



International Labour Organization

iTrack

Evaluation

ILO EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** University Centers for Career Development (UCCD) Project – Internal Midterm Evaluation
- **ILO TC/SYMBOL:** EGY/17/02/AUE
- **Type of Evaluation :** Internal
- **Country(ies) :** Egypt
- **P&B outcome(s):** 5
- **SDG(s):** 8 and 4
- **Date of the evaluation:** February 2021
- **Name of consultant(s):** Ashraf Bakr Elsherif, PhD
- **ILO Administrative Office:** Decent Work Team / Country Office Cairo
- **ILO Technical Backstopping Office:** Decent Work Team / Country Office Cairo
- **Other agencies involved in joint evaluation:** N/A
- **Date project ends:** 19 September 2022
- **Donor: country and budget US\$** AUC/USAID; 2,224,619 USD
- **Evaluation Manager:** Heba Rashed
- **Evaluation Budget:** USD 4,050
- **Key Words:** Entry into working life; Labour market analysis; Labour market information system; People with disabilities; Higher education; Egypt

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS.....	II
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	III
1. PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	1
2. EVALUATION BACKGROUND.....	1
3. METHODOLOGY	2
3.1 Evaluation Criteria and Questions	2
3.2 Approach	3
3.3 Data Types and Sources	3
3.4 Sampling Framework	3
3.5 Evaluation Process	4
3.6 Limitations and Mitigation Strategies	5
4. FINDINGS	5
4.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit	5
4.2 Validity of Design.....	7
4.3 Effectiveness	10
4.4. Efficiency of Resource Use.....	20
4.5 Impact Orientation and Sustainability.....	21
5. CONCLUSIONS	22
6. LESSONS LEARNED	25
7. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	26
ANNEXES	27
1 Terms of Reference.....	27
2 Lessons Learned	39
3 Evaluation Matrix	41
4 Data Collection Tools.....	46
5 Stakeholders' Workshop Agenda	66
6 Documents Reviewed	67
7 Evaluation Timeline	68

ACRONYMS

A/COR	Alternate Contract Officer Representative (USAID)
AUC	The American University in Cairo
Baseera	The Egyptian Center for Public Opinion Research
CAPMAS	Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics
CoP	Chief of Party
CPOs	Country Priority Outcomes
DCoP	Deputy Chief of Party
DET	Disability Equality Training
DWT/CO-Cairo	Decent Work Team/Country Office, Cairo
EGP	Egyptian pounds
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GoE	Government of Egypt
ILO	International Labour Organization
KII	Key Informant Interview
LMI	Labour Market Information
LMIS	Labour Market Information Systems
LMO	Labour Market Observatory
LMS	Labour Market Survey
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoHESR	Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OECD/DAC	Donor Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
P&B	ILO Programme & Budget
PWDs	Persons With Disabilities
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SDS	Sustainable Development Strategy
SWDs	Students With Disabilities
TCPR	Technical Cooperation Progress Report
ToC	Theory of Change
ToF	Training of Facilitators
UCCD	University Centers for Career Development
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WG	Working Group

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University Centers for Career Development (UCCD) is a project funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and managed by the American University in Cairo (AUC). It aims to establish 20 sustainable UCCDs in 12 Egyptian public universities in Upper Egypt, Delta and Greater Cairo over a four-year duration. The International Labour Organization (ILO) partnership with AUC in this project aims to enhance the capacity of already operational UCCDs, increase the inclusiveness of UCCD services for students with disabilities (SWDs), and support the collection, analysis and dissemination of quantitative and qualitative labour market information relevant for career guidance and counselling.

ILO component officially commenced in June 2018. The UCCD project, as a whole, was forecast to conclude on September 19, 2021 – as per the agreement between USAID and AUC. In December 2020, AUC informed ILO of a potential one year, no-cost extension, though no formal addendum had been signed when this evaluation was being conducted.

ILO considers evaluation as an integral element of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. ILO applies the Quality Standards for Development Evaluation of the Donor Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD/DAC) and the United Nations Evaluation Group's (UNEG) Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System. In line with ILO evaluation policy and procedures, ILO component of the UCCD project is subject to a mid-term, internal evaluation, which was facilitated by an external consultant.

The mid-term evaluation was conducted to assess the overall achievements of the project and draw recommendations and lessons learned that can inform its operations through the remainder of its lifespan. Additionally, the mid-term evaluation discussed how the project is addressing ILO cross-cutting themes of gender, non-discrimination and tripartism. The mid-term evaluation covered the project duration from June 10th, 2018 to December 15th, 2020. The geographical scope covered activities conducted in the project's target operating UCCDs in the following Egyptian public universities: Ain Shams, Alexandria, Mansoura, Menoufia, Sadat, Zagazig, Aswan, Beni Suef, Minya, and Sohag.

The primary clients of the evaluation are the ILO constituents. These include UCCD staff in 16 operating centres in 10 Egyptian public universities and officials of the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MoHESR) Labour Market Observatory (LMO). Other relevant clients are the donor (AUC/USAID) and ILO (i.e., Country Office Cairo, Decent Work Team Cairo (DWT/CO-Cairo), and HQ Skills).

This was an internal mid-term evaluation. It adopted a participatory approach actively involving key stakeholders throughout the process. Specifically, answers to the evaluation questions – i.e., assessment of the project performance and experience – drawing conclusions, identifying actionable recommendations to guide the project in its remaining timeframe and inform future programming, as well as lessons learned from the component's experience thus far, were based first and foremost on stakeholders' perspective and feedback. The evaluation was a mixed methods exercise, drawing on qualitative and, to the extent available, quantitative data. It drew on both primary data – through interaction with stakeholders – and secondary data already available in project documentation.

Due to health and safety concerns as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, face-to-face interaction with stakeholders was not feasible and bilateral consultations and the Stakeholders' Workshop were both conducted virtually. These were all conducted over Zoom, using ILO's licensed account. To overcome the challenge of facilitating online discussions, the number of participants in the Stakeholders' Workshop was kept within manageable limits. However, upon the request of AUC, the workshop was conducted in one (1) day not two (2) as was initially planned. This did not allow

for adequate time for discussion among and with participants to elaborate on their feedback to seek further insights.

Evaluation findings and conclusions

Overall, ILO component of the UCCD project has made good progress towards its outputs despite delays caused by contextual and management challenges that were beyond its control. It strategically fits with the developmental objectives of the Government of Egypt (GoE) and is relevant to and serves the needs of national partners. The remaining period of the project represents an opportunity for the component to consolidate its success and enhance the sustainability prospects of its outcomes.

Relevance and Strategic Fit. ILO component fully aligns with the objectives of the GoE. It supports the second and fourth Strategic Objectives of its Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS) 2030 – Economic Development and Improving Employability, respectively. It also aligns with the third objective of MoHESR’s strategy (enhancing the competitiveness of higher education system and outputs) and directly supports the mandate of MoHESR’s LMO of providing the Ministry with updated information on the labour market needs. The component’s clear focus on inclusion of SWDs is in line with both Egypt’s and MoHESR’s efforts to enhance the inclusion of persons with disabilities (PWDs) at the national level. Similarly, by capacitating UCCDs staff and enhancing their access to updated information about labour market skills requirements, ILO component aligns with and serves the mandate and role of the UCCDs, further enabling them to offer students and graduates with appropriate career advice and guidance.

The component directly supports ILO DWT/CO-Cairo Country Programme Outcome (CPO) 103: “Programmes and strategies for lifelong learning and future oriented, inclusive skills development (including disabled, women and refugees and migrants, and children at risk) are developed, reviewed and/or upgraded”. Its explicit focus on inclusion of SWDs further reinforces its alignment with Outcome 103. It falls under ILO Programme and Budget (P&B) 2020-2022 Outcome 5: “Skills and lifelong learning to facilitate access and transition in the labour market”. The component also aligns with and serves Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 8 (Good Jobs and Economic Growth) and 4 (Quality Education). It also compliments ILO’s work with the Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS), and cooperates with ILO’s ongoing projects with a focus on skills development of PWDs, while it also draws on the expertise and backstopping of ILO in both Cairo and Geneva.

Validity of Design. In principle, ILO component was realistic in its design – the expected outputs and outcomes could be achieved within the 4-year span stipulated in project documents. While the component commenced implementation almost one year after the project’s official start date, and was faced with only three (3) years’ timeframe, the one-year no-cost extension sets the timeframe back to its initial duration of four (4) years.

There was one adaptation to the original component design, and a related add-on. The tracer study of university graduates is being conducted at the national not university level, and by a research institute not UCCDs. The related add-on is the production of a labour market information (LMI) brochure, in Arabic and English, presenting labour market trends and information based on the most recent Labour Force Survey (LFS) of CAPMAS. UCCDs staff are being trained on using and disseminating this information and updating it when subsequent LFS results were available.

The component’s M&E framework is made up of only output-level indicators. Since there are no outcome-level indicators, there has been no assessment of UCCDs or MoHESR LMO staff performance as a result of ILO component’s interventions. The component reports to AUC on quarterly basis, using ILO’s Technical Cooperation Progress Report (TCPR) template, inclusive of

a “Performance Indicator Tracking Table”. The fact that ILO component does not have direct access to UCCDs seems to have negatively impacted its knowledge sharing practice among UCCDs; the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic and the shift to virtual meetings have also limited UCCDs staff ability to exchange knowledge as they used to during in-person trainings and workshops.

Strong indications are such that ILO component streamlines gender equality as a cross-cutting issue, even though it is not explicitly stated in its design. The component also incorporates ILO’s cross-cutting issue of non-discrimination with its clear focus on inclusion of SWDs. It works directly and closely with two (2) of the tripartite constituents: employers and the government. It is due to the political context that engaging with the third constituent (labour unions) has not been feasible.

Effectiveness. Overall, ILO component is “almost halfway” towards the achievement of its output targets. The component’s effectiveness presents a somewhat mixed picture; some activities/interventions are on track while others are behind schedule. This progress was achieved over a period of two (2) years; had the component not been extended, it would have had less than one (1) year to fulfil its mandate.

While the aggregate progress for several indicators may be on track, it is important to note that the situation differs among UCCDs – in terms of the extent they could benefit from ILO component’s interventions and, accordingly, their current level of capacity. UCCDs joined the project at varying points in times and their staff were not recruited in a synchronized manner. To date, four (4) UCCDs in the universities of Banha and Tanta have not been established yet. There has also been some turnover among UCCDs staff – sometimes extensively. The level of commitment among UCCDs staff, and their baseline capacity, also differed. Another major issue is the availability of UCCDs staff; numerous activities of ILO component were postponed as UCCDs were busy, either with other activities implemented by AUC and/or its partners, or their university workload and responsibilities. University managements’ approval of activities was, and continues to be, a major challenge in a number of universities. The process is often lengthy, which delays implementation. Approvals are yet to be secured from two (2) universities (Minia and Ain Shams) and, as such, all activities under component 2 have been blocked.

The lack of proper datasets in Egypt was another major challenge which impacted progress under Outcome 2. Actual data collection for the tracer study was yet to commence at the time the evaluation was conducted, and the study is carried out at the national level and the sample, though large, may not be necessarily truly representative. Similarly, at the governorate level, and in order to move forward with the Enterprise Surveys use convenient sampling approach drawing on available datasets.

As a sub-grantee, and as per USAID policy, ILO does not have direct communication or working relationship with USAID. For ILO, the contracting and funding agency is AUC; discussion of workplans, activities, reporting, and release of funding are all managed between AUC and ILO. There has been no *joint* planning exercise between the two entities. ILO shares the component’s workplans with, and responds to requests for clarification and justification from, AUC. However, ILO have had no access to the project’s overall workplan to better align the timeline of the component’s activities. As a result, many ILO activities were delayed on the grounds that UCCDs were busy with other tasks. On the technical side, there has also been instances where AUC requested clarification and justification of ILO activities, or made what was seen as technically unsound arguments. This has led to further delaying ILO activities. There are also indications, on the part of AUC, of lack of understanding and appreciation of the role and contribution ILO can bring into this project. There are no indications AUC took any action to mitigate challenges repeatedly reported by ILO; nor are there indications these challenges have been reported to USAID.

ILO project management does not have direct communications with UCCDs, either. All communication related to ILO activities and interaction with UCCDs, including requests for approval from university management, is channelled through AUC PMs, following clearance from AUC project management for ILO to contact PMs. ILO maintains direct communication and working relationship only with MoHESR LMO, which is not targeted by other interventions of AUC. As a result, there has been continuous communication and coordination MoHESR LMO whereas UCCDs staff clearly lacked knowledge and appreciation of the challenges that face ILO component.

On the other hand, a positive external factor that may well support the drive towards inclusion of SWDs and the implementation of UCCDs Inclusion Enhancement Action Plans was the issuance of the Executive Regulations of Law no. 10 of 2018 (Rights of Persons with Disabilities) and Ministerial Decree no. 2555 of 2020 (MoHESR) also focusing on inclusion of SWDs.

In response to the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic, the content of trainings and workshops had to be adapted for online delivery; the first virtual activity took place in April 2020. Despite adaptations, though, some online training was not as effective as in-person. This was particularly true for the Disability Equality Training (DET) and SPSS trainings; the latter has been re-adapted, though. Additionally, the level and effectiveness of interaction among UCCDs staff has not been the same in the virtual setting as it was in in-person activities. The DET ToF, however, remains planned for face-to-face delivery given the nature of the training itself. With continued global travel restrictions, that had led to considerable delay in implementing this important activity – which impacted the progress of other activities (e.g., training of university staff and students). This shift to remote/virtual delivery of trainings and workshops represents a model that can be applied in similar crisis situations.

Efficiency. As of end of November 2020, the overall expenditure rate of ILO component was 26.09 percent of the total budget. This is nearly a quarter of the total budget spent over almost two-thirds of the component's actual life span. Such a low rate is due to delays in many activities, as well as reduced cost of the many activities that were conducted virtually. Should this continue to be the case – delayed activities and virtual delivery – the component is very likely to come to an end with a budget surplus.

Impact Orientation and Sustainability. Overall, ILO component has been successful in building the capacity of UCCDs staff, to varying levels; many will be able to maintain the newly acquired knowledge and skills into the future and can convene Enterprise Roundtables. Their capacity to conduct Enterprise Surveys, though, is limited; they cannot do statistical analysis and will face difficulty writing the report. They lack the ability to implement inclusion activities with SWDs; these require more “practical” training and financial resources, on the part of the universities, that are still not available.

A number of UCCDs plan to continue offering their career guidance and counselling services to students into the future. Some UCCDs have already opened their own separate bank account and are generating income, through students' annual tuition fees. There is also the possibility of offering services to students for minimal/nominal fees, and through sponsors (local businesses). Other UCCDs have no future plans yet. UCCDs staff turnover, buy-in, commitment, and ownership may all, however, be impediments to sustainability. The fact that the project (AUC) tops up UCCDs staff's salaries is noteworthy. Despite this monetary incentive, there has been a notable level of turnover among UCCDs staff.

At the time this evaluation was conducted, ILO component had not developed its sustainability/exit plan. AUC project management, on the other hand, asserted that the overall project has its

sustainability plan, and that all UCCDs have their sustainability plans in place. They also asserted that AUC is “committed” to supporting UCCDs beyond the project.

The potential for MoHESR LMO to host career guidance and tracer studies beyond the project remains uncertain. Similarly, the extent to which MoHESR LMO will be able to assume the role of ILO by supporting and monitoring UCCDs, once the component/project came to an end, is unclear.

The sustainability prospects of two (2) key deliverables/results of ILO component are also somewhat unclear. First, the tracer study that is being conducted by a research institute (CAPMAS) does not have the appropriate sampling frameworks for such a study, and universities have been unable to provide suitable alternative datasets. Second, while UCCDs staff can make use of the LMI brochure, they do not have the capacity to produce them. Whether MoHESR LMO would cooperate with CAPMAS in this regard in the future is unclear.

Another, perhaps more fundamental, sustainability concern is, the institutional sustainability of the UCCDs themselves. These are more of add-on units formed by decision (decree) of university presidents and are not an integral element of the formal structure (organigram) of universities. They remain the product of a project and may continue to be branded by and under the umbrella of AUC.

Lessons Learned. UCCDs and MoHESR LMO staff and stakeholder representatives identified two (2) lessons learned based on ILO component’s experience thus far.

1. Flexibility and adaptability, in the face of change, is key to success. This referred, in the first place, to the shift to remote and virtual modality, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, which made it possible to continue the delivery of training and workshops. There was also reference to the need for ILO component to adapt to institutional challenges, specifically the lack of university management approvals.

2. Balancing the knowledge and practical content of training is another key to success. This referred to the DET that was effective in imparting the knowledge base and diffusing the right understanding and attitude among participants. However, it lacked adequate focus on practical, hands-on application skills and, as such, UCCDs feel ill-equipped to work with SWDs.

Recommendations

1. For ILO: Develop and implement an exit strategy/sustainability plan for the component, with a particular focus on the institutional and financial sustainability of the UCCDs.

(High priority; short term; technical resources)

2. For ILO: Identify relevant and specific outcome-indicators and conduct an assessment of the component’s progress towards its intended outcomes.

(High priority, short term; technical and financial resources and coordination with AUC)

3. For ILO and AUC: Devise and agree to a more collaborative and cooperative working relationship and management approach.

(Highest priority; immediate; management support)

4. For ILO: Expedite the conduct of the DET ToF, with a more practically oriented focus

(High priority; medium term; technical resources)

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND

In Egypt, as in other countries, there is an important misalignment between the skills of the workforce and the actual (and future) needs of the economy. The problem is due, in part, to the lack of relevant and reliable information about, or distorted perceptions of, the realities of the economy and the labour market. This leads to poor choices being made in educational and professional career paths, in particular with regards to transitions from education to the world of work.

The University Centers for Career Development (UCCD) is a project funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and managed by the American University in Cairo (AUC). It aims to establish 20 sustainable UCCDs in 12 Egyptian public universities in Upper Egypt, Delta and Greater Cairo over a four-year duration. The International Labour Organization (ILO) partnership with AUC in this project aims to enhance the capacity of already operational UCCDs, increase the inclusiveness of UCCD services for students with disabilities (SWDs), and support the collection, analysis and dissemination of quantitative and qualitative labour market information relevant for career guidance and counselling.

Specifically, ILO's contribution to the project focuses on three main areas:

- 1) Building the capacity of UCCD staff on collecting, analysing and disseminating labour market information;
- 2) Supporting the regular conduct of university-level tracer studies, enterprise skills surveys and roundtables with employers to obtain quantitative and qualitative information about labour market insertion of graduates, satisfaction with graduates' skills, workforce skill needs and recruitment needs; and
- 3) Enhancing the inclusiveness of UCCD services for students with disabilities.

ILO component officially commenced in June 2018. The agreement between AUC and ILO was signed in April 2018, the first instalment of funds was received by ILO in May 2018, and the project team was recruited in early June 2018. The UCCD project, as a whole, is forecast to conclude on September 19, 2021 – as per the agreement between USAID and AUC. In December 2020, AUC informed ILO of a potential one year, no-cost extension, though no formal addendum had been signed yet when the evaluation was being conducted.

2. EVALUATION BACKGROUND

ILO considers evaluation as an integral element of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. Provisions are made in all projects in accordance with ILO evaluation policy and based on the nature of the project and the specific requirements agreed upon at the time of the project design and during the project as per established procedures. ILO applies the Quality Standards for Development Evaluation of the Donor Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD/DAC)¹ and the United Nations Evaluation Group's (UNEG) Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.²

In line with ILO evaluation policy and procedures, ILO component of the UCCD project is subject to a mid-term, internal evaluation, which was facilitated by an external consultant under management of ILO Project Manager. The component is also scheduled for a final independent evaluation.

The mid-term evaluation was conducted to assess the overall achievements of the project and draw recommendations and lessons learned that can inform its operations through the remainder of its lifespan. Additionally, the mid-term evaluation discussed how the project is addressing ILO cross-cutting themes of gender, non-discrimination and tripartism are mainstreamed in the project.

¹ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/qualitystandardsfordevelopmentevaluation.htm>

² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

The mid-term evaluation covered the project duration from June 10th, 2018 to December 15th, 2020. The geographical scope covered activities conducted in the project's target operating UCCDs in the following Egyptian public universities: Ain Shams, Alexandria, Mansoura, Menofia, Sadat, Zagazig, Aswan, Beni Suef, Minya, and Sohag.

The primary clients of the evaluation are the ILO constituents. These include UCCD staff in 16 operating centres in 10 Egyptian public universities and officials of Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MoHESR) Labour Market Observatory (LMO). Other relevant clients are the donor (AUC/USAID) and ILO (i.e., Country Office Cairo, Decent Work Team Cairo (DWT/CO-Cairo), and HQ Skills).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

a) Relevance and strategic fit

- Is the project coherent with the Governments objectives, National Development Framework, beneficiaries' needs, and does it support the outcomes outlined in ILO's [Country Priority Outcomes] CPOs as well as the [Sustainable Development Goals] SDGs?
- How does the project complement and fit with other on-going ILO programmes and projects in the country?
- Has the project been able to leverage ILO contributions, through its comparative advantages (including tripartism, international labour standards, ILO Decent Work Team etc.)?

b) Validity of intervention design

- Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available, including performance and its monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, knowledge sharing and communication strategy?
- To what extent has the project integrated ILO cross-cutting themes in the design?
- Has the project a Theory of Change comprehensive, integrate external factors and is based on systemic analysis?

c) Effectiveness:

- What progress has been made towards achieving the overall project objectives/outcomes?
- Has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically with all key stakeholders and partners, ILO and the donor to achieve project goals and objectives?
- How contextual and institutional risks and positive external to the project factors have been managed by the project management?
- To what extent is the COVID-19 pandemic influencing project results and effectiveness and how has the project addressed this influence and is ready to adapt to changes for at least some time from now-on?
- Does the (adapted) intervention model used/to be used in the project suggest an intervention model for similar crisis response?

d) Efficiency of resource use

- Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes? If not, why and which measures taken to work towards achievement of project outcomes and impact?

- Are the project’s activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and work plans?
- How efficient was the project in utilizing project resources to deliver the planned results?
- To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote gender equality and non-discrimination, and inclusion of people with disability?

e) Impact orientation and sustainability

- To which extent are the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the SDGs and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)
- Has the project developed and implemented an exit strategy?
- How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected/could be affected by the Covid-19 situation in context of the national responses?

3.2 Approach

The evaluation adopted a participatory approach actively involving key stakeholders throughout the process. Specifically, answers to the evaluation questions – i.e., assessment of the project performance and experience – drawing conclusions, identifying actionable recommendations to guide the project in its remaining timeframe and inform future programming, as well as lessons learned from the component’s experience thus far, were all be based first and foremost on stakeholders’ perspective and feedback. Where relevant, though, and informed by this feedback, additional input was provided by the consultant.

3.3 Data Types and Sources

The evaluation was a mixed methods exercise, drawing on qualitative and, to the extent available, quantitative data. It drew on both primary data – through interaction with stakeholders – and secondary data already available in project documentation. The latter included the project document/proposal; quarterly progress reports; workplans and modifications; and, M&E framework. Primary data collection tools were developed in accordance with the Evaluation Matrix and in a cross-referenced manner among different sources to allow for data triangulation. These tools – protocols for key informant interviews (KIIs) with stakeholder representatives including ILO personnel, and forms to facilitate data collection from UCCDs and MoHESR LMO representatives during a specially-convened workshop – are annexed to this report.

3.4 Sampling Framework

The following list of key stakeholders for bilateral consultations and the sample of UCCDs staff and other stakeholders could be identified in light of the review of project document and progress reports, and initial consultations with ILO project team:

- a. Bilateral Consultations
 - ILO project team
 - ILO Employment Specialist
 - ILO Skills and Employability Specialist
 - Executive Director, MoHESR LMO
 - Disability Enhancement Training DET National Facilitator, CEOSS Egypt
 - Executive Director, Caritas Egypt³
 - Representatives/focal persons at research institutes: Baseera and GISR
 - AUC: Project Chief of Party (CoP) and Deputy Chief of Party (DCoP)

³ The staff member of Caritas was in charge of working with UCCDs on developing their action plans for disability inclusion enhancement.

- USAID Contract Officer Representative or Alternate (A/COR)

b. Stakeholders' Workshop

- MoHESR LMO

The two (2) staff members of MoHESR LMO who have been involved with the project throughout its lifespan.

- UCCDs Staff

Three (3) cohorts of UCCDs were identified, based on the time they joined the project and the “packages” of project interventions they benefited from. From within these cohorts, the following sample was selected, and representatives were invited to the workshop:

Cohort 1:

This includes five (5) UCCDs in four (4) universities: Mansoura, Minya, Beni Suef and Sadat that joined the project from the start (as of September 2018) and benefited from similar interventions.

The sample included Mansoura (2 UCCDs – 2 staff each, 4 individuals in total) – as a Delta governorate with full package of intervention and notable progress – and Minya (1 UCCD – 2 staff) – as an Upper Egypt governorate with a UCCD that showed comparatively less progress. Two (2) UCCD staff from the university of Beni Suef also participated in the workshop.

Cohort 2:

This includes seven (7) UCCDs in four (4) universities: Zagazig, Menofia, Sohag and Alexandria that joined the project between December 2018 and February 2019.

The sample included both Alexandria and Zagazig (2 UCCDs – 2 staff each, 4 individuals in total) and Sohag (1 UCCD – 2 staff).

Cohort 3:

This included two (2) UCCDs in two (2) universities: Ain Shams and Aswan, a third UCCD in the university of Mansoura and a third UCCD in the university of Alexandria, that joined the project between September and November 2019.

The sample included Ain Shams and Aswan (2 UCCDs, 3 individuals in total).

In September 2020, ILO component was informed that UCCDs in the two (2) universities of Tanta and Banha would join the project. To date, however, these UCCDs have not been formally inaugurated and no staff had been officially appointed to any of them. As such, they were not included in the sampling framework.

3.5 Evaluation Process

The evaluation was conducted through four (4) main stages, briefly described below.

I. Inception Stage

The Inception Meeting, among ILO project management, ILO regional M&E specialist and the consultant was followed with desk review of relevant component documentation (for a list of reviewed documents, please refer to Annex 5). The outcome of this stage was a draft inception report which presented the proposed evaluation methodology inclusive of the sampling framework, data sources, and data collection tools. The draft was reviewed by ILO and a revised, final version, incorporating feedback, was produced.

II. Data Collection

With the support of ILO project management, bilateral consultations with key informants and stakeholders' representatives were scheduled and conducted over Zoom. The consultant took notes

during the meetings, with the consent of those being interviewed. The evaluation Stakeholders' Workshop was also convened over Zoom and facilitated by the consultant. Participants provided and presented their feedback in electronic format during the workshop and submitted their final version the following day.

III. Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis was carried out, first, for each separate group of respondents, and then across all groups to gauge convergence and/or divergence in trends. The analysis was guided by the evaluation criteria and questions. Throughout the analysis stage, further, in-depth reference was made to available secondary information (from project documents and others as may be available and relevant) to set findings within context as well as to validate and cross-reference findings. The consultant also reached out, on a number of occasions, to ILO project management to help clarify outstanding issues.

IV. Reporting

A draft evaluation report, presenting findings, conclusions and recommendation, and outlining the evaluation methodology and process was developed and submitted to ILO for review. Upon receiving feedback, and further clarifying the extent of the consultant's input, this final version was produced.

3.6 Limitations and Mitigation Strategies

Due to health and safety concerns as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, face-to-face interaction with stakeholders was not feasible and bilateral consultations and the Stakeholders' Workshop were both conducted virtually. These were all conducted over Zoom, using ILO's licensed account.

Facilitating online discussion among a large group is a challenge. Therefore, and in anticipation the workshop would be conducted online, the Sampling Framework kept the total number of participants within manageable limits.

Zoom offered "Breakout Rooms" which allowed small groups of participants to convene separately and provide largely structured feedback. However, the duration of the workshop did not allow for adequate time for discussion among participants to elaborate on this feedback and seek further insights. The workshop was initially designed for two (2) days. Despite repeated clarifications from both ILO project management and the consultant, AUC maintained this was not possible, on the grounds that UCCDs staff were "very busy"; at the end, the workshop was conducted in one (1) day. This, however, did not impact the validity of the report; there is a notable level of similarity and consistency in feedback among the small groups of participants.

Another limitation related to the overall project and ILO component Theory of Change (ToC). The sub-agreement between AUC and ILO does not include a ToC; neither for the overall UCCD project nor for the ILO component. The overall project document/proposal was also unavailable for review. ILO project management have had no access to it, either, and were not in position to discuss or reflect on the project's ToC. This has limited the potential to discuss the validity of the project's design.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit

Stakeholder representatives interviewed in the course of the evaluation asserted that ILO component of the project "fully aligns" with the objectives of the Government of Egypt (GoE). Many UCCDs staff and, in particular, LMO representatives were able to pinpoint the Strategic Objectives and Programmes of Egypt Vision 2030 and the Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS) with which ILO component aligns. ILO component directly serves and feeds into the "development

of the higher education system” programme, and also serves the 2nd and 4th Strategic Objectives of SDS – Economic Development and Improving Employability, respectively. As such, it also serves the 1st Strategic Objectives (National Security) and the 5th (Improving Living Standards).

UCCDs staff and LMO representatives also agreed that ILO component aligns with MoHESR’s strategy, particularly the 3rd objective (enhancing the competitiveness of higher education system and outputs) which aims to create competent and qualified graduates in line with the national, regional, and international labour market needs. A number of interviewees, from both UCCDs and other stakeholders, also highlighted the focus on inclusion of persons with disabilities (PWDs) and pointed to the Rights of Persons with Disability Law (No. 10 of 2018) and a recent Ministerial Decree (No. 2555 of 2020), both of which aim to enhance inclusion of PWDs.

Many interviewees noted that there is basically no information about the skills requirements of the labour market in Egypt. As such, and as a key informant put it, MoHESR cannot articulate an informed national higher education strategy that responds to Egypt developmental needs and objectives. MoHESR needs valid and up-to-date information about the needs of the labour market in order to guide both the admission strategy to higher education, and curriculum development at different universities. The LMO was set up in 2015 “to provide the Ministry with regular labour market information and feedback on the quality of education provided by public universities.” As such, the focus of the ILO component on LMI, and its collaboration with LMO in this regard, directly respond to the needs and mandate of the LMO, and in turn to the needs of MoHESR.

At the UCCDs-level, stakeholder representatives also agreed that ILO component aligns with and serves the mandate and role of the Centres. Many UCCDs staff spoke specifically of the Enterprise Surveys and Employers’ Roundtables as important tools to identify labour market needs. This would, then, enable them to design and offer the training programmes fresh graduates may require to be able to engage in the labour market, as well as identify training/internship opportunities for students. Many also noted their enhanced capacity to “read and implement Labour Market Maps” which enabled them to understand developments in the labour market and, accordingly, offer students the appropriate career advice and guidance. As a representative of a research institute involved with the project put it, Counsellors are supposed to guide students; “how would they do that when they have no clue about the labour market?” and “on what basis can universities develop their academic programmes and curriculum if they are disconnected from their communities?”.

ILO DWT/CO-Cairo, and ILO project management, pointed out the project directly supports Outcome 103 of ILO’s current CPOs: “Programmes and strategies for lifelong learning and future oriented, inclusive skills development (including disabled, women and refugees and migrants, and children at risk) are developed, reviewed and/or upgraded”. The third area of ILO component is focused on “Enhancing the inclusiveness of UCCD services for students with disabilities.” This further reinforces the alignment of project with Outcome 103. The project falls under ILO Programme and Budget (P&B) 2020-2022 Outcome 5: “Skills and lifelong learning to facilitate access and transition in the labour market”. They also pointed out it aligns with and serves SDGs 8 (Good Jobs and Economic Growth)⁴ and 4 (Quality Education)⁵. As a key informant put it, “it helps build the bridge between SDG 4 and SDG 8”.

ILO DWT/CO-Cairo, and ILO project management, also pointed out that the project – with its focus on tracer studies of university graduates, and through coordination with the Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS – the central statistics office of Egypt) in this regard (though challenging) – compliments ILO’s work with CAPMAS. It also intersects with another ILO

⁴ SDG 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all

⁵ Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote life-long learning opportunities for all

project focused on skills development of PWDs (the “Jobs and Skills for PWD Using ICT Solutions” project). The UCCD project has developed a guide on physical assessment of premises (as part of assessing and enhancing the inclusiveness of UCCD services). This, together with the pool of inclusion trainers and facilitators, have been shared with the PWDs project.

ILO project management, and other ILO DWT staff, indicated the project has been drawing on the expertise and backstopping of ILO in both Cairo and Geneva. This included: the modification of project design and the decision to conduct the labour market survey at the national rather than the governorate/university level; identification of technical experts/facilitators to conduct different trainings, particularly the DET; adaptation of training content for online/virtual delivery as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic; most recently discussions and preparations for the DET Training of Facilitators (ToF) with ILO HQ Disability Team; and liaison with stakeholders. ILO project management asserted this ongoing backstopping has been supportive of and beneficial to the implementation of the project.

4.2 Validity of Design

In principle, as many stakeholder representatives and ILO project management indicated, the project was realistic in its design – the expected outputs and outcomes could have been achieved within the 4-year span “had things gone according to plan.” That being said, though, UCCDs staff noted that the 3rd element of ILO component (inclusion of SWDs) is “unrealistic”; it requires an extended period of time and considerable financial resources, and university management support to start with. UCCDs staff were referring specifically to the implementation of their Inclusion Enhancement Plans. While this is not the direct responsibility of ILO component, the fact that little, if any progress, has been made in this regard in any of the UCCDs lends considerable weight to their view.

The Cooperative Agreement between USAID and AUC was signed on September 20, 2017 – this is the official start date of the project, which was planned for four (4) years through September 19, 2021. The sub-agreement between AUC and ILO DWT/CO-Cairo, however, was signed on April 16, 2018; nearly seven (7) months later. ILO project team was recruited on June 10, 2018; as such, the ILO component “officially started in June 2018” and until end of August 2018 it was still in the planning and preparation phase.⁶ During this phase, a revised, 3-year workplan was developed and shared with AUC, upon the request of USAID since the first year of the project “has already ended”. It is not clear why ILO maintained commitment to the same set of results over a shortened period of time; none of the interviewees could provide insights in this regard.

There has been one notable adaptation, and a related add-on, to the original design of ILO component. The adaptation was made to the second outcome of the component which aims to support UCCDs in the conduct of annual university-level tracer studies. As it turned out, after a lengthy and challenging process of communication and negotiation, there was no such a thing as a database of university graduates’ information – not at universities, MoHESR or CAPMAS. Assuming such data existed, for the tracer study to yield valid and reliable information, a large sample of graduates would be required (one estimate was actually more than 2,000 graduates). As several interviewees pointed out, UCCDs do not have the capacity to conduct such a large survey on annual basis. An interviewee also pointed out that globally “no single university in the most developed countries does that”; the standard practice, as another interviewee explained, is national level tracer studies. Yet, there is no information at the national level with respect to skills requirement statistics; “the project was aiming to do this at universities level while there is a big need for the country as a whole”. It was, therefore, deemed “worth it to take the opportunity to produce data that is useful for Egypt, in general.” Such an argument has its merits and would support MoHESR in articulating its national higher education strategy.

⁶ 2nd Progress Report dated 25 September 2018.

When the decision was taken to conduct the tracer study at the national level, another technical challenge emerged. The datasets available at CAPMAS – on basis of which the Labour Force Survey (LFS) is conducted – was deemed unsuitable for the purpose of the national level tracer study. The total sample size (population) of the LFS is 90,000 individuals, of which only some 18 percent are university graduates. The LFS is also conducted on bi-annual basis. It was estimated that the total number of 2019 university graduates who might be included in the latest LFS would not exceed 300 – 400 individuals; not a representative sample by any means for a national-level survey. The tracer study is being conducted by the research institute (Baseera) using their own database of nearly 350,000 households.

The related add-on to the project design was the production of a “brochure” on key labour market statistics – building on already-available information in CAPMAS’ LFS – in both Arabic and English. This will equip UCCDs staff with updated and reliable information, in a user-friendly manner, to be better able to provide university students with relevant career advice. UCCDs staff are being trained on the use and dissemination of information in this brochure.

A number of stakeholder representatives maintained, however, that the needs of the labour market differ, sometimes significantly, from one governorate to the other; there is need for detailed governorate-level information that can only be obtained through governorate-level surveys. This is a valid argument but overlooks the fact that the Enterprise Survey and Employers Roundtables, both conducted at the university-level, are means to generate governorate-level, quantitative and qualitative information about the local labour market. In this regard, it is important to note that many UCCDs staff emphasized the importance and added value of these activities in providing UCCDs with updated information on the local labour market skills requirements which has enabled them to provide students and graduates with appropriate career advice.

The M&E framework of ILO component is made of only output-level indicators and, as ILO project management described it, is “practical and operational”. That is, collecting and analysing data and reporting on output indicators is not a technically challenging task and yields the required information to track the component’s progress. It is understood, at the start of the project, there were suggestions/recommendations internal to ILO for a focus on outcome achievement/indicators. It was decided, though, to keep with the requirements of the sub-agreement. In terms of reporting, the sub-agreement with AUC only stipulated for the quarterly reporting cycle – which is not the common standards for ILO – but did not stipulate any particular reporting format, except a “Performance Indicator Tracking Table”. In terms of evaluation, the sub-agreement requested “training evaluation forms” for UCCD staff/faculty capacity building trainings, and provided for a final evaluation in Year 4 with an estimated budget.

ILO project management employs the standard ILO “Technical Cooperation Progress Report – TCPR” template. In addition to reporting on performance indicators, the quarterly report includes detailed narrative information of project progress and challenges faced during the reporting period, and also outlines activities planned for the following quarter. All available progress reports are clearly dated 25 days after the end of the reporting period, in line with requirements of the sub-agreement.

It is noted, though, that the indicator for Output 1 is defined as: Number of capacity building workshops for UCCD staff on collecting, analysing and disseminating LMI. In reporting on this indicator, however, ILO quotes the number of individuals trained. This marks a shift from the early stages of the project. In the 2nd Quarterly Progress Report (June – August 2018), the target for that indicator was “4” – clearly indicating an intention to report on workshops not attendees.

UCCDs staff noted that ILO keeps good track of activities and participants, but overall judged the monitoring and evaluation of ILO components as “moderately effective”. This was due to two

reasons. First, a number of UCCDs staff noted there has only been one instance where ILO project management responded, with appropriate remedial actions, to suggestions made by participants in training evaluation forms. ILO project management asserted that appropriate remedial actions are taken in response to participants' feedback, but the project cannot respond to individual comments and/or requests. Second, many UCCDs staff noted there has been no assessment/evaluation of "actual performance" as a result of various trainings and interventions. This is very likely driven by the lack of outcome-level indicators in the component's M&E Framework. However, even if there were such indicators and given that ILO does not have direct communication and working relationship with UCCDs (as will be discussed below), it is not clear how ILO would be in position to monitor those indicators.

They also noted that the component's knowledge sharing strategy is moderately effective. They may have the opportunity to share knowledge amongst them during collective workshops and trainings, but this is not carried out in a systematic way. This may be partly explained by the lack of a direct working relationship between ILO and UCCDs. In this regard, the staff of a particular UCCD who have been unable to participate in trainings and workshops for a long period of time and where no Enterprise Surveys or Employers Roundtables could be conducted (only due to lack of approvals from university management) noted they could have been invited to Employers Roundtables in nearby universities/UCCDs to gain knowledge and exposure.

Gender. Gender approach is not spelt out explicitly in output and outcome statements. However, ILO DWT staff and project management affirmed the project has a clear focus on and connection to gender equality. All work related to labour market statistics and skills requirements aims to capture and produce information that is specific and relevant to both genders. Training of UCCDs staff on career counselling emphasizes the different/specific messages that may have to be delivered to women. UCCDs services, they further affirmed, are available to all students, regardless of gender. ILO project management also noted that UCCDs staff are balanced, in terms of gender. Incidentally, it is noted that participants of the evaluation Stakeholders Workshop from the seven (7) targeted universities were equally split: 9 female and 9 male; and for three (3) of these universities, participants were all females.

ILO project management also pointed out that due attention for female participants is well taken into consideration when planning trainings and workshops – in terms of timing and location – particularly for universities where the campus/UCCD premises is in remote locations. Where feasible, transportation may also be provided.

Non-Discrimination. As clearly stipulated in ILO component design, and as many interviewees pointed out, the 3rd element of ILO component, and all its related activities, is specifically about inclusion of people with disabilities.

Tripartism. ILO DWT staff and project pointed out the component works directly and closely with two (2) of the tripartite constituents: employers – through the Employers Roundtables and Enterprise Survey – and the government, represented in the LMO of the MoHESR. They noted that due to reasons beyond their control (the political context), engaging with the third constituent (labour unions) has not been feasible.

Theory of Change (ToC). Despite the lack of any documented reference to the overall project and ILO component's ToC, and based on both the feedback of stakeholders' representatives on the relevance of the ILO component and the statements of its outputs and outcomes, the component's design is logical. There is a clear link between each set of outputs and the corresponding outcome. The component clearly responds to and supports the mandate of its direct beneficiaries. As the ultimate result of the overall project is understood to be enhancing the employability of university

graduates, capacitating the component's direct beneficiaries – UCCDs and MoHESR LMO – would clearly contribute largely to this result. However, it is not clear to what extent external, institutional factors have been taken into consideration in the design stage of the project. Availability of and access to reliable information in Egypt, and cooperation of universities' management have both been critical challenges that the component faced, and continues to. These are important assumptions that should have been explored in the design stage and appropriate mitigation strategies envisioned in the project design and plan.

4.3 Effectiveness

Project Progress. Table (1) summarizes ILO component's progress, measured against performance indicators, as of end of November 2020. The table shows a mixed picture; some activities/interventions are on track while others are behind schedule, for varying reasons (see below). As ILO project management described it, overall, ILO component is "almost halfway". Table (2), compiled by the Evaluator based on all available 11 progress reports (through November 2020), further delineates the timeline over which ILO activities/interventions have been implemented, per university/UCCDs. This table was included in the Inception Report and was instrumental in drawing the Sampling Framework for this evaluation.

While the overall, or aggregate, progress for several indicators may be on track, it is important to note the situation differs among universities and UCCDs. While some UCCDs have benefited from virtually all ILO interventions/activities and have been able to conduct two (2) rounds of Enterprise Roundtables and complete an Enterprise Skills Surveys – such as, Mansoura, Beni Suef, and Sadat – other UCCDs lag behind, to varying degrees. This variation should be kept in mind when reflecting on UCCDs staff feedback on the achievements of the ILO component thus far. That is, the extent to which UCCDs staff have been able to benefit from ILO interventions varies.

Under Outcome 1, ILO component is on track. Two (2) rounds of LMI training had been conducted by June 2020 – both were actually planned for the first year of the project – and it is understood a third round was conducted in December 2020. Two (2) staff members of MoHESR LMO continue to be engaged in ILO activities, in addition to two (2) staff members of CAPMAS. Other interventions under this Outcome are due to be completed in the final year of the project.

Work on LMI analysis was among the activities that ILO kicked off once the component was underway, between December 2018 and February 2019, and in close coordination with the Working Group (WG), comprising CAPMAS, MoHESR, UCCD select career counsellors and AUC. Initial drafts of the brochure were updated towards the end of 2019 (September – November 2019) in light of newly published LFS 2017 and the English and Arabic brochure was finalised in the summer of 2020 (June – August). A workshop on "How to make use of and disseminate the brochure for Education and Career Guidance" was conducted in November 2020 for a total of 13 staff (9 male/4 Female) from 7 UCCDs in 4 Universities: Alexandria, Beni Suef, Mansoura, and Sadat.

Table (1): ILO Component Progress, as of 30 November 2020⁷

4. Objective-level progress				
IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE ACHIEVEMENT °				
Indicator	Baseline	Indicator Milestone	Target (end-of-project total)	Immediate Objective summary
Outcome 1: Building capacity of UCCD staff on collecting, analyzing and disseminating labour market information				
Number of capacity building workshops for UCCD staff (2 per centre) on collecting, analysing and disseminating LMI	0	43	40	on track given the current status and challenges
Number of people participating in study tour to the US	0	N/A	1 UCCD staff per university, 1 MoHE LMO staff, 1 ILO	due by end of year 4 when all staff are hired
Number of MoHE LMO staff benefiting from ILO capacity building activities	0	4	4 (2 MOHE LMO+ 2 from CAPMAS)	on track
Manual for UCCD staff on collecting analyzing and disseminating LMI is prepared and used by UCCD staff	0	N/A	1	due by end of year 4
Outcome 2: Supporting the regular conduct of university-level tracer studies, enterprise skills surveys and roundtables with employers to obtain quantitative and qualitative information about labour market insertion of graduates, satisfaction with graduates' skills, workforce skill needs and recruitment needs				
Number of tracer studies conducted per year	0	Actual: 0	12 yearly	Behind track
Number of enterprise surveys conducted per year	0	Actual: 12 (1 per university)	12 yearly	on track given the current status and challenges
IT tool for online survey administration is developed and being used	0	Actual: 0	1	On track
Number of enterprise roundtables supported	0	Actual: 11 (1 per 5 universities) (2 per 3 universities)	2 per university in first 3 years	on track given the current status and challenges
Guide on tracer studies for Egyptian universities has been tested and adapted	0	N/A	1	due in end of year 4
Guide on enterprise surveys for UCCDs has been tested and adapted	0	N/A	1	due in end of year 4
Outcome : Enhancing the inclusiveness of UCCD services for students with disabilities				
Accessibility assessment reports are available	0	Actual: 10	16	On track given that no new premises are assigned
Number of people trained on the DET facilitation approach	0	Actual: 80	100	On track given that no new UCCD staff are hired
Number of certified DET facilitators	0	Actual: 0	12	behind track due to Covid19 pandemic
Number of students and university staff reached through DET sessions	0	Actual: 0	1000	Behind track
Actions plans are developed and being implemented	0	Actual: 15 (1 per center)	20	On track

⁷ This table is taken, as is, from the 11th Progress Report (September – November 2020)

Table (2): ILO Component Interventions Timeline

			DET Training					Accessibility Assessment					LMI ⁸											
University		# of UCCDs	1st - Dec 2018 (25 pax)	2nd - Feb 2019 (21 pax)	3rd - Oct 2019 (23 pax)	4th - June 2020 Online	5th - June 2020 - Online	Sep-Nov 2018	Dec 2018-Feb 2019	March-May 2019	Dec 2019 – Feb 2020	June-Aug 2020	1st - July 2019	2nd - June 2020 - Online	Accessibility Work Plan Workshops	Accessibility Action Plans	1st Enterprise Roundtable	2nd Enterprise Roundtable	Rehearsal Enterprise Roundtables	Training for Enterprise Skills Survey ⁹	Enterprise Skills Survey	SPSS & Report Writing (Online)	Use of Career Guidance Brochure Workshop Nov 2020 ¹⁰	
1st Cohort Sep-Oct 2018 5 UCCDs	Mansoura	2	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Minya	1	✓	✓				✓					✓		✓	✓				*11				
	Beni Suef	1	✓	✓				✓					✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Sadat	1	✓	✓				✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
2nd Cohort Dec 2018 - Feb 2019 7 UCCDs	Zagazig	3		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
	Menofia	1			✓				✓					✓	✓	✓	✓			*				
	Sohag	1			✓				✓				✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
	Alexandria	3	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
3rd Cohort Sep-Nov 2019 3 UCCDs	Ain Shams	1			✓	✓					✓			✓	✓	✓				*				
	Aswan	1			✓	✓	✓			✓				✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓			
	Mansoura	3rd										✓						✓						
4th Cohort Sep-Nov 2020 ¹²	Tanta	1																		*				
	Banha	1																		*				

⁸ These two rounds represent the LMI training planned for in Year 1 of the project. It is understood from ILO that Year 2 training commenced in December 2020.

⁹ This is training of volunteer students on survey administration and data entry.

¹⁰ A second round of training was conducted in December 2020 and covered all remaining UCCDs.

¹¹ This denotes “in-house”, by a research institute not the UCCDs.

¹² It is understood there will be two (2) UCCDs in Tanta; the number of UCCDs in Banha is yet to be confirmed. As noted in the body of the report (the Sampling Framework), no staff has been officially assigned to these UCCDs and, as such, they are not included in the sample.

Training on LMI was being implemented somewhat in parallel to the development of the brochure. The first workshop took place in July 2019 in Cairo, by ILO LMI international consultant and the national research institute which was to be in charge of implementing the enterprise surveys. UCCDs staff from the universities of Minya, Sohag, Zagazig, Beni Suef, Mansoura, Sadat, and Alexandria in addition to 3 participants from MoHESR LMO participated in this workshop. The second round of the training on LMI (and enterprise surveys implementation) was conducted in June 2020, by an international consultant, for UCCDs staff from the universities of Aswan, Alexandria, Ain Shams, Mansoura, Zagazig, Sadat, and Menofia. Due to the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic, this workshop was conducted virtually. “As per AUC request, this training included newly hired staff of some of the same UCCDs (previously participated in group 1) who were newly hired after the resignation of others in addition to the new UCCDs recently operated.”¹³

Preparations for the first refresher workshop on LMI and enterprise surveys implementation were reported to be underway for the December 2020 – February 2021 quarter, for UCCDs staff from the universities of Mansoura, Alexandria, Sadat, Beni Suef, Sohag, and Zagazig, to be delivered in a hybrid set up (physical and virtual).

Two staff members of MoHESR LMO have also enrolled in and completed a course on “Institutional Capacity Building for Effective Labour Market Information Systems (LMIS)” offered at ILO International Training Centre (ITC) in Turin, Italy. Due to the outbreak of COVID-19, the course was delivered online.

Under Outcome 2, ILO component is on track with regards to Enterprise Surveys. However, it is noted that these surveys were conducted by the research centre, not the UCCDs staff, in five (5) out of 12 universities. This was either due to the absence of university management approval (Ain Shams, Minia, and Menofia) or that staff have not been recruited yet (Tanta and Banha). ILO project management decided to move ahead with this in-house approach so that the information would be available to the benefit of UCCDs in Ain Shams, Minia and Menoufia as well as for UCCDs staff in Tanta and Banha whenever they are recruited – particularly that, at the time, the component was due to end in September 2021.

The development of an online IT tool to administer survey data collection and analysis is also reported to be on track. ILO component is also reportedly on track with regards to the conduct and support of Enterprise Roundtables. It is noted, though, that while the total number of roundtables may be on track, there remains a number of UCCDs which have not yet conducted their first roundtable. The tracer study remains “behind track”. The two (2) guides – for tracer studies and enterprise surveys – are due by the end of the project.

UCCDs are supported in the conduct of enterprise surveys by a national research institute that was formally on board by August 2019. The survey questionnaire was developed, through a participatory approach with UCCDs staff, AUC team, ILO international expert, and the national research institute – also in August 2019. Developing the sampling framework at the governorate level was, however, a challenge – the datasets available to CAPMAS, Chambers of Commerce, and Investors Associations were incomprehensive. The first round of these surveys had to adopt a convenient sampling approach – drawing on available listings of enterprises at Chambers of Commerce and, in cases, UCCDs, in addition to “other online listings.”

Data collection for the enterprise surveys is conducted by volunteer students selected through competitive and interviewing process. The call for volunteers was announced in seven (7) universities (Sohag, Zagazig, Minya, Beni Suef, Alexandria, Sadat City, and Mansoura) during the

¹³ 10th Progress Report, June – August 2020

period September – November 2019 and the training of the first group of such volunteers took place in Sohag in November 2019, followed by Mansoura, Beni Suef, Zagazig, Alexandria, and Sadat between December 2019 and February 2020. Sampling, data collection and telephone interviewing phase for the enterprise skills survey started in 5 universities: Sohag, Beni Suef, Mansoura, Zagazig, and Alexandria between December 2019 and February 2020, March 2020 in Sadat university and October 2020 in Aswan university.

The English and Arabic reports for these six enterprise surveys were drafted by the research institute during March – May 2020. In June 2020, an online workshop took place to present the most significant findings of the surveys by the research institute. The workshop was attended by ILO and AUC teams. All feedback comments from both teams are reported to have been incorporated in the final versions of the survey reports.

To further build the capacity of UCCDs staff in the regular conduct of enterprise qualitative surveys, they were also trained on SPSS and report writing. The first, fully online, such training took place in April 2020 for UCCDs staff in Beni Suef, Sohag and Sadat universities. Two additional, online rounds for two groups of UCCD staff were conducted in July 2020. The first was for UCCDs staff in Alexandria and Mansoura universities, and the second for Zagazig and Mansoura universities.

An IT consultant was mobilized (June – August 2019) to develop an IT tool to administer the enterprise surveys and several meetings took place during that quarter, in the presence of the research institute, to ensure the consultant is fully aware of the objectives of the assignment. The first version/phase of the tool was presented during the following quarter (September – November 2020) but it was deemed “complicated, not user-friendly and does not meet the objectives of this tool.”¹⁴ Accordingly, ILO and the research institute requested major amendments to the tool. Reportedly, a demo of the revised version was to be presented the following quarter for MoHESR LMO and AUC team. Hosting alternatives of the tool have been discussed with MoHESR LMO and “they showed willingness for its hosting.”¹⁵

While the indicators progress table of the last quarter (September – November 2020) notes that the guide on the enterprise surveys is due by the end of the project, the body of report stated that a “guide on how to conduct a skills enterprise survey and an enterprise roundtable is being initially drafted and subject to discussion and validation with UCCD staff.”

The first Enterprise Roundtable took place at Sohag university in November 2019. Between December 2019 and February 2020, five (5) more Enterprise Roundtables were conducted in Mansoura, Alexandria, Zagazig, Beni Suef and Sadat universities. Due to the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic, the roundtable in Aswan was conducted online in July 2020. In keeping with the objectives of ILO component – of building the capacity of UCCDs staff – a Rehearsal Workshop took place in November 2020 for UCCDs staff from Mansoura, Alexandria, Sohag, Sadat, Beni Suef, and Zagazig. Those six (6) universities have conducted their first roundtable and the workshop aimed to further the capacity of UCCDs staff for them to facilitate the second roundtable. This second roundtable took place shortly after – in November 2020 – in Sohag, Mansoura, and Zagazig universities. These roundtables were totally organized by UCCD staff with technical support from ILO team along the whole process as per the project’s workplan.”¹⁶ The first roundtable in Menofia also took place in November 2020.

Preparations for the tracer studies started once the ILO component commenced actual implementation (December 2018 – February 2019), similar to work on the LMI under Outcome 1.

¹⁴ 11th Progress Report, September-November 2020.

¹⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁶ *ibid.*

During that quarter, ILO received four (4) proposals to build the capacity of 12 UCCD staff in eight (8) universities to conduct regular tracer studies of graduates and enterprise surveys. Once the WG was formed, the decision was taken to develop the design of the tracer study in collaboration with not only UCCDs but also with CAPMAS and MoHESR. It is noted that, at the time, the Department for Educational Statistics at CAPMAS expressed interest in integrating tracer studies in their statistical production.

Communication, and numerous meetings, with CAPMAS with regards to the design and implementation of the tracer studies followed from that initial decision – including an official letter from H.E. Minister of Higher Education to CAPMAS (September – November 2019) “requesting to conduct the graduates’ tracer study on the national level as part of a protocol of cooperation between both entities with the ILO technical support to serve UCCDs in the 12 public Egyptian universities.” ILO, further, enlisted the support of “The Egyptian Center for Public Opinion Research” (Baseera)¹⁷ to discuss potential technical assistance to CAPMAS in the design of the graduates’ tracer study (September 2019). By September – November 2020, the numerous meetings and technical discussions of available datasets at CAPMAS and the sampling framework yielded no result. As an interviewee put it “it took almost a year of discussions with CAPMAS whereas it was planned for 2 months ... and at the end, the result was zero.”

The decision was, therefore, taken to draw the sample for the tracer study, at the national level, out of Baseera’s database (of nearly 350,000 households - HHs). Approximately 50,000 HHs with a member who graduated from university between 2016 and 2018 (that is, before the start of the project to provide a reliable baseline) were identified. By February 2020, these were being screened, via a quick phone survey, to identify a pool of 6,000 graduates from the 17 fields of education (where possible) in the project’s 12 targeted universities.

That being said, it is important to note that the questionnaire for the tracer survey had been developed in English and Arabic, in collaboration with the ILO Statistics Department, CAPMAS and MoHESR LMO.

Under Outcome 3, accessibility assessment of UCCD premises, DET training, and development of action plans for accessibility enhancement are all on track. The DET ToF is behind track and, accordingly, students and university staff are yet to be trained by those Facilitators.

The first round of accessibility assessment took place in November 2018 for the four (4) UCCDs that were already enrolled in the project in the universities of Mansoura, Minia and Beni Suef. The second round followed almost immediately (December 2018 – February 2019) for nine (9) more operational UCCDs in the universities of Zagazig, Menofia, Sohag, Sadat and Alexandria. Assessment of Aswan UCCD was conducted in April 2019, of Ain Shams UCCD in December 2019, and of the third UCCD in Mansoura in July 2020.

With the support of two national experts, the development of action plans for enhancing disability inclusion of UCCD services commenced in the summer of 2019 (June – August) for 10 UCCD in the universities of Minia, Beni Suef, Zagazig, Mansoura, Alexandria, and Sadat. A local workshop for Sohag UCCD to develop its action plan was conducted in November 2019. The third UCCD in Alexandria university followed suit between December 2019 and February 2020. The workshops for Menofia UCCD were conducted in March, June and August 2020. Similar workshops for Aswan and Ain Shams UCCDs were conducted, separately, in July and August 2020. Those workshops for

¹⁷ The Egyptian Center for Public Opinion Research (Baseera) is an independent and nonpartisan organization, established in April 2012, which aims to conduct public opinion research impartially and professionally (<http://baseera.com.eg/EN/Aboutus.aspx>)

Menofia, Aswan and Ain Shams were conducted online, due to the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic.

A guideline for assessment of physical accessibility of existing facilities was also developed (December 2018 – February 2019) for future usage by the newly opened UCCDs.

The first national DET was conducted in December 2018, for UCCDs and academic staff from Minia, Beni Suef, Alexandria, Mansoura, and Sadat Universities, by a certified national DET facilitator with coaching from the international DET expert. The second national DET was conducted in February 2019 for UCCDs and academic staff from Minia, Beni Suef, Alexandria, Mansoura, Zagazig, and Sadat universities. The third such training took place in October 2019 by ILO DET national facilitator under the supervision of the DET international expert for UCCDs staff only from Ain Shams, Aswan, Alexandria, Mansoura, Zagazig, and Sohag universities.

Two online DET national trainings were delivered by the national facilitator in June 2020. The first was for UCCDs staff from Ain Shams, Alexandria, Aswan, Zagazig and Mansoura universities and the second for UCCDs staff from Alexandria, Aswan, Zagazig and Mansoura universities.

The initial plan was to conduct the DET ToF in April 2020, for 12 UCCDs staff. “The aim of the ToF is to train at least one person per university to become a certified DET facilitator”.¹⁸ This was to be delivered by an international expert – and this, it is understood, remains to be the plan. With the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic, it was not possible for the expert to travel to Egypt. ILO discussed the possibility of conducting the training online with the international trainer who indicated “that the DET ToF won’t achieve the required results if it is online”.¹⁹

Between June and August 2020, ILO HQ Disability Team discussed alternative options with the international trainer, given the extended travel restrictions in Europe (where the international trainer is based). The international trainer recommended two (2) other trainers from Indonesia to deliver the training face-to-face who were approached by the project team. Meanwhile, and due to the high demand on DET from other entities, the HQ Disability Team in HQ was then working on developing a new online version of DET to be piloted before the end of the year. An alternative was to train UCCDs staff on this new version, in addition to some facilitation skills, to be able to raise awareness among students and academic staff on DET in its new version. Both options remained subject to further discussion following the start of the academic year to decide on the most convenient option “under the New Normal.”

By the end of November 2020, the situation remained the same for the two (2) trainers from Indonesia; they were still required to work from home. The HQ Disability Team carried out an initial pilot of the newly transformed DET as an on-line learning experience (September – November 2020) and the feedback was very positive. The Team was reported to be working on a manual for the training of trainers course using this new modality of this long-distance training. “Accordingly, a ToT could be piloted by mid-2021.”²⁰

Stakeholders’ Feedback. UCCDs staff who benefited from ILO trainings reflected very positively on the success of these interventions in building their capacities to be better equipped to fulfil the objectives of the UCCDs. In particular, the Enterprise Roundtables and the Enterprise Skills Surveys where these were conducted, were the most successful interventions. These interventions have furthered UCCDs staff’s understanding of labour market skills requirements, and “opened communication channels” between universities and employers, which, in turn, reflected positively

¹⁸ 7th Progress Report, September – November 2019

¹⁹ 9th Progress Report, March – May 2020

²⁰ 11th Progress Report, September – November 2020

on their ability to provide informed career advice to students. They also reflected positively on the LMI training.

UCCDs staff also spoke highly of the DET, but noted it lacked the “practical” dimension – how to apply newly acquired knowledge. While action plans for accessibility enhancement may have already been developed, in a participatory manner with UCCDs staff, the extent to which these plans could actually be implemented is perhaps less than was initially anticipated. UCCDs staff who participated in the Stakeholders Workshop noted that the implementation of these plans requires substantial financial resources, which are not available to UCCDs, as well as extended periods of time. Another prerequisite for the implementation of these plans, as some UCCDs staff pointed out, was the ability (or willingness) of the university management to resolve “bureaucratic” issues and challenges (approvals, budgeting, release of funds, ...).

A number of UCCDs staff further noted that SPSS training was not as effective as other trainings. This view was echoed by a representative of the research institute which delivered the training – it was “difficult” and having delivered it online, participants had to spend considerable time “in front of the screen”.

There are many reasons for the overall mixed progress of both ILO component and specific UCCDs – as documented in progress reports and discussed by UCCDs staff and many stakeholder representatives. As noted above, by the time the sub-agreement between AUC and ILO was signed, and ILO team was on board, the first year of the project was already over. UCCDs joined the project at different points in time, and over an extended period – and their workforce was not always recruited in a synchronized manner. The first cohort of five (5) UCCDs from four (4) universities, joined the project between September and October 2018. The last two (2) UCCDs to join the project did so between September and November 2020 – in Tanta and Banha – and until then, no staff was recruited yet. With no staff on board, and in many cases with no dedicated premises for the UCCDs, ILO had repeatedly to postpone its interventions.

Representatives of research institutions and facilitators/consultants who have worked with UCCDs pointed out to another issue related to UCCDs staff. Some UCCDs staff did not show commitment and willingness to learn during trainings and workshops; “some are not serious about it”. UCCDs staff, further, have varying levels of capacity, to start with; the learning outcomes will, therefore, vary among them.

Another related major challenge is the availability of UCCDs staff. ILO component is only a segment of a larger project. There are numerous other activities implemented by AUC, either directly or through other partners. UCCDs staff are also faculty and staff members of their universities; they have their workload and responsibilities in addition to UCCDs. More often than not, ILO activities had to be postponed on the grounds that UCCDs staff are unavailable and “busy”. It is important to note here that the workplan and timeline of ILO activities have been, and continue to be, shared and discussed with AUC, and ILO project management responded to AUC’s requests for clarifications and justifications. On the other hand, it is understood that, despite repeated requests, ILO has had no access to AUC workplan in order to synchronize activities. There are no indications, to date, of a *joint* planning exercise between AUC and ILO.

Another related challenge is the turnover in UCCDs staff. As noted above, there were many instances where staff from the same UCCD/university participated in subsequent re-iterations of the same training; these were not the same individuals, but rather newly recruited staff in place of others who moved on, for one reason or another.

University managements' approval of activities was, and continues to be, a major challenge in a number of universities. The process is often lengthy, which delays implementation. The 10th and 11th progress reports noted that university management approvals "are also required for each activity even if it is repeated in next years" such as enterprise roundtables and surveys. Approvals are yet to be secured from the universities of Minia and Ain Shams, and as such "activities under component 2 are totally blocked in these universities."²¹

An additional major challenge was the lack of proper datasets in Egypt – whether for graduates' contact information at university level or of enterprises at governorate level; or of a reliable sampling framework of university graduate at CAPMAS. These challenges have clearly impacted progress under Outcome 2. Actual data collection for the tracer study was yet to commence – the study is carried out at the national level and the sample, though large, may not be necessarily truly representative. Similarly, at the governorate level, and in order to move forward with the Enterprise Surveys, the decision was taken to draw on available datasets (e.g., of Chambers of Commerce and Investors Associations) using a convenient sampling approach. With the support of MoHESR LMO, though, ILO was recently able to obtain CAPMAS' enterprises database which was used for the five (5) in-house surveys and will be used for the second round of surveys. The extent to which this database is truly representative of enterprises at the governorate level, though, is not clear (see below).

Management. As per USAID policy and regulations, ILO, as a sub-grantee to the project, does not have direct communication or working relationship with USAID. For ILO, the contracting and funding agency is AUC; discussion of workplans, activities, reporting, and release of funding are all managed between AUC and ILO.

As noted above, there has been no joint planning exercise between AUC and ILO to develop a synchronized workplan for the entire project. ILO has repeatedly requested access to the project's overall workplan in order to be able to fit their activities within the calendar. To date, AUC has not granted this request. ILO submit their workplan to AUC but, with no access to AUC's plan, ILO has been unable to adjust their timeline to fit with the overall workplan. As a result, there has been numerous delays of many ILO activities over the past years on the grounds that UCCDs are busy or even "overwhelmed" with other tasks. On the technical side, there has also been "numerous" instances where AUC requested clarification and justification of ILO activities, or made what ILO staff believed were technically unsound arguments. This has led to further delaying ILO activities implementation. On the other hand, there are indications, on the part of AUC, of lack of understanding and appreciation of the role and contribution ILO can bring into this project.

Representatives of other stakeholders than ILO have also pointed to the lengthy process it took for AUC to "clear" some activities, or, in contrast, the very short notice to have a complex activity (such as an enterprise survey) concluded within a very short span of time. There were also incidents of requests for clarifications and justifications of detailed technical issues (sampling and survey design). They actually stated their observation that AUC gives priority to its activities.

This was actually observed during the course of this evaluation. AUC project management argued, on no technical grounds and with no prior knowledge, against the sampling framework of UCCDs to be invited to the Stakeholders' Workshop, and even the number of participants from each UCCDs. Further, the workshop was planned for two (2) days, but AUC management maintained that UCCDs staff were busy and could not dedicate this time to the workshop. At the end, the workshop was conducted in one (1) day, and nearly two (2) weeks later than it was initially planned. Additionally, it was not possible to interview AUC Project Managers (PMs), again on the grounds

²¹ 11th Progress Report, Sept.-Oct 2020.

they were “very busy” with an upcoming event, even though it was made clear the collective interview would not last for more than one (1) hour.

It is also important to note that this challenge, and others, have been stated clearly and repeatedly in ILO quarterly progress reports to AUC, until the last available report (September – November 2020). There were no indications AUC took any action to mitigate these challenges. What is perhaps more important to note here is that these challenges do not seem to have been communicated to USAID.

ILO project management does not have direct communications with UCCDs, either. All communication related to ILO activities and interaction with UCCDs, including requests for approval from university management, is channelled through AUC PMs, following clearance from AUC project management for ILO to contact PMs. The only stakeholder with which ILO maintains direct communication and working relationship is MoHESR LMO, which is not targeted by other interventions of AUC.

These management arrangements and their impact were reflected in the feedback of representatives of MoHESR LMO and UCCDs staff. Representatives of MoHESR LMO stated there has always been continuous communication and coordination with ILO and described the working relationship between the two parties as that of “one team”. On the other hand, UCCDs staff lacked knowledge of ILO activities’ calendar and workplan; the latter has not been shared with them, they maintained. As such, a number of them noted that the DET ToF has not yet been implemented even though it had been planned for “over a year now”. This indicates their lack of knowledge of the developments, challenges, and negotiations pertaining to this particular activity, but it may also be indicative of lack of proper communication on the part of ILO.

Contextual and institutional factors. As noted above, the lack of datasets at governorate and national levels has severely impacted the progress of key ILO activities – both the tracer study and enterprise survey. Combined with the lengthy, and often times challenging, negotiations with CAPMAS, this has led to notable delays in the implementation of both activities. At the end, the enterprise surveys were being conducted using a “convenience sampling” approach – using available information of enterprises in each governorate which may not necessarily be comprehensive. The extent to which the sample for the tracer study will be fully representative is also not clear. ILO project management, however, decided to move forward despite these technical issues. The results of enterprise surveys and the tracer study would still provide guidance and insights to both UCCDs and MoHESR LMO. Additionally, the participatory process is important in itself – to ensure buy-in – and as a hands-on capacity building of stakeholders – which may contribute to sustainability. As noted above, UCCDs and MoHESR LMO staff reflected positively on the importance and relevance of these activities.

An institutional challenge that ILO component has been facing is the bureaucratic processes of some university managements. Some activities are re-iterative; however, an approval has to be sought every time the activity is to be conducted. Although ILO project management requests approval for the subsequent iterations immediately after the first round, approvals may still take time – by up to six (6) months in some cases. In other universities, approvals for the enterprise surveys have not been granted to date. The lack of direct communication between ILO and university managements has simply curtailed the former’s ability to manage such a challenge; ILO project management had to rely on AUC PMs to follow up with university management.

Another, related challenge pertains to UCCDs staffing. UCCDs joined the project at different points in time, but not all had their staff on board at the time; until the end of 2020, the exact number of UCCDs in two (2) universities (Tanta and Banha) was not formally confirmed and no staff were

hired in any. Then there was an issue of turnover, sometimes at high rates, in a number of UCCDs. This impacted ILO component in two ways. First, and initially, activities had to be postponed until there was a critical mass of UCCDs staff. Second, newly recruited staff (substitutes) had to be trained, but that led on occasions to a large pool of participants which was not conducive for interactive, hands-on workshops.

On the other hand, a positive external factor that may well support the drive towards inclusion of SWDs and the implementation of UCCDs Inclusion Enhancement Action Plans was the issuance of the Executive Regulations of Law no. 10 of 2018 (Rights of Persons with Disabilities). Another positive factor, stemming from the law and regulations, is the Ministerial Decree no. 2555 of 2020 (MoHESR) also focusing on inclusion of SWDs. It is reported, as an interviewee pointed out, that the 2020/2021 cohort of university students included the highest number of SWDs to date.

COVID-19. The outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic also had its impact on the project. The content of trainings and workshops had to be adapted for online delivery. It is reported that by April 2020 ILO implemented its first virtual activity. The DET ToF, however, remains planned for face-to-face delivery given the nature of the training itself. With continued global travel restrictions, that had led to considerable delay in implementing this important activity – which impacted the progress of other activities (e.g., training of university staff and students).

Despite adaptations, however, some online training “was not as effective as face-to-face”, as an interviewee pointed out. This was particularly so for DET which “is largely interactive ... it is difficult to manage and observe participants and foster interaction” online. As noted above, UCCDs staff had a similar view and also noted that SPSS online training was not very effective – a view also shared by another interviewee. The subject matter was difficult and UCCDs staff “had to spend long hours” in front of computer monitors. In response, the second round of this training was delivered in segments – short, recorded videos covering elements of the training that participants could take at their own pace, followed by webinars to discuss issues and answer questions. A number of UCCDs staff also pointed out that the level and effectiveness of interaction among them has not been the same in the virtual setting as it was in in-person activities.

On the other hand, a “positive” impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the new normal of working remotely was the high response rate to the phone-based screening of Baseera’s database of households to identify the sampling framework for the tracer study. The response rate is normally between 40 and 50 percent; in this screening, it has reached almost 70 percent.

Adapted model. The adapted mode of implementation – the shift to remote/virtual delivery of trainings and workshops – represents a model that can be applied in similar crisis situations. ILO project management also pointed out that while the Study Tour is planned for the last year of the project, the possibility of conducting it remotely is being investigated. This is in anticipation of a prolonged international travel ban should the COVID-19 pandemic persist through 2021. Once the host university is decided upon, negotiations and preparations will ensue.

4.4. Efficiency of Resource Use

As of end of November 2020, the overall expenditure rate of ILO component was 26.09 percent of the total budget. This is nearly a quarter of the total budget spent over almost two-thirds of the component’s actual life span.

Such a low rate is due to delays in many activities, as a result of the numerous challenges the ILO component has been facing – as discussed above. It is also a result of reduced cost of the many activities that were conducted virtually.

In terms of technical resources, a number of UCCDs staff noted that some trainers/consultants were “not up to expected standards” and “could not convey information”. Others noted that some international consultants lacked knowledge of the Egyptian context. Some also noted the ILO component did not avail resources that would foster inclusion of SWDs, such as sign language interpreters and Braille publications/materials. On the other hand, MoHESR LMO representatives noted that ILO supported them acquire more competitive quotations for supplies.

4.5 Impact Orientation and Sustainability

UCCDs staff agreed that, in general, ILO component has been successful in building their capacity and that they will be able to maintain the newly acquired knowledge and skills into the future. They noted, though, that the level of success differed from one intervention to the other, and among UCCDs. Many UCCDs staff believe they can convene Enterprise Roundtables. They can also conduct Enterprise Surveys but cannot do statistical analysis and will face difficulty writing the report; they spoke of the need for more training in this regard. They also noted their inability to implement inclusion activities with SWDs; they require more “practical” training and noted the challenges of securing required university financial resources required to implement their Inclusion Enhancement Plans.

Other than the inclusion activities, though, UCCDs staff stated they plan to continue offering their career guidance and counselling services to students into the future. A number of UCCDs have already opened their own separate bank account and are generating income – an amount of Egyptian pounds (EGP) 10 is being deducted from students’ annual tuition fees towards the finance of the UCCDs. Other UCCDs are planning similar action, while others have no future plans yet. Those UCCDs which opened, or are planning to open a bank account, indicated they are also considering other sources of income: offering services to students, such as Job Fairs and trainings, for minimal/nominal fees, and through sponsors (local businesses).

A number of UCCDs staff noted, however, that an important “condition” for the sustainability of project results is the retention of trained UCCDs staff.

At the time this evaluation was conducted, ILO component had not developed its sustainability or exit plan. AUC project management, on the other hand, asserted that the overall project has its sustainability plan, and that all UCCDs “have their sustainability plans in place”. They also asserted that AUC is “committed” to supporting UCCDs beyond the project. While the exact nature and scope of this support is unclear, it is the consultant’s view that this would run counter to the very idea and concept of sustainability.

A representative of MoHESR LMO stated it will be difficult to “host” career guidance and tracer studies within LMO as it currently stands. MoHESR LMO lacks qualified personnel; as a public institution, there is a cap on salaries which makes it difficult to attract the right calibre. Budget is also another concern. Other representatives of MoHESR LMO, on the other hand, indicated that the plan is for LMO to assume the role of ILO by supporting and monitoring UCCDs, once the component/project came to an end. There were no indications, though, that financial resources that may be required for MoHESR LMO to play this role have been estimated, let alone secured. Representatives of other stakeholders also pointed out the fact that universities are “autonomous” and the decision-making processes among them and MoHESR, in general, and LMO, in particular, have to be taken well into account.

In contrast to what UCCDs staff indicated, however, representatives of other stakeholders and consultants involved with the project drew a somewhat different, and mixed picture, of the sustainability prospects of ILO component’s results. An interviewee noted that should the project “phase out now, UCCDs do not have the full capacity to stand on their own.” Another interviewee

was clear that UCCDs “cannot conduct a survey ... they cannot draw a representative sample or perform statistical analysis or interpret results.” This latter interviewee also questioned the point of having the 12 universities go through the entire process of conducting the same surveys. The interviewee was of the opinion that a fully automated survey system should be built and shared among UCCDs. This, clearly, is the case; the survey management system (aka IT tool) is currently being developed. ILO project management noted, however, that UCCDs staff turnover may be an impediment to the sustainability of such system; should those UCCDs staff trained on the use of the system depart, it is uncertain substitutes will have the capacity to make use of the system.

ILO project management also noted that the level of buy-in and ownership among UCCDs is not at expected levels. UCCDs staff may well have acquired knowledge and skills, but it is a question of “willingness”. They “remain on the receiving end ... it is not clear if they would convene a roundtable if they were not asked to.” Similarly, the “demand”, for an enterprise survey for instance, should come from UCCDs; this has not been the case thus far. While some UCCDs staff have shown commitment, others have not, and the selection criteria of UCCDs staff are sometimes “questionable”. At a certain point in late 2020, it was rumoured the project would come to an end; some UCCDs staff reportedly approached ILO personnel in search of a job.

The sustainability prospects of two (2) key deliverables/results of ILO component are also somewhat unclear. First, the tracer study is being conducted by a research institute. While the survey questionnaire has been developed in consultation with CAPMAS, it is unclear whether the latter will have the capacity to replicate the study; it is noted CAPMAS does not have the appropriate sampling frameworks available for such a study and universities have been unable to provide suitable alternative datasets. Second is the LMI brochures. UCCDs staff noted that while they can make use of such brochures, they do not have the capacity to produce them. The “expectation”, according to an interviewee, is that MoHESR LMO would cooperate with CAPMAS in this regard. The next round of updating the brochure is likely to take place after the project comes to an end; whether the two entities will follow up on this, keeping potential leadership turnover in perspective, it unclear.

An important factor to consider here is the fact that the project (AUC) “tops up” UCCDs staff’s salaries – understandably as both a compensation and incentive for the extra workload in addition to their responsibilities as faculty and university staff. However, and despite this monetary incentive, there has been a notable level of turnover among UCCDs staff.

A number of interviewees raised another, perhaps more fundamental, sustainability concern. That is, the institutional sustainability of the UCCDs themselves. It is understood the UCCDs are more of “add-on units” formed by decision (decree) of university presidents. They are not an integral element of the formal structure (organigram) of universities – autonomous as they maybe, public universities are public institutions and are governed by the same regulations as other government agencies. An interviewee questioned the “identity” of UCCDs – are these the product of a project or have they been created to fulfil a specific role? The interviewee was of the opinion that these UCCDs “will continue to be branded by and under the umbrella of AUC.”

5. CONCLUSIONS

Overall, ILO component of the UCCD project has made good progress towards its outputs despite delays caused by contextual and management challenges that were beyond its control. It strategically fits with the developmental objectives of the Government of Egypt (GoE) and is relevant to the needs of national partners and serves their needs. The remaining period of the project represents an opportunity for the component to consolidate its success and enhance the sustainability prospects of its outcomes.

Relevance and Strategic Fit

ILO component fully aligns with the objectives of the GoE. It supports the second and fourth Strategic Objectives of its SDS 2030 – Economic Development and Improving Employability, respectively. It also aligns with the third objective of MoHESR’s strategy, which aims to create competent and qualified graduates in line with the national, regional, and international labour market needs. It responds clearly to the mandate of MoHESR LMO of providing the Ministry with regular labour market information and feedback on the quality of education provided by public universities. The component’s clear focus on inclusion of SWDs is in line with both Egypt’s and MoHESR’s efforts to enhance the inclusion of PWDs at the national level.

ILO component aligns with and serves the mandate and role of the UCCDs by capacitating their staff to be better able to offer students and graduates with appropriate career advice and guidance.

The component directly supports ILO DWT/CO-Cairo CPO 103: “Programmes and strategies for lifelong learning and future oriented, inclusive skills development (including disabled, women and refugees and migrants, and children at risk) are developed, reviewed and/or upgraded”. The component’s explicit focus on inclusion of SWDs further reinforces its alignment with CPO 103. The component also aligns with and serves SDG 8 (Good Jobs and Economic Growth) and 4 (Quality Education). It also compliments ILO’s work with CAPMAS, and cooperates with ILO’s ongoing projects with a focus on skills development of PWDs, while it also draws on the expertise and backstopping of ILO in both Cairo and Geneva.

Validity of Design

ILO component was realistic in its design, except for the third outcome. The realization of this outcome requires university approvals and financial resources; both of which are beyond the control of ILO, though.

There was one adaptation to the original component design, and a related add-on. The tracer study of university graduates is being conducted at the national not university level, and by a research institute not UCCDs. The related add-on is the production of an LMI brochure, in Arabic and English, presenting labour market trends and information based on the most recent LFS of CAPMAS. UCCDs staff are being trained on using and disseminating this information and updating it when subsequent LFS results were available.

The component’s M&E framework yields information that is supportive of project management. It is made of only output-level indicators; there are no outcome-level indicators and, as such, there has been no assessment of UCCDs or MoHESR LMO staff performance as a result of ILO component’s interventions. The component reports to AUC on quarterly basis using ILO’s TCPR template, inclusive of a “Performance Indicator Tracking Table”. The fact that ILO component does not have direct access to UCCDs seems to have negatively impacted its knowledge sharing practice among UCCDs; the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic and the shift to virtual meetings have also limited UCCDs staff to exchange knowledge as they used to during in-person trainings and workshops.

Strong indications are such that ILO component streamlines gender equality as a cross-cutting issue, even though it is not explicitly stated in its design. The component also incorporates ILO’s cross-cutting issue of non-discrimination with its clear focus on inclusion of SWDs. ILO component works directly and closely with two (2) of the tripartite constituents: employers and the government. It is due to the political context that engaging with the third constituent (labour unions) has not been feasible.

Effectiveness

The component's effectiveness presents a somewhat mixed picture; some activities/interventions are on track while others are behind schedule. It is also important to note that this progress was achieved over a period of two (2) years; had the component not been extended, it would have had less than one (1) year to fulfil its mandate.

Further, while the aggregate progress for several indicators may be on track, it is important to note the situation differs among UCCDs – in terms of the extent they could benefit from ILO component's interventions and, accordingly, their current level of capacity. The component has also faced numerous challenges and many activities were delayed. The virtual mode of delivery of trainings, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, has also impacted the outcome of a number of interventions.

With that in perspective, the following conclusions may be drawn:

Outcome 1: UCCDs staff may well be able to use and disseminate LMI contained in the brochure, but the extent to which they will be able to update the brochure when new datasets are available is unclear.

Outcome 2: Some UCCDs may be able to convene Employers Roundtables, but overall their capacity to conduct Employers Surveys is limited. Their role in, and ability to contribute to, any future rounds of a tracer study at national or governorate level is also unclear.

Outcome 3: Overall, UCCDs staff have acquired enhanced understanding of, and attitudes towards, disability issues and PWDs. They, however, lack the practical skills to deal with SWDs. UCCDs are further constrained by university management and lack of resources to implement their Inclusion Enhancement Plans.

ILO have had no access to the project's overall workplan, and there has been no joint planning exercise between AUC and ILO to date. There are no indications AUC took any action to mitigate challenges repeatedly reported by ILO; nor are there indications these challenges have been reported to USAID. ILO project management does not have direct communications with UCCDs or universities management, either. These are all channelled through AUC PMs, following clearance from AUC project management for ILO to contact PMs. ILO maintains direct communication and working relationship only with MoHESR LMO, which is not targeted by other interventions of AUC. As a result, there has been continuous communication and coordination with MoHESR LMO whereas UCCDs staff clearly lacked knowledge and appreciation of the challenges that face ILO component.

In response to the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic, the content of trainings and workshops was adapted for online delivery. However, some online training was not as effective as in-person. Additionally, the level and effectiveness of interaction among UCCDs staff has not been the same in the virtual setting as it was in in-person activities. The DET ToF, however, remains planned for face-to-face delivery given the nature of the training itself. The continued global travel restrictions had led to considerable delay in implementing this important activity – which impacted the progress of other activities (e.g., training of university staff and students). Overall, the shift to remote/virtual delivery of trainings and workshops represents a model that can be applied in similar crisis situations.

Efficiency

ILO component is notably under-spent. It had only consumed nearly a quarter of its total budget over the span of two (2) years. Such a low rate is due to delays in many activities, as well as reduced cost of the many activities that were conducted virtually. Should this continue to be the case – delayed activities and virtual delivery – the component is very likely to end up with a budget surplus.

Impact Orientation and Sustainability

Overall, ILO component has been successful in building the capacity of UCCDs staff, to varying levels; many will be able to maintain the newly acquired knowledge and skills into the future and can convene Enterprise Roundtables. UCCDs capacity to conduct Enterprise Surveys, though, is limited. They also lack the ability to implement inclusion activities with SWDs.

Other than the inclusion activities, though, a number of UCCDs plan to continue offering their career guidance and counselling services to students into the future, by leveraging financial resources through different means. Other UCCDs have no future plans yet. UCCDs staff turnover, buy-in, commitment, and ownership may all, however, be impediments to sustainability. The fact that the project (AUC) tops up UCCDs staff's salaries is noteworthy. Despite this monetary incentive, there has been a notable level of turnover among UCCDs staff.

At the time this evaluation was conducted, ILO component had not developed its sustainability or exit plan. On the other hand, it is reported that the overall project, implemented by AUC, as well as UCCDs have all developed their sustainability plan.

The potential for MoHESR LMO to host career guidance and tracer studies beyond the project remains uncertain. Similarly, the extent to which MoHESR LMO will be able to assume the role of ILO by supporting and monitoring UCCDs, once the component/project came to an end, is unclear.

The sustainability prospects of two (2) key deliverables/results of ILO component are also somewhat unclear. First, the tracer study is being conducted by a research institute; CAPMAS does not have the appropriate sampling frameworks for such a study and universities have been unable to provide suitable alternative datasets. Second, while UCCDs staff can make use of the LMI brochure, they do not have the capacity to produce them. Whether MoHESR LMO would cooperate with CAPMAS in this regard in the future is unclear.

Another, perhaps more fundamental, sustainability concern is, the institutional sustainability of the UCCDs themselves. These are more of add-on units formed by decision (decree) of university presidents and are not an integral element of the formal structure (organigram) of universities. They remain the product of a project and may continue to be branded by and under the umbrella of AUC.

6. LESSONS LEARNED

UCCDs and MoHESR LMO staff and stakeholder representatives identified two (2) lessons learned based on ILO component's experience thus far. It is possible, though, that UCCDs staff were informed, or influenced, by their experience with AUC and other partners; this, however, could not be ascertained.

1. Flexibility and adaptability, in the face of change, is key to success.

This referred, in the first place, to the adapted mode of implementation and the shift to remote and virtual modality, as a result of restrictions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic, which made it possible to continue the delivery of training and workshops. A number of UCCDs staff were also referring to the need for ILO component to adapt to institutional challenges, specifically the lack of university management approvals in two (2) universities, by devising other means to engage UCCDs staff of these universities in activities.

2. Balancing the knowledge and practical content of training is another key to success

UCCDs staff were referring to the DET. The training was effective in imparting the knowledge base and diffusing the right understanding and attitude among participants. However, it lacked adequate

focus on practical, hands-on application skills. As such, UCCDs staff feel ill-equipped to work with SWDs.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

UCCDs and MoHESR LMO staff and representatives of stakeholders interviewed in the course of the evaluation put forward a number of recommendations. The consultant grouped these, as relevant, and identified the relevant entity, priority level, and required resources.

1. For ILO: Develop and implement an exit strategy/sustainability plan for the component, with a particular focus on the institutional and financial sustainability of the UCCDs.

(High priority; short term; technical resources)

Given the varying level of capacity of different UCCDs, and the fact that they will graduate from the project at different points in time, it is advisable this be a “tailored” plan – to the extent feasible addressing different needs and varying contextual factors of different UCCDs. The plan should explore the role that MoHESR LMO might play, beyond the project, in support of UCCDs and in sustaining national level outcomes, particularly the tracer study. The plan may better be costed as well to support UCCDs and MoHESR LMO plan their fund-raising efforts. In line with regulations of ILO, AUC and USAID, it should also explore alternative scenarios to utilizing potential budget surplus. This may include supporting UCCDs kick-start the implementation of their Inclusion Enhancement Plans, fostering their cooperation with other relevant university department, or synergizing with other on-going projects and activities.

2. For ILO: Identify relevant and specific outcome-indicators and conduct an assessment of the component's progress towards its intended outcomes.

(High priority, short term; technical and financial resources and coordination with AUC)

This recommendation ties in, and will indeed inform, the development of the component's tailored exit strategy/sustainability plan.

3. For ILO and AUC: Devise and agree to a more collaborative and cooperative working relationship and management approach.

(Highest priority; immediate; management support)

It requires support from and involvement of the highest relevant management level of the two parties, and should be pursued immediately.

Within this revised management approach, the planning exercise for the remainder of the overall project and component should be conducted jointly and, equally important, the sustainability plans of both should be synchronized and complimentary. ILO should be granted access to and allowed direct communication with UCCDs and universities management, with AUC and PMs appropriately kept in the loop.

4. For ILO: Expedite the conduct of the DET ToF, with a more practically oriented focus

(High priority; medium term; technical resources)

Notwithstanding the importance of this recommendation to the realization of the third outcome, it may not be feasible to implement immediately. This is due to both the availability of and accessibility to international consultants and the need to review the training content, as may be needed to ensure its emphasis on skills development, as well as alternative delivery formats given the restrictions imposed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.



Terms of Reference

Mid-Term Evaluation of the project

University Centers for Career Development (UCCD) Project

Project Title	University Centers for Career Development (UCCD)
DC Symbol	EGY/17/02/AUE
Administrative Backstopping	Decent Work Team / Country Office Cairo
Technical Backstopping	Decent Work Team / Country Office Cairo
Donor	AUC/USAID
Project Budget	2,224,619 USD
Duration of Project	20 September 2017- 19 September 2021
Timing of Evaluation	Mid-Term
Type of Evaluation	Internal

1. Project background

In Egypt as in other countries, there is an important misalignment between the skills of the workforce and the actual (and future) needs of the economy. Part of the problem lies in the lack of appropriate information, or distorted perceptions, with the realities of the economy and of the labour market, that lead to poor choices being made in educational and professional career paths, in particular with regard to transitions from education to the world of work.

The University Centers for Career Development (UCCD) Project is a USAID-funded project managed by the American University in Cairo. It aims to establish 20 sustainable UCCDs in 12 Egyptian public universities in Upper Egypt, Delta and Greater Cairo over a four-year duration. The International Labour Organization has partnered with AUC aiming to enhance the capacity of already running UCCDs, increase the inclusiveness of UCCD services for students with disabilities and support the collection, analysis and dissemination of quantitative and qualitative labour market information relevant for career guidance and counselling.

The International Labour Organization's contribution focused on three main areas:

- 4) Building capacity of UCCD staff on collecting, analyzing and disseminating labour market information
- 5) Supporting the regular conduct of university-level tracer studies, enterprise skills surveys and roundtables with employers to obtain quantitative and qualitative information about labour market insertion of graduates, satisfaction with graduates' skills, workforce skill needs and recruitment needs
- 6) Enhancing the inclusiveness of UCCD services for students with disabilities

In terms of staffing, the project team joined in June 2018 (9 months after its official start date) led by the ILO Cairo's project backstopper (the Employment specialist for North Africa) and the National Project Coordinator and they have ensured progress against the project's objectives and expected results.

Project alignment with the ILO Programme and Budget and SDGs

This project contributed to the ILO Programme & Budget (P&B) 2018-19²², Outcome 1: Employment Promotion, Outcome 2: Skills Development in addition to the ILO P&B 2020-21, Outcome 5: Skills and lifelong learning to facilitate access and transition in the labour market, as well as the cross-cutting issues of disability inclusion and gender equality.

This project will also contribute to a number of Sustainable Development Goals (2015-2030), most prominently SDG 8.

Project progress

By Mid December 2020, the project will have completed the following key results:

- 1) Building capacity of UCCD staff on collecting, analyzing and disseminating labour market information**

²² The ILO Programme and Budget (P&B) of the Organization sets out the strategic objectives and expected outcomes for the Organization's work and is approved every two years by the International Labour Conference. The P & B specifies the strategies the ILO will implement to achieve results over the biennium, alongside the capacities and the resources required to deliver those results. The ILO's biennial programme of work is delivered in member States mainly through Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP) and through Development Cooperation programmes

- A report on the “Labour market dynamics for university graduates 2009-2017” and the user-friendly brochure on “Labour Market Information for Education and Career Guidance” have been developed. Moreover, the training on how to use and disseminate the brochure took place over two rounds for a total number of 32 UCCD staff.
- Two national trainings on LMI and enterprise surveys implementation have been delivered by an international expert for 36 UCCD Staff and two officials from MoHE Labour Market Observatory (LMO).
- Capacity of 2 MoHE LMO staff built to support UCCDs in collecting, analysing and disseminating LMI by their participation in the ITC online course on “Institutional capacity building for effective labour market information systems (LMIS)”.

2) Supporting the regular conduct of university-level tracer studies, enterprise skills surveys and roundtables with employers to obtain quantitative and qualitative information about labour market insertion of graduates, satisfaction with graduates’ skills, workforce skill needs and recruitment needs

- Seven Enterprise Qualitative Skills Surveys were produced in 7 universities to understand the current and forthcoming recruitment needs and competency requirements and to identify opportunities for internships or traineeships.
- 139 volunteering students from 7 universities were trained on enterprise survey administration and data collection.
- Three rounds of SPSS and report writing training took place for a total of 18 UCCD staff from 6 universities.
- Fourteen Enterprise roundtables took place in 7 universities to strengthen partnerships and obtain additional relevant information on local labour markets (2 per 6 university and 1 in Aswan University, 1 in Menofia university)
- The project has leveraged on the latest technological advantages and developed a survey management system (SMS) to automate and facilitate the survey creation and results gathering processes, and then build informative reports based on collected data that will serve as basis for informative decision making. The system will facilitate the data entry process of the graduates and enterprise surveys. It will support the UCCD staff in collecting and disseminating labour market information.

3) Enhancing the inclusiveness of UCCD services for students with disabilities

- 5 National Disability Equality Training (DET) training have been delivered to 80 UCCDs.
- 15 Action plans for enhancing disability inclusion of UCCD services were developed for 15 UCCD in 10 universities. Follow up on these action plan also took place in order to provide more technical support.
- 16 Physical accessibility assessments for UCCD premises have been conducted for 16 UCCD in 10 universities.

2. Evaluation background

ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. Provisions are made in all projects in accordance with ILO evaluation policy and based on the nature of the project and the specific requirements agreed upon at the time of the project design and during the

project as per established procedures. The UCCD project is subject to a Mid-term internal evaluation as per ILO evaluation policy and procedures..

ILO applies the evaluation criteria established by the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard²³; and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System²⁴.

The present Terms of Reference have been developed by the the project manager with technical support of the Regional M&E officer for ILO Africa for standard issues to be covered by a project MTIE facilitated by an external facilitator.

3. Purposes and Scope, and clients of Evaluation

- a. Assess the relevance and coherence of project's design regarding country needs and how the project is perceived and valued by the target groups.
- b. Identify the contributions of the project to, the SDGs, the countries UNDAF, the ILO objectives and CPOs and its synergy with other projects and programs
- c. Analyse the implementation strategies of the project with regard to their potential effectiveness in achieving the project outcomes and impacts; including unexpected results and factors affecting project implementation (positively and negatively).
- d. Review the institutional set-up, capacity for project implementation, coordination mechanisms and the use and usefulness of management tools including the project monitoring tools and work plans.
- e. Assess the implementation efficiency of the project.
- f. Review the strategies for outcomes' sustainability and orientation to impact.
- g. Identify lessons and potential good practices for the key stakeholders.
- h. Provide strategic recommendations for the different key stakeholders to improve implementation of the project activities and attainment of project objectives.

The mid-term evaluation has to cover the project duration from June 10th, 2018 to December 15th, 2020. The geographical analysis will cover activities conducted in the project's target operating universities: Ein Shams, Alexandria, Mansoura, Menoufia, Sadat, Zagazig, Aswan, Beni Suef, Minya, Sohag..

The evaluation will discuss how the project is addressing its main issue and the ILO cross-cutting themes gender and non-discrimination. Moreover other relevant subjects for all ILO projects to consider how are or not mainstreamed include social dialogue and tripartism, international labour standards, and just transition to environmental sustainability.

The evaluation should help to understand how and why the project has obtained or not the specific results from output to potential impacts.

The primary clients of the evaluation are the ILO constituents. These include UCCD staff in 15 operating centres in 10 Egyptian public universities and officials of MoHE Labour Market Observatory (LMO). Other relevant clients are the donor AUC/ USAID and ILO (i.e. Country Office Cairo, Decent Work team Cairo, and HQ Skills).

4. REVIEW CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

a) Review criteria

²³<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/qualitystandardsfordevelopmentevaluation.htm>

²⁴<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2017:

(https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/--eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf)

The review will address the following ILO evaluation concerns;

- Relevance and strategic fit of the project;
- Validity of the project design;
- Project effectiveness;
- Efficiency of resource use;
- Sustainability of project outcomes;
- Impact orientation;
- Gender equality and non-discrimination

b) Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluator shall examine the following key issues:

f) Relevance and strategic fit,

- Is the project coherent with the Governments objectives, National Development Framework, beneficiaries' needs, and does it support the outcomes outlined in ILO's CPOs as well as the SDGs?
- How does the project complement and fit with other on-going ILO programmes and projects in the countries?
- Has the project been able to leverage the ILO contributions, through its comparative advantages (including tripartism, international labour standards, ILO Decent Work Team etc.)?

g) Validity of intervention design

- Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available, including performance and its M&E system, knowledge sharing and communication strategy?
- To what extent has the project integrated ILO cross cutting themes in the design?
- Has the project a Theory of change comprehensive, integrate external factors and is based on systemic analysis?

h) Effectiveness:

- What progress has been made towards achieving the overall project objectives/outcomes?
- Has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically with all key stakeholders and partners, ILO and the donor to achieve project goals and objectives?
- Assess how contextual and institutional risks and positive external to the project factors have been managed by the project management?
- To what extent is the COVID-19 Pandemic influencing project results and effectiveness and how the project have addressed this influence and is ready to adapt to changes for at least some time from now-on?
- Does the (adapted) intervention model used/to be used in the project suggest an intervention model for similar crisis response?

i) Efficiency of resource use

- Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes? If not, why and which measures taken to work towards achievement of project outcomes and impact?
- Are the project's activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the Project team and work plans?
- How efficient was the Project in utilizing project resources to deliver the planned results?
- To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote gender equality and nondiscrimination; and inclusion of people with disability?

j) Impact orientation and sustainability

- To which extent the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the SDG and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)
- Does the project developed and implement an exit strategy?
- How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected/could be affected by the Covid19 situation in context of the national responses?

5. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the relevant parts of the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy; ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation: Principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations and UNEG Principles.

In particular, this evaluation will follow the ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation; and the ILO EVAL Policy Guidelines Checklist 3 "Preparing the inception report"; Checklist 4 "Validating

methodologies”; Checklist 5 “Preparing the evaluation report” and Checklist “6 Rating the quality of evaluation report”

Recommendations, emerging from the evaluation, should be strongly linked to the findings of the evaluation and should provide clear guidance to all stakeholders on how they can address them, indicating in each one to whom is directed, Priority, Resources required and timeframe (long, medium or short).

Due to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on the world of work, this evaluation will be conducted in the context of criteria and approaches outlined in the ILO internal guide: Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal Guide on adapting to the situation (version March 25, 2020).

The evaluator will facilitate a discussion among key stakeholders to answer the questions above through a desk review of the project documentation bilateral consultations and a workshop to synthesize the views of the stakeholders on the project in the different evaluation criteria. . The evaluator will be supported by the project team. The key steps will comprise:

1. Desk review of all relevant documents and preparation an inception report for the evaluation process including the programme and methodology of the workshop and the outline of the evaluation report.

Desk review, including the following information sources:

- Project documents (logframe, budget, implementation plan, etc.)
 - Progress reports and outputs
 - Research and studies conducted by the Project
 - Project finance documents and records
 - All other relevant document from the project
2. Carry out bilateral consultations with key stakeholders and the donor :
 - a. Project team
 - b. Some of UCCD staff in selected universities
 - c. Head of MoHE LMO
 - d. Consultants and Experts who worked with the project
 - e. Donor
 3. Plan and facilitate a one-day workshop with key stakeholders (preferable face-to-face) to discuss the evaluation questions and identify lessons, good practices an recommendations
 4. Develop a report based on desk review and the workshop discussion
 5. Final evaluation report.

6. Main deliverables

The Inception report should be written in English, the workshop can be fully conducted in Arabic and the report at draft and final version should be in English with Executive summary in Arabic and English

- a) An inception report (not more than 20 pages excluding the annexes) - upon the review of available documents and an initial discussion with the project management and the donor (EVAL Guidelines –Checklist 3) will be developed. The inception report will:
 - Describe the conceptual framework that will be used to undertake the evaluation;
 - Elaborate the methodology proposed in the TOR with changes as required;

- Set out in some detail the data required to answer the evaluation questions, including desk review documentation and stakeholders to participate in the pre-workshop interviews and in the workshop, (emphasizing triangulation as much as possible)
- Selection criteria for individuals for interviews and participation in the stakeholders workshop (as much as possible should include men and women);
- Detail the work plan for the evaluation, indicating the phases in the evaluation, their key deliverables and milestones;
- Set out the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed and the tools to be used for interviews and discussions;
- Set out the agenda for the stakeholders workshop;
- Set out outline for the final evaluation report;
- Interview guides and other data collection tools

The Inception report should be approved by the Evaluation manager before proceeding with the field work.

- b) Agenda of the workshop, considering .The evaluator will set the agenda for the meeting. The presentation should provide a brief review of key results for each evaluation criteria. The workshop will be technically organized by the evaluation team with the logistic support of the project.
If the COVID 20 situation requires the workshop should be conducted virtually with all logistic efforts to be supported by the project.

- c) First draft of Evaluation Report in English: the report should be no longer than 30 pages excluding annexes. The Evaluation Manger holds the responsibility of approving this draft. The draft review (as per EVAL Checklists 5 and 6) report will be shared with all relevant stakeholders and a request for comments will be asked within two weeks.
1. Cover page with key project and evaluation data
 2. Executive Summary
 3. Acronyms
 4. Context and description of the project including reported results
 5. Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation
 6. Methodology and limitations
 7. Findings (this section's content should be organized around evaluation criterion and questions), including a table showing output and outcome level results through indicators and targets planned and achieved and comments on each one.
 8. Conclusions
 9. Recommendations (i.e. for the different key stakeholders), indicating per each one priority, timeframe and level of resources required
 10. Lessons learned and good practices
 11. Annexes:
 - TOR
 - List of people interviewed
 - List participants in the workshop
 - Schedule of work
 - Documents examined
 - Lessons learned and good practices (under EVAL formats)
 - Others

- d) Final version of the evaluation report incorporating comments received from ILO and other key stakeholders. Any identified lessons learnt and good practices will also need to have standard annex templates (one lesson learnt and one Good Practice per template to be annexed in the report) as per EVAL guidelines.

The final version is subjected to final review by EVAL (after initial approval by the Evaluation manager/Regional evaluation officer)

- e) Executive summary in ILO EVAL template

7. Management arrangements and work plan

Evaluation Manager

Evaluation Manager: the evaluation will be managed by Heba Rashed (rashed@ilo.org) and the evaluator should discuss any technical and methodological matters with the evaluation manager should issues arise. The evaluation will be carried out with full logistical support of the project staff, with the administrative support of the ILO Office in Cairo.

The evaluation manager is responsible for completing the following specific tasks:

- Draft and finalize the evaluation TOR with inputs from key stakeholders;
- Develop the Call for expression of interest and select the independent evaluator in coordination with the Regional M&E officer for ILO Africa;

Evaluator responsibilities

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Desk review of programme documentsb. Briefing with ILO/ Evaluation Managerc. Development of the Inception report including the evaluation instrumentd. Interviews with the project manager, the donor and the key stakeholders (4-5)e. Facilitate the virtual stakeholders' workshopf. Draft evaluation reportg. Finalise evaluation report |
|--|

Evaluator profile

Qualifications

- University Degree with minimum 5-7 years of experience in project /program evaluation.
- Conducting evaluations on social development project, especially in labour market and inclusiveness of people living with disabilities areas 5-7 years;
- Strong background in as Human Rights Based Approach programming and Results Based Management;

- Experience in facilitation of multi-stakeholders workshops
- Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming is desirable;
- Excellent analytical skills and communication skills;
- Demonstrated excellent report writing and oral skills in Arabic and good English level.

The tasks of the Project:

The project management team will provide logistical support to the evaluator and will assist in organizing the data collection (documents and interviews). The projects will ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible (in electronic form in a space such as Google Drive) by the evaluator from the first day of the contract (desk review phase).

Evaluation Timetable and Schedule

The internal MTE will be conducted in December 2020-February 2021.

List of Tasks	Responsible	Number of evaluation team working days	Time line (Tentative dates to be adjusted)
Development of the ToRs draft	Evaluation manager	0	5 Nov. 2020
Share the draft TOR for comments with key stakeholders	Evaluation manager	0	9-20 November
Selection of the consultant and contract signing (Call for EoI, selection and contracting)	Evaluation manager	0	9 Nov- 15 Dec
Briefing with the evaluation manager, desk review of project documents, and development and submission of the Inception report	Evaluator	4	15 Dec.- 5 Jan.
Feedback and approval of the inception report	Evaluation manager	0	10 Jan. 2021
Workshop with stakeholders	Evaluator	1	20 Jan. 2021
Consolidation of data and information from the desk review and the workshop for the preparation of the draft report	Evaluator	3	20-25 Jan. 2021
Review of the Zero Draft evaluation report	Evaluation manager	0	25-31 Jan. 2021
Circulate draft report among key stakeholders including the donor	Evaluation manager	0	1-7 Feb 2021
Consolidate feedback for sharing with the evaluator	Evaluation manager	0	7-15 Feb 2021
Finalize the report and submit to the evaluation manager	Evaluator	1	15 Feb 2021
Review for approval by the evaluation manager, Regional M&E officer and reviewed by EVAL	Evaluation manager, Regional M&E	0	21 Feb 2021

	officer, and EVAL		
Total days		9	

Resources

Estimated resource requirements at this point:

- Evaluator honorarium for 9 days
- Stakeholders' workshop
- Translation of draft and final report from Arabic to English (if necessary)

ANNEXES

RELEVANT POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 3rd ed.

http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluators)

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist No. 3: Writing the inception report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist 5: preparing the evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist 6: rating the quality of evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm

Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang--en/index.htm

Guidance note 7: Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation

https://www.ilo.org/global/docs/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm

Guidance note 4: Integrating gender equality in the monitoring and evaluation of projects

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

Template for evaluation title page

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm

Template for evaluation summary

<http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc>

UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/548>

2 Lessons Learned

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: University Centers for Career Development (UCCD)

Project TC/SYMBOL: EGY/17/02/AUE

Name of Evaluator: Ashraf Bakr Elsherif, PhD

Date: March 2012

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<p>Flexibility and adaptability, in the face of change, is key to success.</p> <p>This refers, in the first place, to the adapted mode of implementation. As a result of restrictions imposed by the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, the project could no longer continue delivery of trainings and workshops in person. Content was adapted and the project successfully shifted to remote and virtual modality.</p> <p>It also refers to the need for the ILO component to adapt to institutional challenges, specifically the lack of university management approvals in two (2) universities, by devising other means to engage UCCDs staff of these universities in activities.</p>
Context and any related preconditions	<p>ILO component focuses on enhancing the capabilities of MoHESR and LMO and UCCDs staff.</p> <p>The absence of university management approvals in two (2) universities has thus far hindered ILO component's ability to engage UCCDs staff in its activities.</p>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Staff of MoHESR LMO and UCCDs
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	ILO component does not have direct communication and working relationship with university management.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	Adapting the content of trainings and workshops for remote and virtual delivery enabled ILO component to continue working with MoHESR LMO and UCCDs staff.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	ILO should take up the issue of university management approval with the AUC. In the meantime, though, ILO may devise other appropriate means to engage staff of UCCDs of these universities in activities (e.g., invite them to attend activities in neighbouring universities).

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: University Centers for Career Development (UCCD)

Project TC/SYMBOL: EGY/17/02/AUE

Name of Evaluator: Ashraf Bakr Elsherif, PhD

Date: March 2012

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<p>Balancing the knowledge and practical content of training is key to success.</p> <p>The Disability Equality Training (DET) was effective in imparting the knowledge base and diffusing the right understanding and attitude among UCCDs staff. However, it lacked adequate focus on practical, hands-on application skills. As such, UCCDs staff feel ill-equipped to work with students with disabilities (SWDs).</p>
Context and any related preconditions	ILO component focuses on enhancing the inclusiveness of UCCD services for students with disabilities.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	UCCDs staff
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	DET trainers/facilitators have not been able to enhance the skills of UCCDs staff in dealing with students with disabilities.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	DET trainers/facilitators, on the other hand, have been able to enhance UCCDs staff understanding of and attitudes towards students with disabilities.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	ILO should take up the issue of UCCDs staff skills development in dealing with students with disabilities with DET trainers/facilitators and adapt the format of training accordingly, in as far as feasible given the constraints imposed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

3 Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Indicator	Data Source(s)	Data Collection Method(s)
Relevance and Strategic Fit	Is the project coherent with the Governments objectives, National Development Framework, beneficiaries' needs, and does it support the outcomes outlined in ILO's CPOs as well as the SDGs?	Alignment of the project with Government objectives, the National Development Framework, and beneficiaries' (UCCDs) needs	Executive Director, MoHESR LMO	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			UCCDs staff	Stakeholders' Workshop (FGDs)
			MoHESR LMO staff	Stakeholders' Workshop (FGDs)
			AUC CoP & DCoP	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Project Team	
			ILO Employment Specialist	
		Extent to which the project supports ILO's CPOs Outcomes	ILO Employment Specialist	KII
			ILO Project Team	Bilateral Consultation
			ILO's CPOs	Document Review
		Extent to which the project aligns with/contributes to SDG8	Project Documents	Document Review
			UN SDG Report	
			ILO Project Team	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	
			AUC CoP & DCoP	
	How does the project complement and fit with other on-going ILO programmes and projects in the countries?	Extent to which the project complements and fits with other on-going ILO programmes and projects in Egypt?	ILO Project Team	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	
	Has the project been able to leverage the ILO contributions, through its comparative advantages (including tripartism,	Extent to which the project has been able to leverage ILO resources and contributions	ILO National Project Manager	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Indicator	Data Source(s)	Data Collection Method(s)
	international labour standards, ILO Decent Work Team etc.)?			
Validity of Intervention Design	Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available, including performance and its M&E system, knowledge sharing and communication strategy?	Feasibility of achieving project results within time frame and available resources	ILO Project Team	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	
			Executive Director, MoHESR LMO	
			Representatives/focal persons at research institutes	
			AUC CoP & DCoP	
	To what extent has the project integrated ILO cross cutting themes in the design?	Extent to which the project design integrates/incorporates ILO cross-cutting themes	Project Document/Proposal	Document Review
			ILO Employment Specialist	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
	Has the project a Theory of change comprehensive, integrate external factors and is based on systemic analysis?	Extent to which the project's Theory of Change is robust and based on systemic change	ILO National Project Coordinator	
			Project Document/Proposal	Document Review
			ILO National Project Coordinator	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	
			AUC CoP & DCoP	
Effectiveness	What progress has been made towards achieving the overall project objectives/outcomes?	Assessment of progress against output and outcome indicators	Project Progress Reports	Document Review
			Executive Director, MoHESR LMO	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO National Project Coordinator	
			ILO Employment Specialist	
			UCCDs staff	Stakeholders' Workshop (FGDs)
			MoHESR LMO staff	

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Indicator	Data Source(s)	Data Collection Method(s)
	Has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically with all key stakeholders and partners, ILO and the donor to achieve project goals and objectives?	Extent to which project management worked strategically with key stakeholders	Executive Director, MoHESR LMO	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			AUC CoP & DCoP	
			ILO National Project Coordinator	
			ILO Employment Specialist	
			MoHESR LMO personnel	Stakeholders' Workshop (FGDs)
			UCCDs staff	
	Assess how contextual and institutional risks and positive external to the project factors have been managed by the project management?	Extent to which the project management has been able to respond to positive and negative contextual factors	ILO National Project Coordinator	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	
			AUC CoP & DCoP	
			Representatives/focal persons at research institutes	
			UCCDs staff	Stakeholders' Workshop (FGDs)
			MoHESR LMO personnel	
			Project progress reports	Document Review
	To what extent is the COVID-19 Pandemic influencing project results and effectiveness and how the project has addressed this influence and is ready to adapt to changes for at least some time from now-on?	Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the achievement of outputs and outcomes	ILO National Project Coordinator	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			AUC CoP & DCoP	
			Representatives/focal persons at research institutes	
			UCCDs staff	Stakeholders' Workshop (FGDs)
			MoHESR LMO staff	
		Extent to which the project management was able to adapt to changes as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic	ILO National Project Coordinator	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	
			AUC CoP & DCoP	

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Indicator	Data Source(s)	Data Collection Method(s)
	Does the (adapted) intervention model used/to be used in the project suggest an intervention model for similar crisis response?	Relevance of adapted intervention model to crisis response	Project progress reports	Document Review
			ILO National Project Coordinator	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	
Efficiency of Resource Use	Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes? If not, why and which measures taken to work towards achievement of project outcomes and impact?	Timeline of disbursement and procurement	Project Workplans	Document Review
			Project progress reports	
			ILO National Project Coordinator	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
	Are the project's activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the Project team and work plans?	Timeliness of activities	Project workplans	Document Review
			Project progress reports	Document Review
			ILO National Project Coordinator	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	
			Executive Director, MoHESR LMO	
			AUC CoP and DCoP	
	How efficient was the Project in utilizing project resources to deliver the planned results?	Timely decisions and result-oriented operational systems and procedures	Project document	Document Review
			Project progress reports	
			Executive Director, MoHESR LMO	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO National Project Coordinator	

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Indicator	Data Source(s)	Data Collection Method(s)
	To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote gender equality non-discrimination and inclusion of people with disability?	Resources leveraged to promote gender equality non-discrimination and inclusion of people with disability	ILO Employment Specialist	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			AUC CoP and DCoP	
			Project progress reports	Document Review
			ILO National Project Coordinator	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	
Impact orientation and sustainability	To which extent are the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the SDG and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)	Contribution of the project – explicit and implicit – to the SDG8	ILO National Project Coordinator	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO Employment Specialist	
			AUC CoP and DCoP	
			Project progress reports	Document Review
	Has the project developed and is implementing an exit strategy?	Exit strategy; stakeholders’ plans and budget allocations	Exit Strategy	Document Review
			MoHESR LMO Plan(s)	
	UCCDs Plan(s)			
	How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected/could be affected by the Covid-19 situation in context of the national responses?		Executive Director, MoHESR LMO	Bilateral Consultation (KII)
			ILO National Project Coordinator	
			UCCDs Staff	Stakeholders’ Workshop (FGDs)

4 Data Collection Tools

ILO Project Team

a) Relevance and strategic fit

- To what extent is the project coherent with:
 - The Government of Egypt's (GoE) objectives and its National Development Framework?
 - Beneficiaries' needs (i.e., UCCDs and MoHESR LMO)?
- How does the project support the outcomes outlined in ILO's CPOs?
- How does the project complement and fit with other on-going ILO programmes and projects in Egypt?
- How does it contribute to the SDGs?
- To what extent has the project been able to leverage ILO contributions, through its comparative advantages (including tripartism, international labour standards, ILO Decent Work Team etc.)?

b) Validity of intervention design

- Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available?
- To what extent are the project's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, knowledge sharing and communication strategy practical and operational?
 - To what extent has been timely informative for project management?
- To what extent has the project integrated ILO cross-cutting themes in its design?
 - Gender
 - Non-discrimination/People with Disabilities
 - Tripartism
- Is the project's Theory of Change comprehensive, integrating external factors and based on systemic analysis?

c) Effectiveness:

- What progress has been made towards achieving the overall project objectives/outcomes?
- To what extent has the project management worked strategically with:
 - all key stakeholders and partners
 - ILO
 - the donorto achieve project goals and objectives?
- How have contextual and institutional risks been managed?
- Have there been positive external factors that supported the project implementation? What are these? How has the project management capitalized on these?
- To what extent is the COVID-19 pandemic influencing project results and effectiveness?
 - How has the project addressed this influence?
 - To what extent is the project ready to adapt to changes in the near future?
- Does the (adapted) intervention model used/to be used in the project suggest an intervention model for similar crisis response?

d) Efficiency of resource use

- Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes?
 - If not, why?

- What measures have been taken to work towards achievement of project outcomes and impact?
- How efficient was the project in utilizing project resources to deliver the planned results?
- Are the project's activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and work plans?
- To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote gender equality and non-discrimination, and inclusion of people with disability?

e) Impact orientation and sustainability

- To what extent are the project results (outputs and outcomes) likely to be sustained by target stakeholders?
 - To what extent will UCCDs and MoHESR LMO be able to sustain improved knowledge, skills and capacity into the future?
- To what extent are the project results likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the SDG and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)
- Has the project developed and is implementing an exit strategy?
- How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected/could be affected by the Covid-19 situation, within the context of the national responses?

ILO Employment Specialist & ILO Skills and Employability Specialist

[to be revised in light of the extent to which the Specialists are involved with the project; not all questions may be relevant]

a) Relevance and strategic fit

- To what extent is the project coherent with the Government of Egypt's (GoE) objectives and its National Development Framework?
- How does the project support the outcomes outlined in ILO's CPOs?
- How does the project complement and fit with other on-going ILO programmes and projects in Egypt?
- How does it contribute to the SDGs?
- To what extent has the project been able to leverage ILO contributions, through its comparative advantages (including tripartism, international labour standards, ILO Decent Work Team etc.)?

b) Validity of intervention design

- Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available?
- To what extent are the project's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, knowledge sharing and communication strategy practical and operational?
- To what extent has the project integrated ILO cross-cutting themes in its design?
 - Gender
 - Non-discrimination/People with Disabilities
 - Tripartism
- Is the project's Theory of Change comprehensive, integrating external factors and based on systemic analysis?

c) Effectiveness:

- What progress has been made towards achieving the overall project objectives/outcomes?
- To what extent has the project management worked strategically with:
 - all key stakeholders and partners
 - ILO
 - the donorto achieve project goals and objectives?
- How have contextual and institutional risks been managed?
- Have there been positive external factors that supported the project implementation? What are these? How has the project management capitalized on these?
- To what extent is the COVID-19 pandemic influencing project results and effectiveness?
 - How has the project addressed this influence?
 - To what extent is the project ready to adapt to changes in the near future?
- Does the (adapted) intervention model used/to be used in the project suggest an intervention model for similar crisis response?

d) Efficiency of resource use

- Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes?
 - If not, why?
 - What measures have been taken to work towards achievement of project outcomes and impact?

- How efficient was the project in utilizing project resources to deliver the planned results?
- Are the project's activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and work plans?
- To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote gender equality and non-discrimination, and inclusion of people with disability?

e) Impact orientation and sustainability

- To what extent are the project results (outputs and outcomes) likely to be sustained by target stakeholders?
 - To what extent will UCCDs and MoHESR LMO be able to sustain improved knowledge, skills and capacity into the future?
- To what extent are the project results likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the SDG and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)
- Has the project developed and is implementing an exit strategy?
- How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected/could be affected by the Covid-19 situation, within the context of the national responses?

a) Relevance and strategic fit

- To what extent is the project coherent with:
 - the Government of Egypt's (GoE) objectives and its National Development Framework?
 - MoHESR LMO mandate and needs?

b) Validity of intervention design

- Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available?

c) Effectiveness:

- What progress has been made towards achieving the overall project objectives/outcomes?
 - To what extent has the project management worked strategically with MoHESR LMO to achieve project goals and objectives?
- Have there been positive external factors that supported the project implementation? What are these? How has the project management capitalized on these?

d) Efficiency of resource use

- How efficient was the project in utilizing project resources to deliver the planned results?
- Are the project's activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and work plans?

e) Impact orientation and sustainability

- To what extent are the project results (outputs and outcomes) likely to be sustained by target stakeholders?
 - To what extent will MoHESR LMO be able to sustain improved knowledge, skills and capacity into the future?
- Has the project developed and is implementing an exit strategy?
- Does MoHESR LMO have a plan to continue similar activities after the project comes to an end? If yes, how likely is it that budget will be available to implement this plan? What are the funding sources?

a) Relevance and strategic fit

- To what extent is the project coherent with beneficiaries' needs (i.e., UCCDs and MoHESR LMO)?

b) Validity of intervention design

- Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available?

c) Effectiveness:

- What progress has been made towards achieving the overall project objectives/outcomes?
- How have contextual and institutional risks been managed?
- Have there been positive external factors that supported the project implementation? What are these? How has the project management capitalized on these?
- To what extent is the COVID-19 pandemic influencing project results and effectiveness?
 - How has the project addressed this influence?

d) Efficiency of resource use

- Are the project's activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and work plans?

e) Impact orientation and sustainability

- To what extent are the project results (outputs and outcomes) likely to be sustained by target stakeholders?
 - To what extent will UCCDs and MoHESR LMO be able to sustain improved knowledge, skills and capacity into the future?

AUC: Project CoP and DCoP

[Discussion will be specific to the three deliverables under ILO component, except where noted]

a) Relevance and strategic fit

- To what extent is the project *[overall and ILO component]* coherent with:
 - The Government of Egypt's (GoE) objectives and its National Development Framework?
 - Beneficiaries' needs (i.e., UCCDs and MoHESR LMO)?
- How does it contribute to the SDGs?

b) Validity of intervention design

- Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available?
- To what extent has ILO reporting been informative and accurate?
- To what extent has the project integrated cross-cutting themes in its design?
 - Gender
 - Non-discrimination/People with Disabilities
- Is the *[overall]* project's Theory of Change comprehensive, integrating external factors and based on systemic analysis?

c) Effectiveness:

- What progress has been made towards achieving the project objectives/outcomes?
- To what extent has the project management worked strategically with:
 - all key stakeholders and partners
 - ILO
 - the donorto achieve project goals and objectives?
- How have contextual and institutional risks been managed?
- Have there been positive external factors that supported the project implementation? What are these? How has the project management capitalized on these?
- To what extent is the COVID-19 pandemic influencing project results and effectiveness?
 - How has the project addressed this influence?
 - To what extent is the project ready to adapt to changes in the near future?
- Does the (adapted) intervention model used/to be used in the project suggest an intervention model for similar crisis response?

d) Efficiency of resource use

- Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes?
 - If not, why?
 - What measures have been taken to work towards achievement of project outcomes and impact?
- How efficient was the project in utilizing project resources to deliver the planned results?
- Are the project's activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and work plans?
- To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote gender equality and non-discrimination, and inclusion of people with disability?

e) Impact orientation and sustainability

- To what extent are the project results (outputs and outcomes) likely to be sustained by target stakeholders?

- To what extent will UCCDs and MoHESR LMO be able to sustain improved knowledge, skills and capacity into the future?
- Has the project developed and is implementing an exit strategy?
- How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected/could be affected by the Covid-19 situation, within the context of the national responses?

منظمة العمل الدولية
مشروع المراكز الجامعية للتطوير المهني
تقييم نصف المدة
ورشة العمل مع الشركاء

مرصد سوق العمل

معيار التقييم: الملاءمة الاستراتيجية Relevance and Strategic Fit

الإجابات/وجهات النظر	أسئلة التقييم
	<p>إلى أي مدى يتسق المشروع مع:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">– أهداف الحكومة المصرية وإطار خطط التنمية الوطنية؟ <p>To what extent is the project coherent with the Government's objectives, National Development Framework, and beneficiaries' needs?</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– مجال عمل وأهداف ودور "مرصد سوق العمل" واحتياجاته؟

معيار التقويم: صلاحية تصميم المشروع Validity of Intervention Design

أسئلة التقويم	الإجابات/وجهات النظر
<p>إلى أي مدى ترى أن المشروع واقعي، من حيث إمكانية تحقيق النتائج المتوقعة منه والأثر، في ضوء المدة الزمنية المحددة له والموارد المتاحة؟</p> <p>Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available?</p>	
<p>– هل لدى المشروع نظام فعال لمتابعة الأداء، وتبادل الخبرات والمعرفة، واستراتيجية الاتصال والتواصل؟</p> <p>Does the project have a robust/efficient M&E system, knowledge sharing and communication strategy?</p>	

مقياس التقييم: الفعالية Effectiveness

أسئلة التقييم	الإجابات/وجهات النظر
<p>ما التقدم الذي تم نحو تحقيق نتائج المشروع والهدف العام منه؟</p> <p>What progress has been made towards achieving the overall project objectives/outcomes?</p>	
<p>إلى أي مدى عمل هيكل إدارة المشروع بشكل استراتيجي مع كافة الأطراف المعنية والشركاء من أجل تحقيق الغاية من المشروع وأهدافه؟</p> <p>Has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically with all key stakeholders to achieve project goals and objectives?</p>	

مقياس التقييم: الفعالية Effectiveness

الإجابات/وجهات النظر	أسئلة التقييم
	<p>كيف تعاملت إدارة المشروع مع المخاطر السياقية والمؤسسية، وكذا العوامل الإيجابية الخارجية؟</p> <p>How have contextual and institutional risks and positive factors external to the project been managed by the project management?</p>
	<p>إلى أي مدى تؤثر جائحة كوفيد-19 على فعالية المشروع وتحقيق نتائجه؟ كيف تعامل المشروع مع هذا الوضع؟ هل المشروع قادر على التكيف مع هذه الظروف لفترة قادمة؟</p> <p>To what extent is the COVID-19 Pandemic influencing project results and effectiveness and how the project has addressed this influence and is ready to adapt to changes for at least some time from now on?</p>

معيّار التّقويم: كفاءة استغلال الموارد Efficiency of Resource Use

الإجابات/وجهات النظر	أسئلة التّقويم
	<p>هل تمّ تنفيذ أنشطة/عمليات المشروع طبقًا لجدول الأنشطة كما يحدده فريق المشروع وخطة العمل؟</p> <p>Are the project's activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the Project team and work plans?</p>
	<p>ما مدى كفاءة المشروع في استخدام الموارد المتاحة له لتحقيق النتائج المخطط لها؟</p> <p>How efficient was the Project in utilizing project resources to deliver the planned results?</p>

Impact Orientation and Sustainability معيار التقويم: التوجه نحو الأثر والاستدامة

الإجابات/وجهات النظر	أسئلة التقويم
	<p>إلى أي مدى سيتمكن مرصد سوق العمل من الحفاظ على المعارف والمهارات والقدرات المحسنة في المستقبل؟</p> <p>To what extent will LMO be able to sustain acquired knowledge and skills and enhanced capacities?</p>
	<p>هل لدى مرصد سوق العمل خطط لمواصلة أنشطة مماثلة بعد انتهاء المشروع؟ إذا كان الجواب نعم، ما مدى احتمال توافر الميزانية لتنفيذ هذه الخطة؟ ما هي مصادر التمويل؟</p> <p>Does LMO have plan(s) to continue similar activities after the project comes to an end? If yes, what are the chances budgets will be available to implement this plan? What are the funding sources?</p>

منظمة العمل الدولية
مشروع المراكز الجامعية للتطوير المهني
تقييم نصف المدة
ورشة العمل مع الشركاء

مجموعة رقم: 1 الجامعة: المركز/الكلية:

معيار التقويم: الملاءمة الاستراتيجية Relevance and Strategic Fit

أسئلة التقويم	الإجابات/وجهات النظر
<p>إلى أي مدى يتسق مكون منظمة العمل الدولية بالمشروع مع:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">– أهداف الحكومة المصرية وإطار وخطط التنمية الوطنية؟ <p>To what extent is the ILO component in the project coherent with the Government's objectives, National Development Framework, and beneficiaries' needs?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">– مجال عمل وأهداف ودور "المراكز الجامعية للتطوير المهني" واحتياجاتها؟	

معيار التقويم: صلاحية تصميم المشروع Validity of Intervention Design

أسئلة التقويم	الإجابات/وجهات النظر
<p>إلى أي مدى ترى أن مكون منظمة العمل الدولية بالمشروع واقعي، من حيث إمكانية تحقيق النتائج المتوقعة منه والأثر، في ضوء المدة الزمنية المحددة له والموارد المتاحة؟</p> <p>Is the ILO component in the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available?</p>	
<p>– هل لدى مكون منظمة العمل الدولية بالمشروع نظام فعال لمتابعة الأداء، وتبادل الخبرات والمعرفة، واستراتيجية الاتصال والتواصل؟</p> <p>Does the ILO component in the project have a robust/efficient M&E system, knowledge sharing and communication strategy?</p>	

مقياس التقييم: الفعالية Effectiveness

الإجابات/وجهات النظر	أسئلة التقييم
	<p>ما التقدم الذي تم نحو تحقيق نتائج مكون منظمة العمل الدولية والهدف العام منه؟</p> <p>What progress has been made towards achieving the overall ILO component objectives/outcomes?</p>
	<p>إلى أي مدى عمل هيكل إدارة مكون منظمة العمل الدولية بالمشروع بشكل استراتيجي مع كافة الأطراف المعنية والشركاء من أجل تحقيق الغاية من المشروع وأهدافه؟</p> <p>Has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically with all key stakeholders to achieve the goals and objectives of the ILO component in the project?</p>

مقياس التقويم: الفعالية Effectiveness

أسئلة التقويم	الإجابات/وجهات النظر
<p>كيف تعاملت إدارة مكون منظمة العمل الدولية بالمشروع مع المخاطر السياقية والمؤسسية، وكذا العوامل الإيجابية الخارجية؟</p> <p>How have contextual and institutional risks and positive factors external to the ILO component of the project been managed by the project management?</p>	
<p>إلى أي مدى تؤثر جائحة كوفيد-19 على فعالية مكون منظمة العمل الدولية بالمشروع وتحقيق نتائجه؟ كيف تعامل مع هذا الوضع؟ هل هو قادر على التكيف مع هذه الظروف لفترة قادمة؟</p> <p>To what extent is the COVID-19 Pandemic influencing the results and effectiveness of ILO component in the project and how it has addressed this influence and is ready to adapt to changes for at least some time from now on?</p>	

معيار التقويم: كفاءة استغلال الموارد Efficiency of Resource Use

الإجابات/وجهات النظر	أسئلة التقويم
	<p>هل تم تنفيذ أنشطة/عمليات مكون منظمة العمل الدولية بالمشروع طبقاً لجدول الأنشطة كما يحدده فريق وخطة العمل؟</p> <p>Are the activities/operations of the ILO component of the project in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the team and work plans?</p>
	<p>ما مدى كفاءة مكون منظمة العمل الدولية بالمشروع في استخدام الموارد المتاحة له لتحقيق النتائج المخطط لها؟</p> <p>How efficient was the ILO component in the Project in utilizing project resources to deliver the planned results?</p>

Impact Orientation and Sustainability معيار التقويم: التوجه نحو الأثر والاستدامة

الإجابات/وجهات النظر	أسئلة التقويم
	<p>إلى أي مدى ستتمكن المراكز الجامعية للتطوير المهني من الحفاظ على المعارف والمهارات والقدرات المحسنة في المستقبل؟</p> <p>To what extent will UCCDs be able to sustain acquired knowledge and skills and enhanced capacities?</p>
	<p>هل لدى المراكز الجامعية للتطوير المهني خطط لمواصلة أنشطة مماثلة بعد انتهاء مكون منظمة العمل الدولية بالمشروع؟ إذا كان الجواب نعم، ما مدى احتمال توافر الميزانية لتنفيذ هذه الخطة؟ ما هي مصادر التمويل؟؟</p> <p>Do UCCDs have plan(s) to continue similar activities after the ILO component of the project comes to an end? If yes, what are the chances budgets will be available to implement this plan? What are the funding sources?</p>

.5 Stakeholders' Workshop Agenda



International Labour Organization
 University Centers for Career Development Project
 Mid-Term Evaluation
 Stakeholders' Workshop
 Date: Tuesday, February 16th 2020

Time	Topic	Facilitator
08:30 – 09:00	Registration	
09:00 – 09:15	Welcome & Opening: - Objective of the Workshop: The Internal Mid-Term Evaluation - Refresher presentation of the project	ILO National Project Coordinator
09:15 – 09:30	- The Mid-Term Internal Evaluation - The Workshop Schedule and Modality	Consultant
09:30 – 10:30	Relevance and Strategic Fit - Small Group Work - Group Presentations - Open Discussion	Consultant
10:30 – 11:30	Validity of Design	Consultant
11:30 – 12:30	Effectiveness	Consultant
12:30 – 13:00	Break	
13:00 – 14:00	Efficiency	Consultant
14:00 – 15:00	Impact	
15:00 – 16:00	Recommendations and Lessons Learned Wrap-Up The Way Forward	Consultant Facilitated Discussion

6 Documents Reviewed

(in no particular order)

- Subagreement between The American University in Cairo and International Labour Organization re: USAID Cooperative Agreement Number AID-263-A-17-00002, entitled “University Centers for Career Development”; 16 April 2018
- ILO Text for proposal; no date
- Teaming Agreement between The American University in Cairo (AUC) and International Labour Organization (ILO) Re: USAID RFA-263-17-00001 entitled “University Centers for Career Development (UCCD”, no date
- University Centers for Career Development project – the ILO component: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, no date
- APPENDIX E: Summary Implementation Plan (UCCD ILO Implementation Plan 10 Dec 2019)
- ILO Technical Cooperation Progress Report
 - All 11 quarterly progress reports, from March – May 2018 through September – November 2020
- UCCD Project – ILO Component: Required changes at activity level, no date

7 Evaluation Timeline

Inception Meeting	16 December 2020
Draft Inception Report	5 January 2021
Final Inception Report	17 January 2021
Bilateral Consultations	25 January – 17 February 2021
Evaluation Stakeholders' Workshop	16 February 2021
Follow-Up Meeting (ILO)	23 February 2021
Draft Evaluation Report	14 March 2021
Revised Draft Evaluation Report	25 March 2021
Draft Evaluation Report for Comments	4 April 2021
Final Evaluation Report	19 April 2021