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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions by Topic** | **Findings** | **Conclusions** | **Recommendations** |
| 1. How well does GEE correspond to the **GoSS education priorities**? | Project goal aligns (MoEST Policy Handbook; Child Act; Ed Act; draft Gender Policy; Interim Constitution 2005; Undersecretary ambitions; President ambitions; international agreements to which GoSS is a signatory—CEDAW, other??; MDG--) | The Project aligns well with GoSS education and broader Govt priorities. | None |
| 8. Assess the **quality and performance of Winrock International in managing** the implementation of GEE. | **Performance**  Winrock addressed challenges during the transition from GESP to GEE implementation, e.g., data provided by CARE were flawed. GEE’s budget and plans were based then on wrong and inadequate data.  Scholarship component elements werecarried out as per workplan despite the challenges of the context.  Challenges with efficiency, some of which are beyond GEE’s control (school opening and closing days, banking, weather, security situation) and some of which are within GEE’s control (data collection, entry, processing). WI had to obtain $ from a private donor (ended up being part of the cost-share) in order to finance scholarships for 2008. Scholarships were scheduled for disbursement in April 2008, but were disbursed in July 2008. COP wasn’t in Sudan full-time from project start-up—had visits but didn’t mobilize until early 2008.  **Quality** (discussed as a topic in subsequent question)  Reporting format is consistent and concise. Indicator data are reported consistently.  Scholarship selection and distribution processes are systematized and generally consistent in application.  It took a long time to distribute the first scholarships, some ten months and the signing of the contract.  Internal project operations (finance, reporting, etc.) are functional and processes are documented.    Some personnel are reported that they are over-burdened consistently (COP, M&E Officer, Operations and Logistics) while others reported that they have periods of down time that reflect the cyclical nature of a scholarship activity. | Winrock managed the transition well from GESP to GEE, regrouping quickly and getting scholarships out without missing an allocation during transition year.  Winrock is managing the Project well in terms of progress on key indicators such as number of beneficiaries and number of scholarships distributed.  Winrock has coped well with challenges beyond their control such as problems with the banking system and delays with USAID obligations.  Winrock developed and using an effective process for distributing scholarships, that has become more efficient over time.  Time management may warrant Winrock attention,to smooth out work flow and reduce peaks and valleys |  |
| 8.a. What are the **team’s strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement with respect to management of the Cooperative Agreement**? | **Strengths**  Ongoing GEE-Juba personnel dialogue with USAID-Juba  Self-reporting by Winrock staff regarding their flexibility and creativity in responding to emerging situations (e.g., USAID delays in disbursement) and contextual challenges. Extension of scholarships to boys—no modification.  Winrock has created a functional scholarship program processes for selecting schools and students, and for delivering the scholarships. They have good communication with schools in terms or orientation and distribution of scholarships and, in most cases, deliver the scholarships within a reasonable time.  No leakage of the funds was found  The Project is on target for 5 or 6 of the 9 performance indictors.  Course evaluation forms indicate that Winrock’s training programs, such as monitoring, Leadership for Change, and M&E have been well received. They are using good training materials.  Winrock introduced equity considerations beyond girls for the scholarships including boys and the disabled. | Good, ongoing communication between field staff and USAID.  Responsive to the contextual challenges and changing situation.  Winrock likely to be able to reach almost all of the performance targets, perhaps with the exception of the number of teachers trained and the number of policies or guidelines developed.  The have good control of the money – good FM |  |
|  | **Weaknesses**  . The eligibility (selection) criteria are very broad. They fit the majority of students in Southern Sudan.  Progress on key implementation indicators a result of focus on developing and implementing procedures by Winrock, but without sufficient consideration of other aspects of the Project.  The Project is perceived by most people in southern Sudan as a Winrock initiative, not that of USAID or MoEST. This is because Winrock takes a strong lead in most activities. In part, this is a result of a high level of turnover of Ministry staff.  Observation and interview data indicate that, at the state, county and school levels there is good communication with key education personnel regarding the scholarship program. The team was also told, however, that in some places the secondary education departments not sufficiently involved.  The Project has focused in on obtaining the big performance targets – number of beneficiaries and number of scholarships.  The comfort kits has always been a mainstay of the GESP and GEE programs because the sanitary pads in the comfort kits allow girls to continue to attend school during their monthly period. However, a majority of the girls interviewed said that the pads only lasted about three months, far shorter than previously assumed by the Project. In addition, students buy disposable pads where available and if they have the money.  Documentary evidence and interview data indicate that less attention was given to other aspects such as capacity building, ownership and sustainability. GEE activities have not been embedded into MoEST or SMoE annual plans.  The Project makes same payment to each student, the same tuition support regardless of the amount of tuition charged at each school, and the same amount of institutional support regardless of the size of the school or the needs of the institution. There is no variation in approach that might take into account the circumstances in the different states (other than the special program involving NESEI).  The scholarship package consists of about $20 for tuition support, $20 for personal items, and a per student average of about $10 (although the improvement grants are given on a school basis). In addition, the girls receive a comfort kit, costing the Project about $20. Virtually all recipients told the evaluators that, while the support is appreciated, the amount of money is too low to make much of a difference to scholars or the school.  Winrock has some programs that have only been partially develop or not stated at all, such as the school-based monitoring committees, micro-credit program for families to help finance school tuition, and Leadership for Change. | The Scholarship Component could be better focused in terms of targeting schools and selection of students  Government credibility in delivery of services and consequently, the anticipated ‘peace dividend’ is undermined because the Government is not in the forefront of activities.  The implementation approach taken by Winrock does not provide flexibility that might strengthen implementation.  The locally produced are sanitary pads are not adequate for meeting project objectives.  The project’s “one model fits all” approach approach to payments of students may have been too low and too inflexible to meet all student needs.  Given that there are only two years left in the Project and that some promising activities have not sufficiently implemented (monitoring, Leadership for Change, and capacity building), it may make sense to reduce some of the planned activities in order to give better focus and financial support to those activities that are most important and promising. | Review criteria for targeting of schools and selection of students.  Seek additional ways to place the government in the lead position.  Issue scholarship certificates to the students that includes proper branding for MoEST, USAID, and Winrock.  Winrock may want to consider asking schools to make certain commitments regard the scholars or girls in general as a requirement to participate in the GEE Project.  The project should upgrade the quality of the sanitary pads it procures.  Consider ways in which the amount of support can be increased. This needs to include the ability to show a much great impact on the school as a whole, in part, to help reduce student resentment against the scholars.  Regarding the comfort kits, the Project should examine international sources for pads that will last for several years (some companies offer special prices or contributions to places such as southern Sudan). In the short term, the Project could consider stopping the distribution of the comfort kits and addition the savings to other parts of the scholarship package. |