementation? What recommendations could be replicated in similar projects implemented in comparable situations? What are the things that should have been done differently?
3. Are there any specific recommendations to be considered when designing similar projects in the future?

### **6. Evaluation Methodology**

- The external evaluator is expected to undertake the evaluation in as rigorous manner as possible to produce information and make recommendations that are sufficiently valid and reliable based on desk review of available reports, data. The evaluator will be also supported by a number of qualified Iraqi consultants who will responsible on data collection through field visits to the completed schools/facilities and interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries (DOE officials, head teachers, teachers and students and parents).The evaluator will be required to clearly indicate within your key approaches how the participation of both men and women from the target population in the evaluation process is ensured.

The evaluator will conduct a preparatory meeting with UN-HABITAT team, to discuss and develop an inception report, which should include:

1. Develop the monitoring and evaluation framework, design and methodology.
2. Develop the evaluation implementation work plan.

#### **6.1 Desk Review**

The evaluation team is suppose to review the project documents, progress reports, external reviews and auditing reports, contracts related reprocesses and documents, MOE strategy document, National Development Plans/strategies, Sector strategies and organisation programmes.

## 6.2 Data Collection and field visits

1. In discussion with UN-HABITAT, the Evaluation Team Leader /Project Manager will discuss and agree on the design of the data collection system including the questionnaire format for each type of interviewees, methods of interview and who will be interviewed.
2. Identify the stakeholders and benefactress who will be interviewed and who will provide relevant information to help in conducting the evaluation, and the number and location of schools which will be visited by the field team to collect information, photographs and videos.

## 6.3 Time Frame

The total duration of the consultancy is 3 months. The consultant/ project manager is expected to meet with UN-HABITAT team frequently and discuss progress of evaluation, obstacle and/or other issue, information. He/She should provide guidance to the evaluation team in Iraq.

## 7. Expected Deliverables

The evaluator shall produce the following reports for the review and approval by UN-HABITAT;

1. An inception report within two weeks of start of assignment
  2. Evaluation framework/design and implementation plan agreed with the evaluation team
  3. Evaluation instruments developed and validated
  4. Data analysis
  5. First draft of the evaluation report
  6. Presentation of the evaluation report
  7. Finalization of the evaluation report
- The final **Evaluation Report** should contain the following:
    - Title Page
    - List of acronyms and abbreviations
    - Table of contents, including list of annexes
    - Executive Summary
    - Introduction: background and context of the programme
    - Description of the project/ programme – its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success
    - Evaluation Methodology & Approach (including key challenges and limitations)
    - Findings with clear evidence base and interpretations
    - Conclusions
    - Recommendations
    - Lessons and generalizations
    - Annexes

**Note: It is highly recommended that the Evaluation Report should follow the standards set out by UNEG. Refer to UNEG Standards for Evaluation**

## 8. Composition, skills and experience of the evaluation team

- **Qualifications or specialized knowledge/experience required for the Team Leader/project Manager:**

1. Post graduate degree in engineering, architecture, social sciences or any other related field
2. More than 15 years of progressively responsible work experience in the area of development-related research including especially in evaluation of development programmes. Experience in the Iraq will be an advantage.

3. Proven ability to work as a team leader in a multi-cultural working environment
4. Excellent spoken and written communication in English. Knowledge of Arabic will be a strong advantage

- **Qualifications of the local consultants:**

1. First degree in social science, civil engineering or related field
2. More than 10 years experience in planning, management of similar projects
3. Excellent written communication in English and Arabic

## 9. Management Arrangements

In order to enhance national ownership and to comply with Paris Declaration, it is recommended that the evaluation should be closely coordinated with, if not fully guided by, the key national counterpart throughout the evaluation process. A Joint Task Force comprising of UN, national counterpart(s) and the Evaluation Team may be created to guide and coordinate the evaluation process.

- The evaluator shall follow the following management arrangements including:
  - **Role of the UN-HABITAT;**
    1. UN-HABITAT will provide all the necessary document for the review of the evaluator, inter alia, including the project document, the budget review approvals, communication with the counterparts, etc...
    2. UN-HABITAT field staff will facilitate the coordination with DOE for the necessary field visits to the rehabilitated schools.
  - **Role of national counterparts and partners**
    1. The concerned counterparts (MOE/DOE), will facilitate the access of the evaluator field team to the selected schools, and help them to interview the teachers, head teachers, parents, community leaders and students
    2. Participate in the review of the final outcome/evaluation report and provide comments.
  - **Role of evaluator(s)**
    1. The evaluator shall review the above ToR and suggest the evaluation modalities including the time schedule/evaluation plan, sampling methods, questionnaires, etc
    2. Comply to the above terms and conditions
    3. Submit the final agreed upon deliverables
    4. Follow UNEG standards, norms and ethical evaluation guidelines

## 10. Indicative Work Plan

- The final section of the TOR should outline a timetable for the evaluation, including key activities and deliverables in the process, with responsibilities.

| Phase                       | Key Activities | Time Frame* | Responsibility |
|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Preparatory phase           |                |             |                |
| Field work/ Data Collection |                |             |                |
| Data Analysis               |                |             |                |
| Report preparation          |                |             |                |
| Dissemination               |                |             |                |

\* Tentative and to be finalized with the Evaluation Team/ Evaluator(s)

## **ANNEX B: List of documents reviewed**

### **I. Desk study documents:**

#### Project Documents

- UNDG-ITF School Rehabilitation and Capacity Building for School Maintenance (B1-22b)
- UNDG-ITF Progress Reports
- UNDG-ITF Final Narrative report
- Basrah – Schools Rehabilitation Project (SRP) – Project No. (B1 - 22b)
- SRP Projects in Basrah Summary.
- Missan / B1-22/ Additional classrooms for SRP-MI-Project.

#### Normative Guidance

- UNEG Norms for Evaluation
- UNEG Standards for Evaluation
- UNEG Ethical Guidelines
- UNDG RBM Harmonized Terminology

### **II. Preliminary interviews**

Preliminary interviews took place with the following:

- UN-HABITAT Iraq Office in Amman
  - Eng. Wael Al-Ashhab – Project Manager - infrastructure
  - Eng. Dabraz Hawizi – Project Officer
  - Ms. Nihal Kanaan – M&E
- UN-HABITAT Focal Points
  - Eng. Ali Mutasher Al-Ka'by - Missan
  - Eng. Zedan Ghareeb - Missan
  - Eng. Jalal Abdul-Sahib – Thi-Qar
  - Eng. Abdul-Kareem Al-Kassab – Basra

## ANNEX C: Field Interviews

UN-HABITAT focal points in the targeted governorates also supported and facilitated the evaluation through providing information about the project implementation and arranging interviews with government officials and visits to the targeted regions. Below is a list of UN-HABITAT focal points participated in supporting the evaluation activities:

| UN-HABITAT Focal Points     | Governorates |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Eng. Ali Mutasher Al-Ka'by  | Missan       |
| Eng. Zedan Ghareeb          | Missan       |
| Eng. Jalal Abdul-Sahib      | Thi Qar      |
| Eng. Abdul-Kareem Al-Kassab | Basra        |

Moreover, the evaluation teams interviewed and met with project stakeholder and beneficiaries (total 707 beneficiaries) to obtain their feedback and assess their role during the project implementation, Summary of evaluation field interviews as follow:

| Title of Person Interviewed  | Type of Interview | Number intervned | Location           |
|--|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Headmasters  | Person-to-person  | 21               | All 3 governorates |
| Teachers (two from each visited school)  | Person-to-person  | 42               | All 3 governorates |
| Students (three from each visited school)  | Person-to-person  | 63               | All 3 governorates |
| Student classrooms (one focus group in each school visited) in each focus group; 25 students attended the section.   | Focus Groups      | 525              | All 3 governorates |
| Students parents (two from each visited school)  | Person-to-person  | 42               | All 3 governorates |
| DoE Official (including Department of Education Director in Thi Qar, Department of Education Deputy Director In Missan and Education Director official in Basra) | Person-to-person  | 3                | All 3 governorates |
| City Council members   | Person-to-person  | 3                | All 3 governorates |
| Deputy Governor  | Person-to-person  | 1                | Thi-Qar            |
| Deputy Governor  | Person-to-person  | 1                | Missan             |
| Chairman, City Council   | Person-to-person  | 1                | Missan             |
| Construction Contractors involved in project implementation  | Person-to-person  | 5                | All 3 governorates |

## ANNEX D: Field Evaluation Guidelines

### Objectives/Activities: 1 to 5

The main objective for school rehabilitation is to increase access to primary, intermediate and secondary education for school age children grade 1 to 12 with emphasis on rural areas and girls' education, and enhance the capacity of DOE on school maintenance and school sanitation and hygiene promotion.

### Project activities:

1. Improvement of the physical environment of 70 schools in 3 Southern governorates, including water and sanitation facilities.
2. Enhance the capacity of DoEs to undertake the maintenance of schools and promote hygiene practices.
3. Reduce the number of shifts and reduce the number of students in crowded classrooms by adding new classrooms
4. Building capacity of local contractors under several categories and using local materials, which will contribute to improving the economical conditions of the local communities
5. Contribute to the reduction of the number of unemployed people in local remote communities.

### Project under evaluation duration:

The original duration of this project was 18 month starting from 16 June 2006; however the actual completion date was 31 December 2008.

### Project location:

The project was implemented in Missan, Thi Qar and Basra

### Stakeholders for each activity:

| #  | Activity # 1             | Activity # 2             | Activity # 3             | Activity # 4      | Activity # 5      |
|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1  | UN-Habitat Staff         | Directorate of Education | Directorate of Education | Traders           | Community leaders |
| 2  | Directorate of Education | Schools Directors        | School Director          | Contractors       |                   |
| 3  | Schools Directors        | Maintenance Staff        | School Staff             | Community leaders |                   |
| 4  | School Staff             | Students                 | Students                 |                   |                   |
| 5  | Contractors              | Parents                  | Parents                  |                   |                   |
| 6  | Community leaders        |                          |                          |                   |                   |
| 7  | IDP representatives      |                          |                          |                   |                   |
| 8  | City Council             |                          |                          |                   |                   |
| 9  | Students                 |                          |                          |                   |                   |
| 10 | Parents                  |                          |                          |                   |                   |

### General evaluation guidelines:

1. Visit the schools within your governorate and report on the school rehabilitation, equipment, maintenance plan, current condition and sustainability of its operation and intended purpose (70 schools in 3 Southern governorates), including water and sanitation facilities.
2. Benefited SCHOOLS to be visited! This is a PRIORITY
3. What is their opinion of the project idea in general?
4. Was the outcome the way they were expecting?
5. What were they expecting? Ask them about this in detail!! Even if they said yes with the previous question. Was their answer (expectations) according to the proposal?
6. According to the project ToR the project implementation started in 16 June 2006 and was planned to be completed after 18 months, never the less the project was completed in 31 December 2008, which is 12 months in delay:
  - a) What was the reason for this delay? (lack of funds, government regulations, government approvals, contracting, others)

- b) How did UN-HABITAT, DoE and other stakeholders dealt with this delay.
  - c) How this delay affected the project outputs and objectives.
7. How is the design of the project activities relevant to the context and actual needs of the targeted communities?
  8. How do the proposed interventions and project activities have a potential for replication for other SCHOOLSs in other governorates?
  9. How the needs, purpose and overall objectives were properly defined before the rehabilitation started? (please clarify the mean in which the needs were defined and involved stakeholders during the need assessment stage)
  10. What were the challenges during project implementation? (security, logistics, coordination, legislations, government approval, funds, contractors capacity, cooperation among stockholders, UN-HABITAT procedures, others)
  11. What was the role of DoE/SCHOOLS in this project? What was the contribution of other ministries in the implementation of this project? Ministries that contributed to the implementation of this project:
    - a) Ministry of Education
    - b) Ministry of Municipalities
  12. In general how was the situation of the surrounding communities before implementation of the project? (Accessibility to SCHOOLS, distance to the nearest SCHOOLS, number of students in the community...)
  13. How did the educational situation of the surrounding communities improve after the implementation of the project? (Accessibility to SCHOOLS, distance to the nearest SCHOOLS, number of students in the community...)

**In addition to the aforementioned guidelines/questions SOC are also seeking to elaborate on the below questions:**

**a) Achievements and Results:**

7. Have the project activities contributed to the realization of following project underlying objectives as perceived by the beneficiaries especially women and vulnerable groups and how?
  - a) Improvement of the physical condition of the primary and secondary school system in the target areas as a means of increasing enrolment rates and reducing dropout rates and non-attendance.
  - b) Expand the capacity of the school system in order to reduce overcrowding and multiple shifts.
  - c) Build the capacity of the small enterprise sector by developing the skills of construction contractors, building material manufacturers and young professionals in architecture and engineering.
  - d) Strengthen the capacity of the Ministry of Education and the Directorates of Education at the Governorate level to better undertake the management of school rehabilitation and maintenance programmes in Iraq.
8. Have the project outcome contributed to the national education priorities and national priorities identified in NDS, ICI and MDGs
9. What have been the specific benefits of the project to different beneficiary groups including men, women, children, youth and marginalized population groups?
10. Are there any unintended positive or negative results of the programme/ project and how are those perceived by the stakeholders?
11. What are the factors that hindered programme/ project implementation? What were the actions taken to overcome those?

**b) Efficiency and Effectiveness**

1. To what extent have the different projects activities/outputs were implemented in cost-effective given the Iraqi context?
2. In what way the project outputs/results contributed to improved access to schools, enhanced school conditions and helped in changing the schools into Child Friendly School suitable for teaching and learning
3. Were the results achieved to date at a reasonable cost compared with alternative approaches to accomplishing the same development objectives/ results? Was the budget gender allocated and was any of it allocated specifically to women?
4. To what extent the project and its components have addressed the underlying issues?

5. How did the project engage with stakeholders and beneficiaries in during project planning and implementation?

**c) Relevance**

1. Has the project been responsive to the underlying issues that provided rationale for the programme/ project? How?
2. How the project strategies were tailored to the current project context and in line with the national policies and strategic plans?
3. How did the project contribute to local/ national needs and priorities?
4. Should the direction of future projects be changed to better reflect those needs and priorities?

**d) Partnership**

1. Who are the partners in this project? How they are selected? How it did it ensure women participation? Has the project forged new partnerships/ strengthened existing partnerships and how?
2. What factors hindered or fostered effective partnership development?
3. To what extent has the project contributed to capacity development of the involved partners?

**e) Sustainability**

1. What is current status of the project components? Are functions and facilities still maintained? Who is responsible for the management and oversight of project facilities after the project closure?
2. How far the programme/ project activities can be self-sustained from domestic resources – financial, materials and human?
3. What is current status of services provision in the selected facilities? Has the service provision been affected (negatively or positively) after the end of the project cycle and why?
4. Has the project resulted in knowledge transfer from those who were trained and capacitated in different competencies and how?
5. How the project addressed the issues of security during the implementation phase? What risk mitigation measures were undertaken and how successful were they?

**f) Lessons Learned**

1. What are the good practices that have resulted from this project? How and why some these practices can be labeled as a ‘good practice’? Substantiate with evidence.
2. What are the key lessons learned from the project implementation? What recommendations could be replicated in similar projects implemented in comparable situations? What are the things that should have been done differently?
3. Are there any specific recommendations to be considered when designing similar projects in the future?

---

**Field evaluation guidelines per activity**

**Activity 1:**

**a) Achievements and Results:**

1. To what extent, this activity participates in improving the Education sector services.
2. To what extent, this activity affected the schools staff performance and motivation
3. To what extent, this activity encouraged students and their families to send their kids to school.
4. To what extent, this activity affected female students in particular (new enrollments)
5. Did the rehabilitation achieve its goals?
6. During the visit to the SCHOOLSs make sure to check if the rehabilitation process had been completed as planned, which may include:
  - a) Replacement of existing service system (i.e. electrical and sanitation systems).
  - b) Improving the finishing works (i.e painting, tiling, plastering, cement rendering, roofing and others).
  - c) Repairing or replacing windows and doors and providing generators where requested.
  - d) Bill of Quantity Check (per visited SCHOOL in your governorate)
  - e) Check details of BoQ



- f) Check items/equipment against the contract specifications; make sure the items are exactly the same as on the Bill of Shipping
- g) Check if each one of these details has been carried out.
- h) Check if these details has been completed 100%
- i) Report if any diversity / changes / not completed.
- j) Double CHECK details of the equipment and its current condition. (take pictures)
- k) Check workmanship and finish. Are there any damages? Are all the parts there? (i.e. drawers, shelves, etc)
- l) Make sure that the Specifications are EXACTLY the same as on the Bill of Quantity from UN-HABITAT
- m) Check the condition of the goods. Is it clean? Damaged? Anything missing? Is it working (TEST it).
- n) MOST IMPORTANTLY: is it being used for the intended purpose?
- o) Are the SCHOOL staff and students using the new equipment and are happy with them?
- p) If there are any comments, WRITE these down. i.e. Should it have been different? Bigger/smaller? Other specifications? Was it needed?

a) **Efficiency and Effectiveness:**

- 1. Were there any structural defects during handover? What were the damages, if any?
- 2. How is the rehabilitation quality of work?
- 3. Was there any delay in the rehabilitation work and what was the reason?
- 4. Assess the criteria used to select the construction and supply contractors.
- 5. Describe the drinking water services before and after the rehabilitation.
- 6. Describe the sanitation services before and after the rehabilitation.
- 7. Was the rehabilitation and supply of equipment implemented according to plan? (per SCHOOL)
- 8. How well has the rehabilitation been adapted during implementation?
- 9. How did the rehabilitation affect female students especially in rural areas?
- 10. How could the intervention have been done better, faster and more cost economic?

b) **Relevance**

- 1. Was the project implemented according to plan? Everything finished on time?
- 2. If not, why not? Was UN-HABITAT informed on time?
- 3. How have the conditions of the intended beneficiaries group changed since the beginning of the development intervention?
- 4. Were all rehabilitation works (items) urgently needed and will it make deference for school staff and students.

c) **Partnership**

- 1. Did the partnership ensure women participation? Has the project strengthened existing partnerships and how?
- 2. What factors hindered or fostered effective partnership development?
- 3. Were stakeholders consulted before starting the implementation and during planning and designing stage
- 4. To what extent has the project contributed to capacity development of the involved partners?
- 5. Assess the cooperation among the rehabilitation contractors and supply contractors with DoE in the governorate and SCHOOLS director.
- 6. Were there a sense of ownership among stakeholders (DoE, School director, School staff, community leaders, IDPs, parents, others)

d) **Sustainability**

- 1. Examine the warranty period.
- 2. How are objectives in line with needs, priorities and partner government policies?
- 3. Are all planned beneficiaries using or benefiting from the projects' results?
- 4. Did the rehabilitation face any problems during the implementation period?
- 5. Did all 70 benefited SCHOOLS complete the rehabilitation and are operational now?

e) **Lessons Learned**

1. What could be done to make the rehabilitation more effective when implementing similar activities in the future?
2. What are the good practices that have resulted from this project?
3. How and why did some of these practices be labeled as a ‘good practice’? Substantiate with evidence.
4. What should have been done differently? Quotes of direct and indirect beneficiaries (please state the person interviewed name, age, gender and occupation)
5. Assess the output from this intervention.

---

**Activity 2:**

a) **Achievements and Results:**

1. What is the number of DoE staff trained on maintenance
2. Where did the training take place?
3. What was the DoE staff trained on?

b) **Efficiency and Effectiveness:**

1. Did beneficiaries benefit from the training?
2. Do beneficiaries practice what they were trained on?
3. Was the training in line with schools needs?
4. Assess the maintenance tools provided to this maintenance team under this project
5. Were there any maintenance systems for the project (the rehabilitated building, supplied equipment) in the SCHOOLSs to be applied AND in place, once the project was handed over to the related government department?
  - a) Is the maintenance system functional?
  - b) If not, why not, and what are the problems?
  - c) Can these be solved? How, and how quickly?
  - d) Who is responsible for providing the maintenance? UN-HABITAT, DoE, other?

c) **Relevance**

1. Assess the maintenance of the training materials.
2. Assess the training plan
3. Assess the training agenda.
4. Describe the maintenance structure.
5. Assess the background of the maintenance team benefited from this project.
6. Assess the background of the trainers
7. Is there a maintenance plan (visits, what to check in each visit)
8. Are there any hygiene standards in place?
9. Are the teachers aware of what hygiene standards should be conveyed to the students?

d) **Partnership**

1. How could the intervention have been done better, faster and more cost economic?
2. Were DoE, trainers and other stakeholders consulted during training planning and workshops design

e) **Sustainability**

1. Has the project resulted in knowledge transfer from those who were trained and capacitated in different competencies and how?
2. Is the hygiene system in place and functioning

f) **Lessons Learned**

1. What are the good practices that have resulted from this project?
2. How and why did some of these practices be labeled as a ‘good practice’? Substantiate with evidence.
3. What should have been done differently?

---

**Activity 3:****a) Achievements and Results:**

1. What is the number of classrooms in schools under evaluation (before and after)

**b) Efficiency and Effectiveness:**

1. Provide number of students before and after the rehabilitations (male and female)
2. Provide number of students enrolled for next year (male and female)
3. Provide number of students per classroom (before and after rehabilitation) and for boys and girls schools
4. Provide number of teachers before and after the rehabilitation (male and female)
5. What is the number of shifts before and after the rehabilitation?
6. Is their sufficient number of school desks to meet the increase in classrooms?

**c) Relevance**

1. Assess schools benefited under this project by gender (how many female schools, number of female students benefited).
2. Assess schools benefited to primary, intermediate and secondary.

**d) Partnership**

1. How could the intervention have been done better, faster and more cost economic?
2. Were DoE, school directors consulted on the suggested number of extra classrooms in each school?

**e) Sustainability**

1. To what extend is this newly rehabilitated facilities participated in addressing the overcrowded classrooms.

**f) Lessons Learned**

1. What are the good practices that have resulted from this project?
2. How and why did some of these practices be labeled as a ‘good practice’? Substantiate with evidence.
3. What should have been done differently?

---

**Activity 4 and 5:****a) Achievements and Results:**

1. What have been the specific benefits of the project to different beneficiary groups including men, women, and children?
2. How did this project participate in building the local contractor’s capacity?
3. Is the contractor from the governorate
4. Are the skilled workers from the governorates?
5. Are the un-skilled workers from the governorate?
6. Were materials and equipments needed under this project procured from the local governorate market?
7. Assess the number of local workers employed under this project.
8. Building capacity of local contractors under several categories and using local materials, which will contribute to improving the economical conditions of the local communities
9. Contribute to the reduction of the number of unemployed people in local remote communities.

**b) Efficiency and Effectiveness:**

1. When visiting the office of the rehabilitation contractors or supply contractors, you must check implementation plan, delivery notes for equipments and other supply related documents.
2. Assess to what extent the contractors procured their needs from the local market.
3. Assess to what extend this project affected unemployment in the targeted communities.
4. How could the intervention have been done better, faster and more cost economic?
5. Has the project resulted in the capacity development of the involved partners?

6. Assess the capacities and capability of the contractor's team.

**c) Relevance**

1. What were the criteria in selecting the rehabilitation contractors?
2. Was there a bidding process (please give details and documentations)
3. How did the project contribute to local/national needs and priorities?

**d) Partnership**

1. What was the level of cooperation between UN-HABITAT representatives and DoE?
2. Assess the cooperation among the rehabilitation contractors and supply contractors with DoE in the governorate and SCHOOLS director.
3. Did any factors hinder or foster effective partnership?

**e) Sustainability**

1. How did this project and its activities affect the unemployment and for how long
2. Has the project resulted in capacity building of the workers
3. Has the project contributed to the reduction in the unemployment rate and provide additional sources of family income by generating jobs in the construction sector through labor intensive methods of building rehabilitation. Provide sex-disaggregated numbers of new long term and short term jobs created as a result of the project?

**f) Lessons Learned**

1. What are the good practices that have resulted from this project?
2. How and why did some of these practices be labeled as a 'good practice'? Substantiate with evidence.
3. What should have been done differently?
4. Are there any specific recommendations to be considered when designing similar projects in the future?

**Multiple Choice Questions: (Teachers and Students)**

| Questions for Students  | Excellent | Good | Average | Weak | Remarks or (YES/NO) |
|---|-----------|------|---------|------|---------------------|
| How do the students find their school?                                      |           |      |         |      |                     |
| Do they think that their school condition was improved?                     |           |      |         |      |                     |
| What do they think they need more to be done for their school?              |           |      |         |      |                     |
| Has the number of Students (boys/girls) increased after the rehabilitation? |           |      |         |      |                     |

| <b>Questions for Teachers</b>   | <b>Excellent</b> | <b>Good</b> | <b>Average</b> | <b>Weak</b> | <b>Remarks or (YES/NO)</b> |
|---|------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| How was the condition of the school before the rehabilitation?                            |                  |             |                |             |                            |
| How is the condition of the existing water-tanks and water-pumps?                         |                  |             |                |             |                            |
| How do you find the school conditions after the rehabilitation?                           |                  |             |                |             |                            |
| Was any maintenance done for the school after the last rehabilitation done by UN-HABITAT? |                  |             |                |             |                            |
| Were any funds allocated by directorate of education for school repair or maintenance?    |                  |             |                |             |                            |
| Is there continuous cleaning of school facilities?  |                  |             |                |             |                            |
| Is the water and sanitation still functioning?  |                  |             |                |             |                            |
| Is the public water resource available? Is the water distributing system working?         |                  |             |                |             |                            |
| Is the public drainage system available?  |                  |             |                |             |                            |
| Is the condition of school helping students to have better education achievements?        |                  |             |                |             |                            |

**ANNEX E: Pictures of schools with current average structure condition**

**Al-Fetawa School – Basra (weak rehabilitation works)**



**Al-Faw School – Basra (weak rehabilitation works)**



**Al-Hadbaa School – Basra (weak rehabilitation works)**





**Annex F: Pictures of all schools benefited under this project: 30% visited**

**Al-Farazdaq High School / Basra**





**Al-Busrjisiah primary school / Basra**



**Al-Furqan primary school / Basra**



**Beni Hashem primary school / Basra**



**Ibn Khaldoun primary school / Basra**



**Al-Hadbaa primary school / Basra**



Al Adab High School / Thi Qar





**Al Hikma High School / Thi Qar**



**Hiber Aloma School / Thi Qar**



**Mecca Al macrama High School / Thi Qar**



**ANNEX G: Field feedback from beneficiaries interviewed for each school visited:**

**Key:**

**Positive:** The feedback from the field evaluation engineering team and beneficiary comments support the conclusion that the achievements for this school were of high-quality and in-line with the envisioned works. Physical environment of water and sanitation facilities were improved.

**Average:** The feedback from the field evaluation engineering team and beneficiary comments support the conclusion that the achievements for this school were of poor-quality and not up to the standard of the envisioned works. (Please refer to Annex E for pictures)

| #  | Name of School   | Location | Field Feedback (beneficiary feedback)  |
|----|------------------|----------|--|
| 1  | Ibn Al-Nafees    | Missan   | Positive (improved school environment)   |
| 2  | Um Al-Baneem     | Missan   | Average (no new enrolment but improved school environment)                             |
| 3  | Al Yamama        | Missan   | Average (no new enrolment but improved school environment)                             |
| 4  | Bint Al-Hodaa    | Missan   | Average (no new enrolment but improved school environment)                             |
| 5  | Ghareeb Karbala  | Missan   | Positive (improved school environment)   |
| 6  | Al-Hawraa        | Missan   | Positive (improved school environment)   |
| 7  | Al-Ameen         | Missan   | Positive (improved school environment)   |
| 8  | Al-Awali         | Missan   | Positive (improved school environment)   |
| 9  | Al-Naaman        | Missan   | Positive (improved school environment)   |
| 10 | Maka Al-Mukarama | Thi Qar  | Average (no new enrolment but improved school environment)                             |
| 11 | Al-Adab          | Thi Qar  | Positive (improved school environment and new enrollment)                              |
| 12 | Al-Hikma         | Thi Qar  | Positive (improved school environment and new enrollment)                              |
| 13 | Haber Al-Emmah   | Thi Qar  | Positive (improved school environment and new enrollment)                              |
| 14 | Al-Farazdaq      | Basrah   | Positive (specially employment opportunities and new student enrollment)               |
| 15 | Al-Fettawa       | Basrah   | Average (weak rehabilitation current condition)  |
| 16 | Al-Burjisiah     | Basrah   | Positive (improved school environment)   |
| 17 | Ibn Khaldoun     | Basrah   | Average (contractor implementation was weak, but new enrollments was high)             |
| 18 | Al-Faw           | Basrah   | Average (weak rehabilitation current condition)  |
| 19 | Beni Hashem      | Basrah   | Positive (specially rehabilitation works done on the outside structure)                |
| 20 | Al-Furqan        | Basrah   | Positive (specially rehabilitation works done on the outside structure and employment) |
| 21 | Al-Hadbaa        | Basrah   | Average (weak rehabilitation works and students were not satisfied)                    |

## **ANNEX H: SOC background:**

Stars Orbit Consultants is an external Monitoring and Evaluation organisation; its strength lies in the long experience of the corporate management team and its employees. SOC's mission is to achieve professional Monitoring and Evaluation aiming to evaluate the past, monitor the present and plan for the future.

Between 2004 and 2009, SOC successfully performed Monitoring and Evaluation activities on more than 200 programmes and grants on behalf of donors and international organisations in various parts of Iraq including (Baghdad, Basrah, Missan, Thi Qar, Mothanna, Qadisiya, Najaf, Babil, Karbala, Anbar, Mosel, Salah El Din, Diyala, Kurkuk, Erbil, Sulaymanyia and Dohuk), the Monitoring and Evaluation activities have been carried out by more than 30 qualified, well trained and professional employees stationed in all the 18 governorates.

Since most of the projects implemented in Iraq are now remotely managed from outside Iraq, the need for professional, effective, objective and honest Monitoring and Evaluation mechanism starts to grow to ensure that the program meets its original objectives, donor perspective and expected outputs.

For more details on SOC and its activities, please visit [www.starsorbit.org](http://www.starsorbit.org)