**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF JOINT PROGRAMMES ON CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT**

**General Context: The MDGF Culture and Development Window**

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDGF supports countries in their progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other development goals by funding innovative programmes that have an impact on the population and potential for duplication.

The MDGF operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 128 joint programmes in 50 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs.

The Culture and Development Window comprises 18 joint programmes that promote culture as a vehicle for social and economic development. The main interventions focus on supporting the development of public policies that promote social and cultural inclusion; and seeking to stimulate the creation of creative industries to expand people’s opportunities.

The beneficiaries of the Joint Programs in the Culture and Development Window are diverse, ranging from national governments to local population. Virtually all joint programs involve supporting the government, at the national and/or local levels, civil society organizations, professional associations, communities, and individuals.

**The ‘Improving Cultural Understanding in BiH’**

The programme was formulated as a partnership between UNDP, UNICEF, and UNESCO, in close collaboration with the state-level Ministry of Civil Affairs, Entity Ministries of Culture and of Education, as well as other institutions responsible for education and culture. The Spanish Embassy, the Council of Europe (culture and education), the OSCE and the EC Delegation were also closely involved in formulation (see Annex E). The relevant MDGs that are being primarily targeted are MDG’s 1 and 8 with relevance in education sector work to MDGs 2 and 3. The programme builds on existing efforts by the UNCT BiH in the areas of the protecting and revaluing cultural heritage, inter-ethnic dialogue, tolerance building in education, and human rights-based approaches to programming, including social inclusion. Programme formulation focused on identifying the strengths and comparative advantages of the UN agencies, and ensuring strong links with existing programmes, including those managed by other donors. This not only helped with coordination, but will also help to assure sustainability.

Both the Federation of BiH and Republika Srpska Ministers responsible for cultural development have expressed, in writing, their enthusiasm and full support for the proposed joint programme. They have both pledged to work with each other and with the state-level Ministry of Civil Affairs to ensure proper implementation. The BiH Government’s commitment to cultural development has also been demonstrated by its decision to become a signatory of the “Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions” (2005), the “Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage” (2003) as well as the 1972 World Heritage Convention.[[1]](#footnote-1) This commitment is also reflected in the BiH Medium-Term Development Strategy (MTDS 2004-7), including its explicitly stated goals of preparing a cultural strategy, of abolishing the practice of “two schools under one roof”, and of improving policies in related fields.

The four mutually-supportive outcomes (see programme document and resource framework) in this joint programme have been designed to achieve the overall goal of strengthening cross-cultural understanding in BiH. The underlying rationale for the programme involves the following:

* That a broad and dynamic definition of ‘culture’, in which the modern is fused with the traditional, is required to circumvent the tendency to collapse culture into history and heritage;
* That a dynamic understanding of culture is intrinsically linked with societal advancement, development and shared enjoyment, and, as such, can be utilised to foster greater respect for interculturalism and an increased awareness of commonalities;
* That a clear articulation of the links between social cohesion, education and economic development will foster greater levels of cross-cultural understanding;
* That interventions in this area must also be tempered with the reality that existing forms of segregation and prejudice must be dealt with through broadening horizons at all level, with a particular focus on providing young children with increased opportunities for intercultural learning and interaction.

This conceptual approach links the reality of modern BiH, lessons learnt and the four outcomes by providing the basis for the necessary innovation that will ensure the success and sustainability of the joint programme. By supporting processes of reconciliation and cross-cultural understanding, the programme will reinforce prospects for peaceful co-existence and social cohesion, and by promoting economic revitalisation as a prerequisite for interculturalism, which will lay a sound base for the future.

The Inception Report was jointly prepared by the three UN Participating Agencies (UNDP, UNESCO and UNICEF) and highlights the key events and achievements made during the Inception Phase, especially looking at the impact on the further detailing and shaping of the project Annual Work Plan.

The efforts of the MDG-F programme, and its impact, was further reinforced by strongly coordinated advocacy and communication campaigns, with involvement of the joint UN Communications Team, and lead by an MDG-F Communications Associate.

The three UN Participating Agencies ensured joint monitoring and reporting on the programme. It is aimed for this joint reporting to replace as much as possible the individual reporting needs of the agencies.

The main example of such increased synergies was the decision of the three agencies to jointly select core localities for local level implementation. This way, the initially more individualistic approach at local level, was redirected towards fully coordinated efforts within core municipalities. Within these municipalities, agencies will develop their individual programme components, but by working in the same localities and often with same target groups, this will allow for individual activities to be strengthened and to build each other’s achievements. UNESCO’s restoration of significant monuments will be linked to UNDP’s work on intercultural understanding, and UNICEF’s efforts in intercultural education.

The full time staff of the MDG-F project team has moved into a joint project office. This collocation has significantly increased interactions between the team members and has allowed for more sharing of information on the different agency components, as well as for developing additional synergies. The key partners to the implementation of MDGF Programme are: BiH Ministry of Civil Affairs, FBiH Ministry of Culture and Sports, RS Ministry of Education and Culture, BiH Ministry of Education and Science, Department for Education of Brcko District, Government Agency for Pre-primary, Primary and Secondary Education, Pedagogical Institutes, 10 core localities (municipalities), Media representatives, Artists and culture workers. The programme is well distributed across the country. Equal representation of both entities has been taken into consideration during the process of approval of criteria for selection of core localities. In addition UNESCO works in city of Mostar (largest city in Herzegovina) and Banja Luka in Republika Srpska.

The programme works within four distinct programmatic components that address evidence-based policy making (strategic policy documents; policy research and improved methodology for statistics), improved cultural understanding at local level (local municipal and NGO projects that address issues of intercultural understanding , improved culture tourism and culture industry potentials (local and umbrella projects focused on improved conditions for and improved tolerance for diversity (media, documentaries and culture workers).

Summarize the joint programme’s scale of complexity, including its components, targeted participants (direct and indirect), geographical scope (regions) and the socio-economic context in which it operates.

The current programme is explicitly linked to all the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), particularly “Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger” (MDG 1) and “Develop a Global Partnership for Development’ (MDG 8). Also, there is a clear linkage to the Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC) – not only as far as the ‘education articles’ 28 and 29 are concerned, but also regarding Articles 12-14 in terms of promoting the child’s right to freedom of expression and participation. These Articles and proposed work in the education sector relate to MDGs 2 and 3 in that they promote universal access of all boys and girls to primary education. Regarding MDG 3 (‘Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women’), this needs to be seen within a broader context of focusing on gender equality across ethnicities and cultures.

The programme directly addressed two outcomes from UNDAF (past reporting period). These are Outcome 1: Strengthened accountability and responsiveness of governments to pro-active citizens and Outcome 2: Improved access to and quality of education, health and social protection services.

**2. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION**

One of the roles of the Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDGF. This role is fulfilled in line with the instructions contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund. These documents stipulate that all joint programmes lasting longer than two years will be subject to an mid-term evaluation.

Mid-term evaluations are highly formative in nature and seek **improved implementation of the programmes during their second phase of implementation**. **They also seek and generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned** that could be transferred to other programmes. As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation will be addressed to its main users: the Programme Management Committee, the National Steering Committee and the Secretariat of the Fund.

**3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC GOALS**

The mid-term evaluation will use an expedited process to carry out a systematic, fast-paced analysis of the design, process and results or results trends of the **joint programme**, based on the scope and criteria included in these terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period of approximately three months.

**The unit of analysis or object of study for this interim evaluation is the joint programme,** understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This mid-term evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. To discover the programme’s **design quality and internal coherence** (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the **Millennium Development Goals**, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
2. To understand how the joint programme **operates** and assess the **efficiency of its management model** in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the **One UN** framework.
3. To identify the programme’s **degree of effectiveness** among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the **Environment and Climate Change thematic window,** and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

**4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS AND CRITERIA**

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

**Design level:**

* **Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies of associates and donors.**

1. Is the identification of the objectives clear in the joint programme?
2. Does the Joint Programme take into account the particularities and specific interests of women, minorities and persons with disabilities in the areas of intervention?
3. To what extent has the intervention strategy been adapted to the areas of intervention in which it is being implemented? What actions does the programme envisage, to respond to obstacles that may arise from the political and socio-cultural background?
4. Are the follow-up indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the joint programme?
5. To what extent has the MDG-F Secretariat contributed to raising the quality of the design of the joint programmes?

* **Ownership in the design:** **Effective exercise of leadership by the country’s social agents in development interventions**

1. To what extent do the intervention objectives and strategies of the Joint Programme respond to national, entity, cantonal and local plans?
2. To what extent have the country’s national, entity and local authorities been taken into consideration, participated, or have become involved, at the design stage of the development intervention?

**Process level**

**- Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, etc.) have been turned into results**

1. To what extent does the joint programme’s management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) contribute to obtaining the predicted products and results?
2. To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other, with the governments and with civil society? Is there a methodology underpinning the work and internal communications that contributes to the joint implementation?
3. Are there efficient coordination mechanisms to avoid overloading the counterparts, participating population/actors?
4. Is the pace of implementing the products of the programme ensuring the completeness of the results of the joint programme? How do the different components of the joint programme interrelate?
5. Are work methodologies, financial instruments, etc. shared among agencies, institutions and Joint Programmes?
6. Have more efficient (sensitive) and appropriate measures been adopted to respond to the political and socio-cultural problems identified?

**- Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country’s social agents in development interventions**

1. To what extent have the target population and participants made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation have taken place?
2. To what extent have public/private national resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme’s objective and produce results and impacts?

**Results level**

**- Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, bearing in mind their relative importance.**

1. Is the programme making progress in helping to achieve the set results?
   1. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals on a local level and in the country?
   2. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the objectives set by the thematic window on gender equality and the empowerment of women?
2. Is the schedule for the set products being met? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the products and results?
3. Do the products created live up to the necessary quality?
4. Does the programme have follow-up mechanisms (to verify the quality of the products, punctuality of delivery, etc.) to measure progress in the achievement of the envisaged results?
5. Is the programme providing coverage of the participating population as planned in the joint programme document?
6. What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of products and results?
7. In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving?
8. What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples have been identified?
9. In what way has the joint programme contributed towards the issue culture and development included on the public agenda? To what extent has it helped to build up and/or bolster communication and cooperation among, civil society organizations and decision-makers?
10. What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the joint programme in accordance with the sex, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent?

**Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.**

1. Are the necessary premises occurring to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the joint programme?

At local, entity and national level:

* + 1. Is the programme supported by national and/or local institutions?
    2. Are these institutions showing technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme and to repeat it?
    3. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
    4. Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?
    5. Is the duration of the programme sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project the sustainability of the interventions?

1. To what extent are the visions and actions of the partners consistent or divergent with regard to the joint programme?
2. In what ways can the governance of the joint programme be improved so that it has greater likelihood of achieving future sustainability?

**Country and Entity level**

1. What lessons learned or good transferable practices to other programmes or countries have been observed during the evaluation analysis?
2. To what extent and in what way is the joint programme contributing to progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals in the country?
3. To what extent and in what ways are the joint programmes contributing to progress towards United Nations reform? One UN
4. How are the principles of aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, management for development results and mutual responsibility) being applied in the joint programmes?
5. To what extent is the joint programme helping to influence the governmental public policy framework?

**5. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH**

The mid-term evaluations will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as annual reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form opinions. Consultants are also expected to use interviews as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the desk study report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at a minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

The mid-term evaluation will use an international consultant, appointed by MDG-F, as the Evaluator to conduct the evaluation and a locally hired consultant who will support the Evaluator by providing information about local context such as institutions, protocol, traditions, etc. and assist with translation of key meetings/ interviews during the mission as needed. It is the sole responsibility of the Evaluator to deliver the inception, draft final and final reports.

**6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the Secretariat of the MDGF:

**Inception Report** (to be submitted within seven days of the submission of all programme documentation to the consultant)

This report will be 5 to 10 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose an initial theory of change to the joint programme that will be used for comparative purposes during the evaluation and will serve as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation managers.

**Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 10 days of completion of the field visit)

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be shared with evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions.

**Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within seven days of receipt of the draft final report with comments)

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. This report will contain the following sections at a minimum:

1. Cover Page

2. Introduction

* + Background, goal and methodological approach
  + Purpose of the evaluation
  + Methodology used in the evaluation
  + Constraints and limitations on the study conducted

3. Description of interventions carried out

* + - Initial concept
  + - Detailed description of its development: description of the hypothesis of change in the programme.

4. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions

5. Conclusions and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear)

6. Recommendations

7. Annexes

**7. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION**

The mid-term evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

• **Anonymity and confidentiality**. The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.

• **Responsibility**. The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.

• **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.

• **Independence**. The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.

• **Incidents**. If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the MDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDGF in these terms of reference.

• **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.

• **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.

• **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

**8. ROLES OF ACTORS IN THE EVALUATION**

The main actors in the interim evaluation process are the Secretariat of the MDGF, the management team of the joint programme and the Programme Management Committee that could be expanded to accommodate additional relevant stakeholders. This group of institutions and individuals will serve as the evaluation reference group. The role of the evaluation reference group will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

* Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design.
* Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation.
* Providing input on the evaluation planning documents,( Work Plan and Communication, Dissemination and Improvement Plan).
* Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference.
* Facilitating the evaluation team’s access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods.
* Monitoring the quality of the process and the documents and reports that are generated, so as to enrich these with their input and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention.
* Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.

The Secretariat of the MDGF shall promote and manage Joint Programme mid-term evaluation in its role as proponent of the evaluation, fulfilling the mandate to conduct and finance the joint programme evaluation. As manager of the evaluation, the Secretariat will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation process is conducted as stipulated, promoting and leading the evaluation design; coordinating and monitoring progress and development in the evaluation study and the quality of the process. It shall also support the country in the main task of disseminating evaluation findings and recommendations.

**9. TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

1. **Design phase (15 days total)**
2. Each of the Secretariat's portfolios managers shall send the generic TOR for the window in question to the specific country where the evaluation takes place. These are then to be adapted to the concrete situation of the joint programme in that country, using the lowest common denominator that is shared by all, for purposes of data aggregation and the provision of evidence for the rest of the MDGF levels of analysis (country, thematic window and MDGF).

This activity requires a dialogue between the Secretariat and the reference group of the evaluation (the body that comments on and reviews but does not interfere with the independent evaluation process). This dialogue should be aimed at rounding out and modifying some of the questions and dimensions of the study that the generic TOR do not cover, or which are inadequate or irrelevant to the joint programme.

1. The TOR will be sent to the MDG-F Secretariat consultant.
2. From this point on, each programme officer is responsible for managing the execution of the evaluation, with three main functions: to facilitate the work of the consultant, to serve as interlocutor between the parties (consultant, joint programme team in the country, etc.), and to review the deliverables that are produced.
3. **Execution phase of the evaluation study (55-58 days total)**

**Desk study (15 days total)**

1. Briefing with the consultant **(1 day).** A checklist of activities and documents to review will be submitted, and the evaluation process will be explained. Discussion will take place over what the evaluation should entail.
2. Review of documents according to the standard list (see TOR annexes; programme document, financial, monitoring reports etc.).
3. Submission of the inception report including the findings from the document review specifying how the evaluation will be conducted. The inception report is sent and shared with the evaluation reference group for comments and suggestions (within **seven days of delivery of all programme documentation to the consultant**).
4. The focal person for the evaluation (joint programme coordinator, resident coordinator office, etc) and the consultant prepare and agenda to conduct the field visit of the evaluation. (Interview with programme participants, stakeholders, focus groups, etc) (Within **seven days of delivery of the desk study report**).

**Field visit (9-12 days)**

1. The consultant will travel to the country to observe and contrast the preliminary conclusions reached through the study of the document revision. The planned agenda will be carried out. To accomplish this, the Secretariat’s programme officer may need to facilitate the consultant’s visit by means of phone calls and emails, making sure there is a focal person in the country who is his/her natural interlocutor by default.
2. The consultant will be responsible for conducting a debriefing with the key actors he or she has interacted with.

**Final Report (31 days total)**

1. The consultant will deliver a draft final report, which the Secretariat’s programme officer shall be responsible for sharing with the evaluation reference group **(within 10 days of the completion of the field visit).**
2. The evaluation reference group may ask that data or facts that it believes are incorrect be changed, as long as it provides data or evidence that supports its request. The evaluator will have the final say over whether to accept or reject such changes. For the sake of evaluation quality, the Secretariat’s programme officer can and should intervene so that erroneous data, and opinions based on erroneous data or not based on evidence, are changed **(within seven days of delivery of the draft final report).**

The evaluation reference group may also comment on the value judgements contained in the evaluation, but these may not affect the evaluator’s freedom to express the conclusions and recommendations he or she deems appropriate, based on the evidence and criteria established.

1. The Secretariat’s programme officer shall assess the quality of the evaluation reports presented using the criteria stipulated in the annex to this evaluation strategy **(within seven days of delivery of the draft final report).**
2. On the completion of input from the reference group, the evaluator shall decide which input to incorporate and which to omit. The Secretariat’s programme officer shall review the final copy of the report, and this phase will conclude with the delivery of this report to the evaluation reference group in the country **(within seven days of delivery of the draft final report with comments).**
3. **Phase of incorporating recommendations and improvement plan (within seven days of delivery of the final report):**
4. The Secretariat’s programme officer, as representative of the Secretariat, shall engage in a dialogue with the joint programme managers to establish an improvement plan that includes recommendations from the evaluation.
5. The Secretariat’s programme officer will hold a dialogue with the point person for the evaluation to develop a simple plan to disseminate and report the results to the various interested parties.

**10. ANNEXES**

**a) Document Review**

MDG-F Context

* MDGF Framework Document
* Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
* General thematic indicators
* M&E strategy
* Communication and Advocacy Strategy
* MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

Specific Joint Programme Documents

* Joint Programme Document: Results framework and monitoring and evaluation framework
* Mission reports from the Secretariat
* Quarterly reports
* Mini-monitoring reports
* Biannual monitoring reports
* Annual reports
* Annual work plan
* Financial information (MDTF)

Other in-country documents or information (available upon Evaluator’s request)

* Evaluation Reporto no Culture sensitivity in Media
* Culture Participation Study ToR
* Municipal Selection Criteria
* Verification Mission Reports
* Report on Curricula and School Practices
* Mapping Teaching Competences
* Guidelines for Monitoring and Evaluation of the projects
* Municipal Project Proposals and detailed Activity plans
* Culture Secotr framework document for mapping administrative resources
* Action plan on implementation of Strategy for Culture Policies in BiH
* Publication with all conventions to which BiH is a signatory.
* KAP Report
* Trainer’s guide
* Teacher’s guide
* Student textbook and educational game „Invitation“
* Brochure for parents
* Cultural ABCs (book for beginners) about people of Bosnia and Herzegovina
* Publication: Learning to Live Together

As for the strategic documents in education and culture sectors to serve as reference to program external coherence with National Development Strategies, UNICEF propose the following documents:

* Strategic Directions for Education Development 2008-2015
* Revised BiH Mid Term Development Strategy 2004-2008.
* Strategy for EU Integration
* Country Development Strategy
* Social Inclusion Strategy
* Multi-Annual Indicative Planning Document

**c) File for the Joint Programme Improvement Plan**

After the interim evaluation is complete, the phase of incorporating its recommendations shall begin. This file is to be used as the basis for establishing an improvement plan for the joint programme, which will bring together all the recommendations, actions to be carried out by programme management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation No. 1** | | | | |
| **Response from the Joint Programme Management** | | | | |
| **Key actions** | **Time frame** | **Person responsible** | **Follow-up** | |
| 1.1 |  |  | **Comments** | **Status** |
| 1.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation No. 2** | | | | |
| **Response from the Joint Programme Management** | | | | |
| Key actions | Time frame | Person responsible | **Follow-up** | |
| 2.1 |  |  | Comments | Status |
| 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation No. 3** | | | | |
| **Response from the Joint Programme Management** | | | | |
| Key actions | Time frame | Person responsible | **Follow-up** | |
| 3.1 |  |  | Comments | Status |
| 3.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 |  |  |  |  |

1. **Evaluation timeline**

**The Reference Evaluation Group proposes Field visit to take place between 21 June and 15 the of July 2010. The proposal is based on availability of government partners.**

1. Bosnia and Herzegovina has two World Heritage sites; the Mostar Bridge (2005) and the Mahmud Pasha Bridge (2007). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)