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1. **Background and context**

In 1967, Israel occupied the West Bank and unilaterally annexed to its territory 70.5 km2 of the occupied area, which were subsequently integrated within the Jerusalem municipality. The total population of the Palestinians in Jerusalem stands around 323,700 and 76% of the people are living under the poverty line, including 83.4% of children.[[2]](#footnote-3) Despite the high taxation imposed on the people, Palestinians continue to suffer from discriminatory distribution of basic social services and infrastructure. Construction in East Jerusalem is totally controlled by the Israeli Authorities, where the zoning and planning provisions and enforcement by the Israeli Jerusalem Municipality vary between Palestinian areas and Israeli areas. Construction is hampered by a combination of the creation of “green zones” around Palestinian neighbourhoods, which prevent their expansion due to the complexity and cost of obtaining building permits; the application of the absentee property law in East Jerusalem discouraging Palestinians from attempting to register land; and more enforcement of building and planning regulations in Palestinian areas in East Jerusalem.

These policies are hindering all the aspects of people lives, and in particularly the educational sector as they are leaving the people with limited choices for accessing education in line with the human rights law and its principles that protects the right of education for everyone. The educational system in East Jerusalem is characterized by a chronic shortage of classrooms, estimated at around 2,200 sqm. [[3]](#footnote-4) The number of shortage of classrooms is projected to grow over the years proportionally with the population growth at an anticipated rate of 3-4% annually.

Moreover, existing classrooms in East Jerusalem are often unsuitable or substandard. Pupils are often accommodated in rented houses, which do not meet basic educational and health standards. Among other factors because the classrooms are severely overcrowded, which resulted from the inadequate and insufficient infrastructure available in existing schools. Estimated area available for every student is in most cases 0.5 square meters, which is less than the international standards of at least 1.25 square meters.[[4]](#footnote-5)

The provision of education in the city is fragmented across five different providers: Palestinian Ministry of Education (MoE) operating under the Jordanian Islamic Awqaf umbrella, private sector, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), the Israeli Jerusalem Municipality and the contractor’s schools that are financed by the Israeli Authorities. Based in the latest statistics,**[[5]](#footnote-6)** the East Jerusalem educational system are categorized as illustrated in table 1.

In tandem, this has led to a fragmented and weak educational system not able to meet the needs of the current and growing student population.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1: Overview of the educational sector in East Jerusalem** | | |
| **Provider of education** | **Number of schools** | **Number of students** |
| Ministry of Education (Awqaf)  (managed by the JDoE) | 46  (out of which 22 are rented) | 12,420 |
| UNRWA | 7 | 1,541 |
| Private Sector  (under the MoE/JDoE administration) | 82 | 28,723 |
| Israeli Jerusalem Municipality | 65 | 38,220 |
| Contractors/ Skhaneen | 19 | 6,374 students |

The existence of the private schools in Jerusalem in comparison to the West Bank and Gaza represents a unique situation. These schools have been established by religious institutions and NGO’s and effectively playing a critical role to cope with the shortage of classrooms. These schools constitute around 32% of the total number of schools in Jerusalem and employs 1,725 teachers (M: 430, W: 1295). However, in the absence of any supervising authority, the majority of the private schools are fragile and weak, which directly impacts a large number of Palestinian students with a lack of access to quality education. The private schools are under the administration of JDoE, which is the only Palestinian institution in East Jerusalem with direct affiliation to the Government of Palestine, even though it is under legal coverage by the Jordanian Government. Due to JDoE working under exceptional circumstances and a complicated political landscape, JDoE’s responsibilities goes beyond its current capacity especially in offering solutions to among others 1) long-lasting issues related to education, 2) safeguard the national education system, 3) advocating the rights of the Palestinian students at multi-dimensional levels, and 4) planning for strategic development of East Jerusalem’s educational system.

Access to education in East Jerusalem are also affected by the large number of incidents of education-related violations, which is happening due to the occupation. The overwhelming majority of these are taking place in East Jerusalem, Area C, the Hebron H2 area.[[6]](#footnote-7) Schools in East Jerusalem and Area C are also continuously subject to the risk of stop-work or demolition orders.

Challenges in access to education also affect the delivery of high-quality education and often means that many children are not consistently receiving a solid grounding in literacy, numeracy, and life skills. Moreover, many teachers embark on the profession without acquiring the necessary pedagogical skills to prepare children for further studies and work. Teaching methodologies employed are almost exclusively teacher-centred and theory-based with a prioritization of memorisation and rote learning. Teaching is not tailored to the range of abilities within the classroom and usually targets a median level, ignoring the needs of both high-achievers and underachievers. There also exist a general lack of school-based psychological support (PSS) for children dealing with psychological distress as a consequence of the unsafe school commute and occasional attacks on schools. Either owing to a disability or because of the life experiences under occupation, teachers and school supervisors are ill equipped to provide the necessary support for these vulnerable children.

The continuous emphasis on knowledge-based rather than competency-based teaching and learning leaves students inadequately prepared for transition to higher level of education and/or work. Constrained by traditional classroom teaching, learning techniques and examination practices, children and youth generally do not receive an education which is clearly aligned with contemporary realities and labour-market requirements. A far-reaching consequence is that children and youth typically lack the life skills to succeed at school and at work, including developing skills for learning, employability, personal empowerment, and active citizenship. The need for mainstreaming life skills in the national education system was also recognized in the Educational Development Strategic Plan (EDSP) 2014-2019 of the Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MOEHE) of Palestine.

Consequently, approximately 4,300 children are not enrolled in any educational institution in East Jerusalem. In addition, among those enrolled many students fail to complete secondary school. According to the latest figures, the dropout rate reached 13%, where the cumulative dropout rate resulted in 33% of children in East Jerusalem failing to complete a full 12 years of school.[[7]](#footnote-8) Data shows that dropouts in Israeli affiliated governmental schools is three times more than that in JDoE and private schools.[[8]](#footnote-9)

* 1. **Introduction to UNDP’s engagement**

UNDP has for years been focusing on improving the learning environment and quality of education, including limiting the fragmentation of the educational system as well as enhancing students’ learnings ability and teachers’ teaching approaches. The long-term objective of UNDP’s interventions within the educational sector has been to improve the system to respond to the students and labour market needs and provide graduates with better opportunities for the future. UNDP has since 2018 addressed these development challenges in East Jerusalem particular through the Support to Educational Sector in East Jerusalem Project.

**Support to Education Sector in East Jerusalem**

The project consists of two major components. The first component is focuses on the physical environment to improve the learning environment. Under this component the project is constructing two schools and rehabilitating one school facility in East Jerusalem. The second component focuses on the quality of education and the enhancement of a unified educational system in East Jerusalem. Under this component the project is capacity building teachers at private schools in the city and provide support to the Jerusalem Directorate of Education in their strategic planning (Geo-Mapping and Information Management). The project has a special focus on increasing the access to quality education and improved learning environment for the most marginalized children and youth.

The project is in line with UNDP’s Strategic Plan (SP) 2018-2021, UNDP/PAPP Country Programme Document (CPD) and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in Palestine. In addition, the project is contributing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs):

|  |
| --- |
| **SP – Outcome 2:** Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development  **UNDAF – Outcome 4.1** – More Palestinians, especially the most vulnerable, benefit from safe, inclusive, equitable and quality services  **CPD – Outcome 4:** Leaving no one behind: Social Development and Protection  **CPS – Output 4.1:** Support to inclusive education through increasing enrolment provided, improved quality of education and learning outcomes, enhanced access to persons with disabilities, promoting life-skills in the curriculum, teaching methods, remedial education in East Jerusalem and Gaza.  **SDG 4 –** Quality Education (Target 4.1, 4.5, 4.7, 4.a) |

The project seeks to contribute to these strategic objectives and agendas through the following three project outputs. The first project component, regarding physical environment, is linked to output 1, while the second component, regarding education quality, is linked to output 2 and 3.

|  |
| --- |
| **Output 1:** Enrolment opportunities for students at national education system in East Jerusalem increased, with a special focus on the inclusion of people with disabilities (PwDs)  **Output 2:** Technical capacities of JDoE in supporting the education process enhanced  **Output 3:** Quality education targeting private schools in East Jerusalem, with a special focus on gender equality in education |

In East Jerusalem there is estimated 2,000 classrooms and due to the increasing demand, the city is in critical need of facilities to host the students in teaching friendly environments, which foster better learnings. Under output 1 linked to the first component, the project therefore aims to provide access to better teaching environments to over 1,200 students in East Jerusalem through the construction of two mixed gender school facilities with a total area of 11,000 sqm. The proposed schools are planned to be constructed at Mount of Olives (Al Tur) and Shu’fat neighborhood. The schools are supposed to offer 44 new classrooms and hereby reduce the shortage of classrooms in East Jerusalem. They will be directly managed by the JDoE – the authorized entity from the Palestinian Ministry of Education (MoE) in East Jerusalem – and operated under the legal umbrella of the Jordanian Ministry of Awqaf.

The location of the school at Shu’fat was selected fully in line with the recommendations of the existing geo-mapping initiative, which was developed with supported from UNDP and funding from GoN through the previous project ‘Right to Education.’ The school at Al Tur was selected due to the convenient availability of land., but recently this activity was replaced with the purchasing of buildings, in addition to associated re-modelling activities for the provision of a school facility. The new Activity (1.3) related to the establishment of Sur Baher School with 12 classrooms was added under the project addendum.

Under output 2 and 3 linked to the second component regarding increased quality education, the project has supported the JDoE in its strategic planning. This by scaling up the geo-mapping system and linking it up to its existing information management system. The aim is to support the JDoE in their strategic decision-making, resulting in positive contribution to a proper development of the educational sector. Technical assistance and institutional development support have further been provided to increase JDoE’s capacity to assume its roles and responsibilities. UNDP provided a series of training and workshops on Skills and Emotional Intelligence, Time Management, Communication as well as Advanced levels of Hebrew and English language sessions. In close collaboration with relevant MoE departments, UNDP invested in improved quality education for 15,000 students across 49 private schools in East Jerusalem through the provision of training sessions to teachers focusing on the creation of an enabling learning environment for students with learning difficulties. Through the project around 10,795 students with psychological, social, and educational problems were further supported with the aim of increasing their learning capacities.

Under the first component, the GoN financed the issuance of designs and permits for the construction of the two educational facilities, while under the second component, they funded training of teachers and activities related to the JDoE capacity building. The construction and equipment of the new schools will be realized through funding from IsDB. The school to be constructed in Shu’afat neighborhood received its required permits and the construction of the school is planned to be initiated Mid-2022 and finalized in 2024. The school in Al Tur is still pending its permit (please see below figure 1).

Significant delays due to external factors were registered during the first year of implementation. The Jerusalem Municipality zoning and planning decisions led to the allocation of part of the Mount Olives School land to the construction of a public road, which made the initial plan for the construction of the school unachievable. Consequently, the project had to be re-scoped by renting a building and transform it into a school facility, covered fully by the GoN. UNDP’s Project Team conducted a detailed assessment for several buildings in the city to identify facilities having the necessary construction to be transformed into a school facility. Based on the options available, a facility in Sur Baher was selected as the best option and was transformed into a school with 12 classrooms and all other essential facilities as external yards, and public spaces. The school can accommodate 380 students and has been operational since August 2021.

The project was launched on the 1st of January 2018 and is planned to be end in December 2024. UNDP is currently in the final stage of implementing the contribution from GoN, which mainly focuses on improving the quality of education in private schools; enhancing the capacities of the Jerusalem Directorate of Education (JDoE); and financing the licensing and design phases for one school in Shu’fat and rehabilitation of school facility in Sur Baher School. The Support to Education in East Jerusalem Project, will continue in the implementation of the physical construction for Shu’fat education complex, which has been funded by IsDB (please see figure 1 for an illustration of the activities initiated through funding from each donor).

**Support to Education Sector in East Jerusalem**

Support funded by NRO

Remodelling design and rehabilitation work in Sur Baher (operational since August 2021)

Support funded by IsDB

Improve the quality of education in 49 private schools in East Jerusalem

Provision of design and building licensing for two schools in East Jerusalem (Shufat Education complex and Al Tur School)

Al Tur school (Activity not started yet)

Shu’afat education complex (permit building in process)

New construction of Shu’afat education complex

New construction of Al Tur school in Jabel Al Zayton (Activity not stated yet)

Completed



Enhanced the capacity of JDoE staff, in supporting the education process.

Figure 1 - Illustration of activities under SES divided by donors

1. **Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives**

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess results achieved through the project so far and to what extent they are contributing to 1) a reduced fragmentation of the educational system in East Jerusalem, 2) improved learning environment and 3) increased quality of education.

The findings of the evaluation shall be utilized for further improvement of the on-going project and future programming. In addition, the findings shall inform UNDP and the national counterpart in their collaboration to enhance the strategic planning of the educational system in East Jerusalem. To assess the relevance and efficiency of UNDP’s approaches and activities, it is expected that the evaluation will include a gaps analysis of the educational system in East Jerusalem, and recommendations on issues UNDP should continue to focus on, and/ or should address.

The recommendations developed through the evaluation are expected to include concrete and practical actions UNDP can implement through project activities to ensure meaningful and lasting impact. In addition, findings and recommendations can inform the strengthening of synergies across with the organization’s other interventions within the education sector, including vocational training initiatives (TVET) in East Jerusalem.

Scope and objectives of the evaluation:

* Assess to what extent the project has and is likely to decrease the fragmentation of the educational system in East Jerusalem;
* Assess to what extent the project has built the capacity of local stakeholders to ensure continuous improvement of the educational sector in East Jerusalem;
* Assess to what extent the project has and is likely to improve the learning environment of schools in East Jerusalem;
* Assess to what extent the project has and is likely to improve the quality of education in East Jerusalem;
* Assess to what extent UNDP’s components under the project have and are likely to address the main gaps in the educational system in East Jerusalem;
* Assess to what extent there have been unintended or negative changes that can be attributed to the project’s approaches or activities;
* Assess opportunities for strategical synergies between UNDP’s interventions under the educational system and TVET initiatives in East Jerusalem;
* Assess to what extent the project has mainstreamed gender equality and women’s empowerment, persons with disabilities, and environmental considerations. This includes making recommendations for increased mainstreaming of these cross-cutting issues.

1. **Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions**

This section proposes the questions that, when answered, will give UNDP together with MoE, the donors and partners the information they jointly seek in order to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge.

The evaluation should be conducted according to the six Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)- Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, the likely impact and sustainability). Each criterion is a different lens or perspective through which the intervention can be viewed. Together, they provide a more comprehensive picture of the project, the process of implementation, and the results.

The criteria play a normative role. Together they describe the desired attributes of interventions: All interventions should be relevant to the context, coherent with other interventions, achieve their objectives, deliver results in an efficient way, and have positive impacts that last. The criteria are used in the evaluation to: a) Support accountability, including the provision of information to the public; and b) Support learning, through generating and feeding back findings and lessons. Suggested evaluation questions are provided below. These guiding evaluation questions will be further refined by the evaluation team and agreed with the UNDP evaluation stakeholders. Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria**  **and Definition** | **Suggested Evaluation Questions** |
| **Relevance**  Extent to which the objectives of the project are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, including marginalized groups such as girls/women and people with disabilities, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies. | * To what extent is the project in line with the national development priorities, UNDP’s mandate, and Strategic Plan? * To what extent is the project relevant for the broader achievements of the SDGs in the country? * To what extent is the project’s components relevant towards addressing 1) improved learning environment, 2) increased quality of education and 3) reduced fragmentation of the educational system in East Jerusalem. Why/Why not? * To what extent has the project’s components been able to address the actual needs among the different target groups e.g., students, teachers, JDoE, MoE? Are there any unaddressed critical development challenges the project has not addressed? In case yes, which challenges are to date unaddressed? * To what extent has integration of relevant human rights and gender and PwD sensitive approaches/considerations been applied under the different components to address the needs of specific target groups. |
| **Coherence:**  To what extent is the project coherent with UNDP and other actors’ intervention in the socio- economic recovery | * To what extent is the project coherent and/or complementary with other UNDP interventions? How can synergies be strengthened? * To what extent is the project coherent and/or complementary with other actors e.g., other UN Agencies’ interventions within the educational sector? * How can a portfolio approach support greater synergy and complementarity? What would that portfolio look like? * To what extent is the project’s approaches to address the actual needs of specific target groups coherent and/or complementary with other interventions within the educational sector implemented by UNDP and/or other actors. |
| **Effectiveness:**  Extent to which the objectives of the project’s outputs has been achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. | * To what extent has progress been made towards achieving the outputs of the project? * In which areas does the project has the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can UNDP build on or expand these achievements? * In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? Why and what have been the constraining factors? How could or can they be overcome? * How effective was UNDP in its response towards the faced challenges in the construction of a new school in East Jerusalem? How can UNDP build on the gained experience? * To what extent has UNDP’s partnership strategy been appropriate and effective to achieve the desired results? * To what extent has the integration of gender sensitivity and human rights considerations contributed positively to the achievements of results so far? |
| **Efficiency:**  Measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. | * Has the project delivered its expected results to date, including budget allocation and cost-efficiency of activities? And in case of challenges/issues, has the project been able to solve these in an efficient way? * To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the desired results? * To what extent has the M&E system and approaches utilized by UNDP contributed to effective and efficient project management e.g., solve challenges, collect information on progress, adjust approaches based on lessons learned, etc.? * To what extent has the allocation and use of resources to target groups considered the needs of certain groups, who are specially marginalized and/or discriminated against e.g., female teachers and students, crisis-affected children, people with disabilities, etc.? * Are there alternative approaches, which could be implemented for a modest investment and enhance the integration of human rights and/or gender equality? |
| **(Likely) Impact:**  Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the projects, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. | * To what extent have/ are the project likely to contribute to an improved learning environment and quality of education as well as a reduced fragmentized educational system in East Jerusalem? * What are the (likely) effects of the project’s components on the target groups’ lives? Is it likely that the project will have a positive impact on the number of enrolled students in East Jerusalem, the learning outcomes for students and/or their future employability? * How likely is it that the project will have a positive impact on relevant stakeholders’ ability to continuously improve the educational system in East Jerusalem? * What is the likely positive impact of the project towards breaking traditional gender structures and upholding students right to access education? |
| **Sustainability:**  Continuation of benefits from the projects after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time. | * To what extent is it likely that the achievements of the projects can sustain after end support? What are the main factors influencing this and what could be done to increase the possibility of sustainability? Especially for soft components such as capacity building of JDoE and teachers’ learning techniques. * What are the major external risks for sustainability, and how can UNDP mitigate these in its exit strategy? * To what extent has the project been able to develop an enabling and adaptable environment for real changes on human rights and gender equality? |

The evaluation questions will be further refined by the evaluation team and agreed with UNDP during the preparation of the inception report.

1. **Methodology**

The project evaluation should utilize a participatory and interactive approach using mixed method of data collection. Hence, the evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries. UNDP is strongly encouraging the use of virtual tools such as phone interviews and phone surveys, virtual Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and online and SMS-based surveys, among others, in case of critical COVID-19 periods.

Minimum requirements for data collection (bidders are encouraged to add more and detail the methodology):

* Survey based on a representative sample of the population (i.e. targeted students at schools and teachers)
* FGDs with the following groups 1) students (divided into relevant subgroups for instance different locations in EJ, gender, PwD status, grades, etc.), 2) teachers (divided into relevant subgroups for instance different locations in EJ, gender, etc.) and 3) principals, 3) Implementing partners (please see table 2 for information on IPs)
* Individual interviews with JDoE, MoE, UNDP and the donor.

**Desk Review**

The evaluators should conduct a thorough document review of the project document, results framework, quality assurance reports, annual workplans, mid-year and annual reports in addition to financial documents (a list of documents will be provided to the evaluators when initiating assignment). Additionally, pre-existing secondary data such as administrative datasets and previous survey datasets can be used to answer some evaluation questions.

**Data Collection**

The evaluators should utilise semi-structured interviews and FGDs with direct beneficiaries (at school and governmental level), and key stakeholders, including MoE. The evaluators should also utilise surveys and questionnaires; field visits, where possible; output/outcome mapping, observational visits (if possible), group discussions; and data review and analysis of monitoring reports. In the data collection the evaluator should strive towards having representative samples of the population groups.

The data collection should follow the principles of ‘do no harm’ to ensure the safety of the beneficiaries, stakeholders as well as the evaluation team. In line with the UNDP’s gender mainstreaming strategy, it is required by the evaluator to use gender and age disaggregate data collected to the extent possible and assessed against the project’s outputs. All evaluation products need to address gender, disability, and human right issues.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report as well as presentation on how to ensure representative sample sizes. The content of the inception report will be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP and the evaluators in consultation with the stakeholders where applicable and to be shared with the donor focal point.

**Data Analysis**

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP’s support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on project indicators, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, beneficiaries’ interviews, stakeholder interviews, FGDs, surveys, and site visits. The analysis should include a gaps analysis of the development of the educational sector in East Jerusalem, which UNDP’s contribution and impact should be hold up against.

**Gender and Human Rights-based Approach:**

As part of the requirement, evaluation must include an assessment of the extent to which the design, implementation, and results of the project have incorporated gender equality and PwD perspective and rights-based approach. The evaluators are requested to review UNEG’s Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation during the inception phase. In addition, the evaluation must focus on expected and achieved gender accomplishments, critically examining the presumed causal chains, processes, and attainment of results, as well as the contextual factors that enhanced or impeded the achievement of results

In addition, the methodology used in the final evaluation, including data collection and analysis methods should be human rights and gender-sensitive to the greatest extent possible, with evaluation data and findings disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, PwD status, age, etc. Detailed analysis on disaggregated data will be undertaken as part of the final evaluation. Findings shall be consolidated to create recommendations and identify lessons learned which can enhance the project’s gender-responsive and rights-based approach as well as inform future programming, and synergies with other interventions.

**Accessibility to Beneficiaries and Partners**

UNDP will provide the evaluator with contact details of and/or direct access to beneficiaries, partners and stakeholder, and the evaluator is expected to:

* Inform interviewees in advance of the evaluation with clear purpose and overview of the evaluation, evaluation team and interview expectations. This will also save time during interviews.
* Ensure and explain the principle of full anonymity of all interviews.
* Share a list of questions with interviewees in advance to speed up the process and facilitate interviewee preparation.
* In case remote and virtual data collection is necessary: Consult with the interviewee on which virtual tool the interviewee is more comfortable with (Zoom, Skype, telephone etc.).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 2 – Presentation of stakeholders & implementing partners** | |
| **Institution** | **Role** |
| **MoE** | The national counterpart and indirect beneficiary at the sectorial level. |
| **JDoE** | The national counterpart and main beneficiary at the sectorial level in East Jerusalem. UNDP is working closely with JDoE to improve the learning environment and address the fragmentation of the educational system in East Jerusalem. In parallel, UNDP is capacity building the institution to enhance its ability to provide quality education and improve the system strategically. |
| **Supervision Unit -JDoE/MoE** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of providing training for 10 supervisors in the fields of (1) learning and teaching, (2) assessing the situation of schools in line with the Palestinian education standards, (3) building professional-technical education societies, and supporting schools in enhancing their learning environment. |
| **National Institute for Educational Training (NIET)** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of developing the capacities of 24 headmasters of private schools to obtain a professional diploma through NIET. |
| **Al Farah Center** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of providing technical knowledge to support students with learning difficulties. |
| **Arab Counseling Center for Education (ACCE)** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of empowering counsellor, and teachers to reduce level of violence and response to psychological, social, and educational problems in private schools, as well as to spread awareness among parents to address these behaviours. |
| **Al Saraya Center for Community services** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of increasing community awareness of TVET Education. |
| **Agricultural Development Association (PARC)** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of tackling social behaviours and enhance the commitment of the community to support the education system in East Jerusalem. |

**COVID-19 Considerations**

Implementing evaluations during the COVID-19 crises might requires careful consideration to planning the implementation of evaluations remotely (virtually), through remote data collection and the remote interviewing of stakeholders. The following shall be taken into account:

* Due to the fear of spreading COVID-19, travel/ movement restrictions and/ or lockdowns might occur, and the evaluation team should therefore develop a methodology, which enables a virtual and remote data collection process to be applied if needed. This includes the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager of UNDP.
* If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for beneficiaries’ and stakeholders’ availability, ability, or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/ computer may be an issue These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report in case remote data collection becomes a reality.
* If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (Skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm and safety is the key priority.
* A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, and stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the evaluation and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

1. **Evaluation products (deliverables)**

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

* **Evaluation inception report (15 pages, excluding evaluation matrix).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators.
* **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminary debriefing and findings.
* **Draft evaluation report (40-50 pages).**[[9]](#footnote-10) The UNDP Evaluation Manager and the evaluation reference group will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
* **Evaluation report audit trail.** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
* **Final evaluation report.**
* **Presentations to stakeholders and the evaluation reference group.**
* **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant.

The evaluator should follow UNDP Standard templates for [inception report](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/Template/section-4/Sec%204%20Template%204%20Evaluation%20Inception%20report%20content%20outline.docx) and [evaluation report](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/Template/section-4/Sec%204%20Template%206%20Standard%20evaluation%20report%20content%20full%20details.docx)

The evaluator will need to consider all the quality criteria required as per the [UNDP evaluation guidelines](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml) and the [UNEG Quality check list for evaluation reports](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/607).

1. **Evaluation team composition and required competencies**

UNDP is for this evaluation seeking a suitable academic institute, think tank or consultancy firm expertized in research and academia (from now called the institution). However, the selected institution should not have participated in the design, implementation, and/or decision-making of the project itself.

The institution entrusted with the responsibility of conducting this evaluation should have proven experience in conducting at least 2 similar evaluations and/or gaps analysis of the educational system (preferable in Palestine and including East Jerusalem) within the last 5 years. If requested, the institution shall be able to provide UNDP with the previous conducted assignments. To carry out this evaluation, the institution should be able to mobilise and appoint specialized experts with records of technical and academic understanding of monitoring and evaluation as well as solid knowledge of the educational sector and system, and especially within the context of East Jerusalem.

The institution shall be responsible for carrying out and performing all the duties and responsibilities as defined and required in the pertinent sections of this TOR. For the whole period of the assignment, the institution shall provide all experts and apply all professional knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques, which are normally required for carrying out the different works and activities engaged in under this assignment.

The institution shall assemble a professional team of qualified experts, who are widely experienced in the carrying out evaluations and policy papers on social/ and or development issues. The institution should formulate an evaluation team which includes evaluators jointly covering all the below specified skills, competencies, and characteristics as minimum requirements for the team members. The listed number of team members required for carrying out the assignment is not fixed. Hence, the exact team composition is up to the individual bidder, yet in tandem the team must include all the below-listed skill sets. Besides the evaluation team, the individual bidder is requested to include in their technical and financial proposal a final language review by a professional English language editor.

The institution shall provide details on the management structures and implementation, describing how the evaluators will be operating. Roles of the proposed evaluation team shall be detailed in the technical proposal showing each team members roles and responsibilities in conducting the different evaluation activities. The institution shall provide only one CV for each position, and all suggested members shall be approved by UNDP. It is the right of UNDP to withdraw, at any time, any approval for members if found to be technically unsuitable, in which case the person or persons in question shall be replaced by others approved by UNDP. UNDP reserves the right to require the institution, at any time, to change the formation of the staff to ensure the quality of the work.

The evaluation team should provide their own computers, communication equipment and personal protective equipment as needed.

The institution shall provide all admin, logistics and financial support staff and facilitations required for successful and timely completion of the different works and activities of the assignment, and all relevant and associated costs for these staff and facilitations are to be included in the cost of the proposal.

The evaluation team shall have high managerial, analytical, evaluation, report writing and communication skills. Under the overall responsibility of the Lead Evaluator, the evaluators shall assume the responsibility for the assignment and liaison with and shall be available for consultation and attending meetings with UNDP and partners. They shall be focused with maintained interdisciplinary coordination between the team, different players and participants and shall be able to explain observations, comments and recommendations and answer any relevant questions.

Team

Lead Evaluator

* Min. master’s degree in Evaluation and Methodology, Social or Political Science, Development Studies, Science of Education or similar;
* PhD focusing on Educational Systems in protracted crisis-affected contexts, ideally Palestine, is an assert;
* Min. 5 years of professional experience in conducting academic gaps analysis, evaluations of development projects and programmes and/ or governmental interventions, preferable in the sectors of education;
* Sound knowledge of results-based management systems and monitoring and evaluation methodologies including experience in applying SMART indicators
* Experience in mixed method data collection and analysis, including development of data collection tools and utilize different software for analysis;
* Experience in developing results frameworks and evaluation matrix is an assert;
* Direct experience working with civil society and government institutions is an assert
* Excellent writing skills in English with a strong background in developing academic papers, evaluations, and analysis;
* Demonstrated ability and willingness to work with people of different cultural, ethnic and religious background, different gender, and diverse political views;
* Demonstrated ability to use critical thinking, conceptualize ideas, and articulate relevant subject matter in a clear and concise way;
* Experience in implementing evaluations remotely would be an asset.
* Proven accomplishment in undertaking evaluations in Arab region will be an asset.
* Proven accomplishment in undertaking evaluations for International development organizations will be an asset
* Proficiency in English is required.
* Proficiency in Arabic a strong assert.
* Ability to meet tight deadlines

Researcher

* Bachelor’s in social or Political Science, Development Studies, Science of Education or similar;
* Master in similar field is an assert;
* Min. 2 years of experience in research and developing research papers, studies, strategic plans, etc. preferably within the educational sector and in Palestine;
* Sound knowledge of results-based management systems and monitoring and evaluation methodologies, including experience in applying SMART indicators
* Experience as a team member of minimum one evaluation;
* Demonstrated ability to use critical thinking, conceptualize ideas, and articulate relevant subject matter in a clear and concise way;
* Proficiency in English and Arabic is required.

Data collection field officer

* Bachelor’s degree in Evaluation and Methodology, Social or Political Science, Development Studies, Science of Education or similar;
* Master in similar field an assert;
* Min. 2 years of experience in collecting and analysing data and demonstrated ability to develop and utilize different tools, such as mentimeter, KoBo, developing interview guides and surveys;
* Proven knowledge of utilizing data analysis tools such as SPSS, Stata, NVivo, etc.;
* Sound knowledge of results-based management system and monitoring and evaluation methodologies including experience in applying SMART indicators.
* Experience as a team member of minimum one evaluation;
* Demonstrated ability to use critical thinking, conceptualize ideas, and articulate relevant subject matter in a clear and concise way;
* Proficiency in English and Arabic is required.

Educational Expert

* Master’s in Educational science or similar field;
* PhD focusing on Educational Systems in protracted crisis-affected contexts, ideally Palestine, is an assert;
* Min. 5 years of experience working within the assessment and improvement of educational systems, preferably in the context of Palestine and more specifically East Jerusalem;
* Knowledge of synergies between formal and informal education is an assert;
* Demonstrated knowledge of developing research studies, evaluations, policy papers, etc. within the educational sector;
* Demonstrated ability to use critical thinking, conceptualize ideas, and articulate relevant subject matter in a clear and concise way;
* Proficiency in English and Arabic is required.

1. **Evaluation ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **Implementation arrangements**

After an agreement has been signed with the successful evaluation institution, the UNDP Evaluation Manager will invite the lead evaluator (incl. his/her evaluation team) for a kick-off meeting. The lead evaluator should submit the inception report based on the meeting and desk review within 5 calendar days after the conduction of the meeting.

After having agreed on the inception report the evaluation team will undertake further desk review and data collection and prepare the first draft of the evaluation report, including lessons learned and recommendations.

In consultation with the lead evaluator and as requested, the UNDP Evaluation Manager and the project staff will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project beneficiaries and stakeholders and facilitate contact where needed. UNDP’s Evaluation Manager in coordination with the project staff will facilitate the evaluation process and assist the evaluation team where relevant. The project staff will also assist in organizing the site visits and meetings and help identify key stakeholders and/ or beneficiaries for interviews by the evaluators but will not join the meetings.

The lead evaluator is responsible is responsible for submitting all deliverables to UNDP for comments and finalize the reviewed product within 5 calendar days after receiving the feedback. UNDP has the right to ask for addition reviews and adjustments before approval of any deliverable in case the product is not living up to UNDP’s minimum requirements for an evaluation (please see annex 9-11 and 13).

The lead evaluator will be in direct contact with the Evaluation Manager assigned as overall responsible for the finalization of the report. In the review processes the Evaluation Manager will include project staff and other members of the evaluation reference group for additional comments. Consultation will be conducted with relevant key stakeholders as well. The Evaluation Manager is in charge of consolidating all feedback before the submission to the consultant.

Below is an overview of relevant roles and responsibilities during the evaluation process:

**Evaluation Commissioner**

Is within UNDP/ PAPP the Special Representative of the Administration, who approve all decentralized evaluations being carried out. It is the evaluation commissioner who appoints this evaluation’s Evaluation Manager.

The Evaluation Commissioner has the following overall responsibilities in this evaluation:

* Safeguard the independence of the evaluation exercise and ensure quality of evaluations;
* Appoints the Evaluation Manager;
* Approves the following before submitting to ERC: Final Terms of Reference, final Evaluation Report and the selected Management responses based in the evaluation’s recommendations.

**Evaluation Manager**

Is the technical person from UNDP responsible for the oversight of the whole evaluation process, and is separated from the project under evaluation. The Evaluation Manager has the following overall responsibilities in this evaluation: Lead the evaluation process and participate in all of its stages - evaluability assessment, preparation, implementation, management and the use of the evaluation;

* Safeguard the independence of evaluations;
* Organize the kick-off meeting to introduce the evaluators to the Project Team and discuss the evaluation assignment;
* Liaise with the Project Manager throughout the evaluation process;
* Circulate, review and approve the inception report, including the methodologies and evaluation matrix;
* Ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment and other cross-cutting issues are considered in the inception report, including a gender-responsive methodology;
* Circulate, review and comment on the draft evaluation report (according to the TOR and inception report);
* Ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment and other cross-cutting issues are considered in the draft evaluation report and ensure that all and respective evaluation questions are answered, and relevant data, disaggregated by sex, is presented, analyzed and interpreted;
* Collect and consolidate comments on the draft evaluation report in one feedback document (audit trail) and share with the evaluation team for finalization of the evaluation report;
* Review the final evaluation report to ensure compliance to the UNDP report template and quality assurance and seek final approval of the commissioner of the evaluation

**Programme Analyst**

The Programme Analyst is the person within UNDP overall responsible for the projects under evaluation. The Programme Analyst has the following overall responsibilities in this evaluation:

* Ensure and safeguard the independence of evaluations
* Provide the Evaluation Manager with all required data (e.g. relevant monitoring data) and documentation (reports, minutes, reviews, studies, etc.), contacts/ stakeholder list etc. to be shared with the Evaluation Team;
* Provides the Evaluation Team access to stakeholders, donors, beneficiaries and others relevant for the data collection;
* Provide comments and clarification on the TOR, inception report and draft evaluation reports;
* Respond to evaluation recommendations by providing management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP;
* Implement relevant key actions on evaluation recommendations

**Evaluation Reference Group**

The reference group is an advisory team composed by the relevant Programme Analyst, the Project Manager, MoE and GoN. They serve as a sounding board and are not decision makers. They also comment on draft ToRs, inception and draft reports before wider circulation.

**Independent Evaluators**

the Evaluation Team is separated from UNDP and the projects under evaluation, who has been assigned to conduct the evaluation. The Evaluation Team has the following overall responsibilities in this evaluation:

* Fulfil the contractual arrangements under the TOR;
* Develop the evaluation inception report, including an evaluation matrix and a gender-responsive methodology, in line with the TOR, UNEG norms and standards and ethical guidelines
* Conduct data collection and field visits according to the TOR and inception report;
* Produce draft reports adhering to UNDP evaluation templates, and brief the Evaluation Manager and Project Manager, as well as stakeholders when needed, on the progress,key findings and recommendations;
* Consider gender equality and women’s empowerment and other cross-cutting issues, check if all and respective evaluation questions are answered, and relevant data, disaggregated by sex, is presented, analysed and interpreted;
* Finalize the evaluation report, incorporating comments and questions from the feedback/ audit trail. Record own feedback in the audit trail.

As mentioned above the evaluation team will be minimum composed of:

* The lead evaluator, who will be leading the evaluation team and submitting all required deliverables.
* Researcher, who will be responsible for conducting all research necessary to deliver a solid evidence-based gaps analysis.
* Data collection field officer, who will be leading the data collection and analysis.
* Educational Expert who will provide technical inputs and advice to the evaluation, including formulation of relevant evaluation questions and indicators, development of surveys and interview guides, assessment of the project against the gaps analysis, elaboration on findings as well as formulation of recommendations and lessons learned.

1. **Time frame for the evaluation process**

The Project evaluation will require 40 working days over the period of two months. The following table illustrates a detailed schedule for the process:

**allocation and schedule for the evaluation (Project evaluation)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **ESTIMATED # OF WORK DAYS** | **DATE OF COMPLETION** | **PLACE** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| **Phase One: Desk review and inception report** | | | | |
| Kick-off meeting with UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed) | - | At the time of contract signing | UNDP or remote | Evaluation Manager and Reference Group |
| Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team | - | At the time of contract signing | Via email | Evaluation Manager and Programme Analyst |
| Desk review, evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed | 5 days | Within two weeks of contract signing | Home- based | Evaluator |
| Submission of the inception report  (15 pages maximum, exlc. Evaluation matrix) | - | Within two weeks of contract signing |  | Evaluator |
| Comments and approval of inception report | - | Within one week of submission of the inception report. OBS: In case multiple reviews are necessary UNDP will require 5 days for review per revised submission | UNDP | Evaluation Manager |
| **Phase Two: Data-collection mission** | | | | |
| Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups | 20 days | Within four weeks from approval of inception report | In country  With field visits | UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc. |
| Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders | 1 day | Within four weeks from approval of inception report (i.e., finalized data collection) | UNDP or remote | Evaluator |
| **Phase Three: Evaluation report writing** | | | | |
| Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes and executive summary (5 pages)) | 9 days | Within three weeks of the completion of data collection | Home- based | Evaluator |
| Draft report submission | - | Within three weeks of the completion of data collection | Home- based | Evaluator |
| Consolidated UNDP and stakeholder comments to the draft report | - | Within two weeks of submission of the draft evaluation report  OBS: In case multiple reviews are necessary UNDP will require 3 days for review per revised submission | UNDP | Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Reference Group |
| Debriefing with UNDP | 1 day | Within one week of receipt of comments | UNDP or remote | Evaluation Manager, Evaluation reference group, stakeholders and Evaluator |
| Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP country office | 4 days | Within one week of final debriefing | Home- based | Evaluator |
| Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (50 pages maximum, excluding executive summary and annexes) | - | Within one week of final debriefing | Home- based | Evaluator |
| **Estimated total days for the evaluation** | **40** |  |  |  |

1. **Application submission process and criteria for selection**

**Criteria for contract award:**

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals.

The award of the contract should be made to the applicant whose offer has received the highest score out of the following criteria:

* + Technical Competency Criteria weight: 70%
  + Financial Criteria weight: 30%

Detailed technical evaluation of the qualified proposals will be conducted prior to any price proposal being considered. A technical proposal shall be rendered non-responsive if it does not substantially respond to the RFP, particularly the demands of the Terms of Reference, which also means that it fails to achieve/attain the minimum technical score (70/100).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms** | | **Points Obtainable** |
| 1 | Relevance of experience of the institutions | 20 |
| 2 | Proposed methodology and approach | 25 |
| 3 | Team Leaders, academic background, skills and experience (assessed based on the requirements listed in the ToR) | 15 |
| 4 | Team structure and compiled academic backgrounds, skills and experience (assessed based on the requirements listed in the ToR) | 35 |
| 5 | At least one female amongst the project technical staff | 5 |
|  | **Total** | **100** |

1. **TOR annexes**
2. **Annexes**

**Annex 1:** [Code of conduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100)**:** Each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the ‘Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations system’ as well as a [pledge of ethical conduct.](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866)

**Annex 2:** [Integrating Gender Equality and Human Rights in Evaluation - UN-SWAP Guidance, Analysis and Good Practices](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1452)

**Annex 3:** Results Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Indicator data | | | |  | |
| LEVEL | EXPECTED RESULT | INDICATORS | BASELINE  Y0 | TARGET Y1 | TARGET Y2 | FINAL TARGET Y3 | Data source of verification | Comments |
| IMPACT | Palestinian national Education system in East Jerusalem enhanced. | Number of schools directly supervised by the national education system | MoE: 46  Private schools: 13 | MoE: 46  Private schools: 24 | MoE: 46  Private schools: 24 | MoE: 48  Private schools:  50 | MoE/M&E Reports | Baselines are based on geo-mapping system at JDoE. |
| Rate of students’ enrolment (disaggregated by sex) in Palestinian national education system | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | MoE/M&E Reports | TBD in Feb 2020 based on the full selection of schools |
| OUTCOME | Increased access for Palestinian students to improved learning and quality education environments in East Jerusalem. | Number of Palestinian students (Dis-aggregated by sex) benefitting from improved access to quality education | M:0  F:0  T:0 | M:0  F:0  T:0 | M:2,300  F:2,300  T:4,600 | M:7,500  F:7,500  T:15,000 | MoE/M&E Reports | To be updated in Feb 2020 |
| Students’ learning achievements | Math average  4th: 44%  10th: 23% | Math average  4th: 47%  10th: 27% | Math average  4th: 50%  10th: 30%: | Math average  4th: 53%  10th: 34% | Baseline for students’ learning achievements (national exam) is based on 2016 MoE M&E report | To be updated in Feb 2020 |
| OUTPUT 1.1 | Enrolment opportunities for students at national education system in East Jerusalem increased | Number of students (Dis-aggregated by sex) enrolled at MoE schools (basic/secondary education) | M: 4,980  F: 7,440  T: 12,420 | 0 | 0 | M:5,200  F:8,040  T:13,240 | MoE/JDoE  Reports | The indicator is based on the Geo-mapping system at JDoE |
| Degree of appropriate school buildings of public schools in East Jerusalem to achieve the standards | 72.8% | 0 | 0 | 75.9% | MoE monitoring and evaluation report | The indicators is measured against 11 standards set by the MoE that include area/student, playground/student, no. of sanitary units,etc. |
| Number of students (dis-aggregated by sex) who have the opportunity to enrolled into national TVET education at public schools | M: 0  F: 0 | M: 0  F: 0 | M: 0  F: 0 | M:100  F: 100 | Progress Reports and Evaluation | Gender data will be presented during the mobilization stage |
|  |  | Number of new classrooms constructed under the Palestinian National education system | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | MoE/JDoE  Reports |  |
| Output 1.2 | Technical capacities of JDoE in supporting the education process enhanced. | Number of schools fully surveyed and linked to GIS and Management Information System | 130 | 45 | 44 | 219 | MoE/JDoE  Reports |  |
| Level of coordination capacities at JDoE | Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Good | Meet expectation | Progress Reports and Evaluation | The baseline was a result of an evaluation study undertaken by UNDP/PAPP together with Birzeit University. The final target will assessed by the end evaluation to be undertaken as part of this project. To be updated in Feb 2020. |
| Level of satisfaction of employees at JDoE | 55.6% | 55.6% | 58% | 60% |  | MoE monitoring and evaluation report. To be updated in Feb 2020. |
| Level of community engagement of tackling education challenges (violence, dropouts, enrolment TVET, co-education, social behaviours) | Poor | Poor | Good | Meet expectation | Progress Reports and Evaluation | The baseline was a result of an evaluation study undertaken by UNDP/PAPP together with Birzeit University. The final target will be assessed by the end evaluation to undertaken as part of this project. To be updated in Feb 2020. |
| OUTPUT 1.3 | Quality education targeting private schools in East Jerusalem improved. | Number of principles/ teachers ( dis-aggregated by sex) at private schools benefited from training and capacity development opportunities | Principles: 0  Teachers:0  M:0  F:0 | Principles: 24  Teachers:  0  M:0  F:0 | Principles: 24  Teachers:100  M:50  F:50 | Principles: 24  Teachers:  200  M:100  F:100 | MoE  /National Institute of Education training (NIET) reports |  |
| Number of qualified teachers ( dis-aggregated by sex) according to the MoE Teachers Education Strategy at the private schools in East Jerusalem | M:0  F:0 | M:0  F:0 | M:50  F:50 | M:100  F:100 | MoE  /National Institute of Education training (NIET) reports |  |
| Students’ (dis-aggregated by sex) learning achievements at private schools in East Jerusalem | NA (foot note plans to align with the MoE | TBD | TBD | TBD | Private school reports at national exams | Will be updated in Feb 2020. |
| Number of students ( dis-aggregated by sex) benefited from improved learning environment and response to psychological, social and educational problems in private schools | 0 | 0 | 8,600 | 14,400 | MoE/Directorate general of Special education Reports |  |
|  |  | Number of students ( dis-aggregated by sex) benefited from improved learning environment to tackle learning disabilities | 0 | 0 | 150 | 300 | Palestinian Counselling Centre for Education |  |

**Annex 4:** Documents to be shared with evaluator

* Project Document
* Results Framework
* Quality Assurance reports
* Annual Work Plans
* Mid-year and annual reports
* Financial documents

[Please visit UNDP’s transparency platform to access all publicly available project information](https://open.undp.org/projects/00113188)

**Annex 5:** Key stakeholders and partners:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **Role** |
| **MoE** | The national counterpart as well as indirect beneficiary at the level of educational system |
| **JDoE** | The national counterpart and main beneficiary at the level of East Jerusalem. Hence, UNDP is working closely with JDoE to improve the learning environment and address the fragmentation of the educational system in East Jerusalem and, in parallel, capacity build the institution to enhance its ability to provide quality education and improve the system strategically. |
| **Supervision Unit -JDoE/MoE** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of providing training for 10 supervisors in the fields of (1) learning and teaching, (2) assessing the situation of schools in line with the Palestinian education standards, (3) building professional-technical education societies, and supporting schools in enhancing their learning environment. |
| **National Institute for Educational Training (NIET)** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of developing the capacities of 24 headmasters of private schools to obtain a professional diploma through NIET. |
| **Al Farah Center** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of providing technical knowledge to support students with learning difficulties. |
| **Arab Counseling Center for Education (ACCE)** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of empowering counsellor, and teachers to reduce level of violence and response to psychological, social and educational problems in private schools, as well as to spread awareness among parents to address these behaviours. |
| **Al Saraya Center for Community services** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of increase community awareness of TVET Education. |
| **Agricultural Development Association (PARC)** | Implementing partner, entrusted with the responsibility of tackling social behaviours and enhance the commitment of the community to support the education system in Jerusalem. |

**Annex 6: Evaluation matrix** (a deliverable which should be included in the inception report, please use table 5 as inspiration). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

**Table 1. Sample evaluation matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant evaluation criteria** | **Key questions** | **Specific sub questions** | **Data sources** | **Data-collection methods/tools** | **Indicators/ success standard** | **Methods for data analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Annex 7:** [inception report](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/Template/section-4/Sec%204%20Template%204%20Evaluation%20Inception%20report%20content%20outline.docx) standard template

**Annex 8:** [evaluation report](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/Template/section-4/Sec%204%20Template%206%20Standard%20evaluation%20report%20content%20full%20details.docx)

**Annex 9:** [UNDP evaluation guidelines](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml)

**Annex 10:** [UNEG Quality check list for evaluation reports](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/607)

**Annex 11:** [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102)

**Annex 12: Dispute and wrongdoing resolution process and contact details**

**Annex 12: Evaluation Quality Assessment:**

Evaluations commissioned by UNDP country offices are subject to a quality assessment, including this evaluation. Final evaluation reports will be uploaded to the Evaluation Resource Centre ([ERC site](https://erc.undp.org/)) after the evaluations complete. The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) will later undertake the quality assessment and assign a rating. IEO will notify the assessment results to country offices. UNDP/ PAPP aims to ensure evaluation quality. To do so, the consultancy firm should put in place the quality control of deliverables. Also, consultancy firm should familiarize themselves with the rating criteria and assessment questions outlined in the Section six of [UNDP Evaluation Guidelines](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml)

1. It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
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