

**Ministry of National Education, Youth, and Sports
Center for Educational Research and Development**

**GENERAL EDUCATION PROJECT
Preparation Phase**

**Component 3
Quality and Efficiency**

Sub-Component 3.4

Evaluation Unit

PROJECT DOCUMENT

David Carroll, Consultant
December 1998

PROJECT DOCUMENT - EVALUATION UNIT

1. BACKGROUND

The MENJS has embarked on an ambitious development program to overcome the impact on educational quality of sixteen years of war. New curricula, textbooks and in-service training programs for teachers are being introduced. The first sets of textbooks are now (late-1998) in the schools, and the remainder will be introduced progressively over the two academic years 1999-2001.

Within MENJS, the CNRDP is responsible for setting the strategy for developing education, and preparing new curricula, textbooks training programs and assessment models. The CNRDP staffing structure suffered during the war. As a result, ad-hoc commissions operating under the CNRDP umbrella carried out the bulk of the development work.

With the introduction of the new materials in the schools, CNRDP needs to monitor the reform in order to reveal any problems identified in implementation, and identify weaknesses in the strategy or materials to be addressed in a second phase of reform. CNRDP also needs to monitor the quality of implementation in general, in order to fulfill its core mission. The CNRDP Evaluation Unit does not at present have the capacity to do the required monitoring and evaluation. It has only one staff member. However, CNRDP is committed to developing a strong, independent Evaluation Unit. It is not appropriate for the evaluation of the impact of the reform to be carried out by the same *ad-hoc* commissions that produced the materials.

Additional staff needed for the CNRDP Evaluation Unit cannot be supplied from within the system owing to the high demand for existing qualified personnel. Therefore, CNRDP needs to hire relatively junior, inexperienced staff, and develop their professional capacity on the job.

2. OBJECTIVES

The primary goal of this Sub-Component is to promote development of institutional capacity to monitor the impact of reform activities, assure the quality of ongoing implementation, and identify issues to be addressed in future reform efforts.

The specific objectives of this Sub-Component are:

- 2.1 to support development of the CNRDP Evaluation Unit by training key staff members;
- 2.2 to assist CNRDP to develop a comprehensive evaluation strategy to meet the needs of the education system;
- 2.3 to introduce a system of annual quality review of official examinations by CNRDP; and
- 2.4 to support establishment of stable CNRDP evaluation capacity by supporting implementation of the initial round of evaluation activities.

3. ACTIVITIES

3.2 Activities of Proposed Evaluation Unit

1. Focus Groups (99-00, 00-01)

The purpose of the Focus Groups is to gather systematic feedback from the field about stakeholders' concerns.

1.1 Required CNRDP Resources

- Steering Committee – 10 senior persons, 4 one-day meetings annually
- Secretariat – drawn from the Evaluation Unit staff and to consist of National Coordinator and 4 regional rapporteurs – 8 days monthly for each person in year 1, 6 days monthly in subsequent years.
- Clerical and secretarial support – allow 2 persons for one month

1.2 Focus Groups

Establish focus groups as follows:

- 4 areas: North, South, Beq'a and Beirut/Suburbs
- 3 groups in each area: parents/employers, teachers, school principals
- Total 12 groups, 10 persons each. Meet irregularly, at least once per semester, maybe as often as once a month at the beginning.
- Pay LL10,000 travel to each participant for each meeting. Total LL1,200,000 per meeting.
- Allow 9 meetings in FY 99-00, 6 in each subsequent year.

1.3 Proposed Consultant Support

International consultant support - 1 person month in FY 99-00, 1 in FY 00-01

National consultant support - 2 person months in FY 99-00, 2 in FY 00-01

1.4 Activity

- Focus groups will define what they see as key issues and discuss them. They will also discuss issues about which CNRDP are seeking feedback.
- The Secretariat will prepare reports, hold meetings with concerned individuals to explain findings and propose follow-up.
- The Steering Committee will review activity and reports, and propose further activity as required.
- Consultants will train secretariat, assist them with planning and implementing focus group meetings, with preparing required reports, and with planning and implementing stakeholder meetings.

2. Setting Criteria (99-00, 00-01)

The purpose of this activity is to develop a standard set of criteria by which schools and teaching can be judged, in order to assure consistency of judgment and clarity of objectives across all agencies and schools.

2.1 Required CNRDP Resources

Establish a Coordinating Committee plus a Specialist Committee for each of three areas:

- School management
- Teaching methodology (including lesson planning)
- School buildings and facilities

Total 40 persons working for 2 months in FY 99-00, 2 in FY 00-01, 1 in FY 01-02

Allow also training for 100 persons for 5 days in FY 00-01

2.2 Main Activities

Year 1: Review international experience (2-week study tour for 8 persons)
Orient Coordinating Committee and Specialist Committees
Develop draft criteria and instruments
Consult stakeholders (directly and through focus groups) and revise draft criteria and instruments as necessary

Year 2: Train 100 inspectors, pedagogic counsellors, in use of draft criteria and instruments (allow 1 week for training).
Inspectors, pedagogic counsellors pilot draft criteria and instruments in schools and critique them
Teams review outcomes and revise draft criteria and instruments as necessary.

Year 3: Inspectors, pedagogic counsellors begin applying criteria and instruments nationally
Teams monitor application and if necessary further revise criteria and instruments

2.3 Proposed Consultant Support

International consultant support - 1 person month in FY 99-00, 1 in FY 00-01, 1 in FY 01-02

National consultant support - 2 person months in FY 99-00, 2 in FY 00-01, 1 in FY 01-02

The consultants will orient the committees, and support development of draft instruments, consultation with stakeholders, training of implementers, and initial piloting/revision.

2.4 Follow-up Envisaged but not Planned or Budgeted

EMIS will begin developing a database of inspection reports, year 3 onwards

CNRDP Bureau de Recherche will begin preparing status reports on Lebanese education based on standard criteria, year 3 onwards

3. Database of Examinations (00-01, 03-04)

The purpose of this activity is to establish a baseline of current examinations practice against which progress during the project can be measured. The database will therefore consist not only of analyses of examination papers, but also evaluative descriptions of procedures and practices. The database will be maintained annually, and at the end of the project period a comprehensive analysis and review will be prepared.

3.1 Required CNRDP Resources

Establish National Steering Committee (the MENJS "Examining Committee" chaired by the General Director of National Education would be appropriate) – allow two one-day meetings annually.

Appoint National Coordinator from CNRDP Evaluation Unit staff – to work for 3 person months in FY 00-01, 1 person month in FY 01-02, 1 person month in FY 02-03, 3 person months in FY 03-04.

CNRDP Examination Development Committees in the various subjects will be mainly responsible for gathering the subject-specific materials. Allow 1 week annually in addition to their regular work on quality review, FY 00-01 to FY 03-04.

3.2 Main Activities

Beginning with the year 2000 examinations, gather:

- copies of specifications, papers, marking schemes;
- all analytical reports, and
- detailed information about procedures used for paper setting, moderation, typesetting and printing, marking, data entry, scores processing, results publication.

3.3 Proposed Consultant Support

International consultant support - 1 person month in FY 00-01, 1 in FY 03-04
National consultant support - 2 person months in FY 00-01, 2 in FY 03-04

In FY 00-01, the consultants would assist with identifying the required information, structuring the database to allow for easy access, and establishing procedures for regular data gathering. In FY 03-04, they would help with preparation of an evaluative report on the development of the official examinations over the period of the project.

4. Quality Review of Examinations (00-01 to 03-04)

The purpose of conducting regular quality review is to provide information about the strengths and weaknesses of the examinations as actually delivered. This information will be used to plan the measures required to improve the quality and relevance of the examinations.

4.1 Required CNRDP Resources

National Steering Committee (the MENJS "Examining Committee" chaired by the General Director of National Education would be appropriate) – allow two one-day meetings annually, FY 00-01 to 03-04.

National Coordinator from CNRDP Evaluation Unit staff – to work for 2 person months in FY 00-01, 1 person month in FY 01-02 to 03-04.

CNRDP Examination Development Committees in the various subjects to undertake content review of examination papers against specifications and manual question analysis of a sample of worked answer books. Allow ten committees (50 persons) for two days each year for content review, five days each year for question analysis, FY 00-01 to 03-04.

Specialist statistical support – allow 4 persons for five days, each year, FY 00-01 to 03-04.

One person from each Examination Development Committee, National Coordinator, two statisticians and one specialist adviser to prepare the annual report and recommendations to the Examining Committee. Allow 14 persons for five days, FY 00-01 to 03-04.

Clerical and secretarial support – allow 2 persons for one month, FY 00-01 to 03-04

4.2 Main Activities

Staff training: two core staff members to be offered 3 months' tailored training overseas in test statistics and quality review/assurance during FY 99-00

Beginning with the year 2000 examinations:

- Statistical review – analysis of the effective weightings of different subjects, the relative difficulty of different optional questions and papers, and the reliability of the marking.

- Content/skills review against specifications (in the absence of specifications for the examinations in 2000, derive approximate content weightings from the syllabus or official textbooks, and identify the skills required in each question).
- Question analysis - manual analysis of question difficulty and discrimination of the examination questions, based on a sample of 200 answer booklets.
- Analytical report and recommendations to examinations committee – in 2000 the report will be purely analytical. From 2001, the report will make recommendations for the coming year's examination, and follow up implementation of previous recommendations.

4.3 Proposed Consultant Support

International consultant support - 1 person month in FY 00-01, 1 in FY 01-02
National consultant support - 2 person months in FY 00-01, 2 in FY 01-02

The consultants would train the statisticians on the job in the essential statistical procedures, assist the Examination Development Committees in carrying out the content/skills review and question analyses, and the drafting team in producing the report. In the second consultancy period, they would assist in establishing the process of developing, implementing and reviewing action plans.

5. Sample-Based National Assessment (99-00 to 03-04)

The primary purpose of this activity is to provide quality assurance information to MENJS and other stakeholders. In particular, it will assure stakeholders that standards are being maintained nationally in the first six grades, following the introduction of automatic and facilitated promotion. The secondary purpose is to gather "diagnostic" information, about which objectives are being achieved or not achieved. In the longer term, it is envisaged that "diagnostic" tests for local use will be derived from the item banks developed for the national assessment.

Assume: testing in 4 subjects (Arabic, mathematics, science, French); initially objectives from the first six grades will be assessed. Assume the first items will be piloted in 2001 in grades 3 and 6, the first tests administered in 2002 and administration repeated in 2004.

5.1 Required CNRDP Resources

- Statistician to draw samples and participate in analyses – 2 months' work annually, FY 99-00 to FY 03-04.
- Educational measurement specialist to calibrate items and participate in analyses, 2 months' work annually, FY 99-00 to FY 03-04.
- Field research coordinator to arrange and supervise administration, coding etc. of tests – 4 months' work annually, FY 99-00 to FY 03-04.

- Coordinating Committee (Evaluation Commission?) 5 persons – 1 month's work annually, FY 99-00 to FY 03-04.
- Subject Committees to set items 4 subjects by 10 persons – 1 month's work annually, FY 99-00 to FY 03-04.
- Data entry coordinator and personnel – 4 persons for 1 month annually, FY 99-00 to FY 03-04.

5.2 Main Activities

5.2.1 Initial Training

- Train two CNRDP staff in Item Response Theory (IRT) - 3 months in U.S. or Netherlands, FY 99-00

5.2.2 Developing Initial Banks

- Develop attainment targets and items – assume 4 (subjects) x 6 (grades) x 10 (targets per subject/grade) = 240 targets, 10 items per target = 2400 items. Assume 5 items per person/day, plus 1 week training and 1 week to identify targets; total 4 weeks work for 40 people, FY 00-01
- Print pilot booklets and answer sheets: assume 60 items per form, therefore 12 test booklets per subject, to allow for anchor items, total 48. Each booklet to be attempted by 200 students – total 9,600 students. Assume \$1 printing cost per student for booklets and answer sheets = \$9,600 for printing, FY 00-01
- Pilot items: assume 20 students per class, 480 classes. Assume 3 classes per school 160 schools. Assume 2 persons per school, 2 schools per day. Total 160 person days for pilot administration, plus 2 person months for drawing sample, arranging schools etc. FY 00-01
- Prepare and enter data – assume half items are m/c, half free-response. 4 person days for machine-scoring. 2 person months for manual scoring and data entry. FY 00-01
- Calibrate and bank items – assume 4 weeks' work for the two statisticians, FY 00-01

5.2.3 First Administration (2002)

- Draw tests for national administration – assume 1 week's work for 10 people, FY 01-02.
- Print tests – assume 4000 test booklets in each of two subjects at grade 3, four subjects at grade 6. Assume \$1 per testee, \$24,000, FY 01-02

- Administer tests: assume 20 students per class, 1200 classes. Assume 3 classes per school 400 schools. Assume 2 persons per school, 2 schools per day. Total 400 person days for pilot administration, plus 2 person months for drawing sample, arranging schools etc. FY 01-02
- Prepare and enter data – assume half items are m/c, half free-response. 10 person days for machine-scoring. 6 person months for manual scoring and data entry. FY 01-02
- Prepare analyses and reports. Assume 2 person months for statisticians, plus 1 person month for Evaluation Commission

5.2.4 Repeat Administration (2004)

- Repeat testing - at same rate as for initial testing

5.2.5 Recurring work to develop banks (01-02, 02-03, 03-04):

- Develop further items – assume 4 (subjects) x 6 (grades) x 10 (targets per subject/grade) = 240 targets, 4 items per target = 960 items. Assume 5 items per person/day; total 3 days' work for 40 people, FY 01-02, FY 02-03, FY 03-04
- Print pilot booklets and answer sheets: assume 60 items per form, therefore 5 test booklets per subject, to allow for anchor items, total 20. Each booklet to be attempted by 200 students – total 4,000 students. Assume \$1 printing cost per student for booklets and answer sheets = \$4,000 for printing, FY 01-02, FY 02-03, FY 03-04
- Pilot items: assume 20 students per class, 200 classes. Assume 3 classes per school 67 schools. Assume 2 persons per school, 2 schools per day. Total 67 person days for pilot administration, plus 1 person month for drawing sample, arranging schools etc. FY 01-02, FY 02-03, FY 03-04
- Prepare and enter data – assume half items are m/c, half free-response. 1 person day for machine-scoring. 1 person months for manual scoring and data entry. FY 01-02, FY 02-03, FY 03-04
- Calibrate and bank items – assume 1 week's work for the two statisticians, FY 01-02, FY 02-03, FY 03-04

5.3 Proposed Consultant Support

International consultant support - 3 person months in FY 00-01, 2 in FY 01-02
 National consultant support - 3 person months in FY 00-01, 2 in FY 01-02

5.4 Other proposed Project Support

Purchase of OMR scanner equipment for CNRDP Evaluation Unit

6. Evaluation of Impact of Reform (00-01, 01-02, 02-03)

The primary purpose of this activity is to give the CNRDP feedback on the success of the reform as a whole, as a basis for further development of curricula, instructional materials, teaching methodology and student assessment. The evaluation will be overseen

6.1 Required CNRDP Resources

Establish a Coordinating Committee (the Committee established for setting criteria would be suitable). Assume the Coordinating Committee consists of a maximum of 10 persons and will work for 1 month annually.

Assume committees established to design questionnaires, interview schedules etc. and prepare reports. Assume a total of 30 persons working for 1 month in FY 99-00

Assume 100 schools are visited annually, 100 principals and 1,000 teachers are interviewed. Assume 10 persons conducting interviews, each visiting 10 schools for 1 day. Assume 100 person days for interviews, 20 person days for coding and data entry.

Assume 5,000 lessons are observed over the course of the year. Assume 10 subjects, 10 persons per subject, each observing 50 lessons over 15 working days. Total 1500 person days. Assume 100 person days for coding and entering data.

Assume 2,500 school principals and 25,000 teachers return questionnaires annually. Assume questionnaires are mainly in fixed-response format with 2-3 free response items. Assume 15 person days for coding free responses, 4 person days for scanning the forms.

Data analysis and report writing will be annual beginning in FY 00-01. Assume 2 persons working for 1 month annually to analyse the data. Assume 4 persons working for 1 month annually to prepare reports for Coordinating Committee to review.

6.2 Main Activities

6.2.1 Gather feedback from stakeholders (focus groups, Inspectorate, Pedagogic Counsellors) during the 1999-2000 academic year. Coordinating Committee to undertake. Allow 1 day's meeting for focus groups (TA/DA for 120 person days plus 20 person days of CNRDP staff time).

6.2.2 Develop and pilot questionnaires for teachers, principals and parents; structured interview schedules for teachers and principals; and classroom observation schedules during the 1999-2000 academic year. Assume piloting in 100 schools. Allow 1 person day per school for piloting, plus 30 further person days for revision.

6.2.3 Gather data: 2000-01 in grades 1, 4, 7 and 10
2001-02 in grades 2, 5, 8 and 11

2002-03 in grades 3, 6, 9 and 12

Assume 100 schools are visited annually, 100 principals and 1,000 teachers are interviewed. Assume 10 persons conducting interviews, each visiting 10 schools for 1 day. Allow 100 person days for interviews.

Assume 5,000 lessons are observed over the course of the year. Assume 10 subjects, 10 persons per subject, each observing 50 lessons over 15 working days. Allow 1500 person days annually.

Assume 2,500 school principals and 25,000 teachers return questionnaires annually. Assume questionnaires are mainly in fixed-response format with 2-3 free response items. Allow 15 person days for coding free responses, 4 person days for scanning the forms.

- 6.2.4 Data processing. Assume 2,500 school principals and 25,000 teachers return questionnaires annually. Assume questionnaires are mainly in fixed-response format with 2-3 free response items. Allow 15 person days for coding free responses, 4 person days for scanning the forms. Allow 100 person days for coding and entering lesson observation data. Allow 20 person days for coding and entering interview data.
- 6.2.5 Prepare reports; incorporate data from quality review of official examinations and sample survey of student achievement as it becomes available. Annual reports will be prepared during the three academic years 2000-03, and a final report during the 2003-04 academic year. Assume 2 persons working for 1 month annually to analyse the data. Assume 4 persons working for 1 month annually to prepare reports for Coordinating Committee to review.
- 6.2.6 Hold national conference and prepare plan for further development of the reform during the 2003-04 academic year. Coordinating Committee plans and leads, with 4 person months' support from CNRDP Evaluation Unit.

6.3 Proposed Consultant Support

International consultant support – 1 person month in FY 00-01, 2 person months in FY 01-02, 1 in FY 02-03, 1 in FY 03-04.

National consultant support - 2 person months in FY 00-01, 2 person months in FY 01-02, 2 in FY 02-03, 2 in FY 03-04.

7. Self-Evaluation (02-03)

The purpose of this activity is to enable CNRDP to review the achievements of the Evaluation Unit, and plan for its further development. It will be undertaken in 2002-2003.

7.1 Required CNRDP Resources

- Evaluation Unit Head, all specialists, field research coordinator – 1 month each

- Evaluation Commission – 1 week
- Focus Groups – 2 days

7.2 Main Activities

- Review the achievements of the unit during the project period;
- Gather feedback from stakeholders about achievements and evaluation needs;
- Prepare an evaluative report;
- Prepare a draft strategic plan, staffing plan etc. for submission to the CNRDP Board; and
- Propose revised Evaluation Unit mission statement, job descriptions etc.

7.3 Proposed Consultant Support

International consultant support - 1 person month in year 4
 National consultant support - 1 person month in year 4

3.2 Proposed Scenario

During the first year of the project, four of the six proposed middle-level staff of the Evaluation Unit will participate in overseas tailored training, in examinations, quality review/quality assurance, and item response theory. During the second year, two further middle-level staff will participate in overseas tailored training, in social research methods and impact evaluation.

During the first year of the project, a presentation will be made to the Unit of ten leading-edge computers, with software and networking cards, three laser printers, one wide-carriage dot-matrix printer, two flat-bed scanners, two mass storage devices and internet connection. This will enable the Unit to carry out its workplan. During the second year of the project, a presentation will be made of two OMR scanners, plus related software and training. This will facilitate processing of tests and questionnaires.

During the first year of the project, the Unit will establish Focus Groups, to gather systematic feedback from the field about stakeholders' concerns in relation to the restructuring. A Steering Committee will be established, plus a Secretariat drawn from the Evaluation Unit staff and consisting of a National Coordinator and 4 regional rapporteurs. Three Focus Groups (parents/employers, teachers, and school principals/administrators) will be established in each of four areas - North, South, Beq'a and Beirut/Suburbs. These groups will meet regularly to identify and discuss what they perceive as critical for the implementation of the restructuring. The Secretariat will prepare reports for the Steering Committee, hold meetings with concerned individuals to explain findings and propose follow-up.

This activity will be ongoing throughout the project. The project will support it with one person month of international consultancy and two person months of national consultancy in the first year of the project, and a further input of the same amount in the second. Consultants will train the secretariat, assist them with planning and implementing focus group meetings, with preparing required reports, and with planning and implementing stakeholder meetings.

The project will also develop a standard set of criteria by which schools and teaching can be judged, in order to assure consistency of judgement and clarity of objectives across all agencies and schools. A Coordinating Committee will be established, plus Specialist Committees for school management, teaching methodology and school buildings and facilities. A two-week study tour will be organized for eight members of the committees to enable them to benefit from international experience in this area, after which the remaining committee members will be oriented. Draft criteria and instruments will be developed, and stakeholders consulted, both directly and through the CNRDP focus groups. During year 2 of the project, when the criteria and instruments have been finalized, 100 inspectors and pedagogic counsellors will be trained in the use of the draft criteria and instruments, and they will pilot them during their regular inspection activity. In year 3, the criteria and instruments will be applied nationally. The project will support activity with one person month of international consultancy and two months of national consultancy in each of the first three years. The consultants will help orient the committees, and support activities.

The CNRDP will also establish a database of examination papers and practices, as a baseline against which progress during the project can be measured. Beginning with the year 2000 examinations, copies of specifications, papers, marking schemes, analytical reports and detailed information about procedures used for paper setting, moderation, typesetting and printing, marking, data entry, scores processing, results publication will be gathered. During the final year of the project, a detailed comparison will be made between the examination papers and procedures for the year 2000, and those for the year 2003.

This activity will be supervised by the MENJS "Examining Committee" chaired by the General Director of National Education, and coordinated by a member of the Evaluation Unit staff. The CNRDP Examination Development Committees in the various subjects will carry out the gathering of subject-specific materials. The project will support this activity with one person month of international and two person months of national consultancy in the 00-01 financial year, and again in the 2003-04 financial year. During the first year, the consultants would assist with identifying the required information, structuring the database to allow for easy access, and establishing procedures for regular data gathering. In 2003-04, they would help with preparation of an evaluative report on the development of the official examinations over the period of the project.

The Evaluation Unit will also establish a regular quality review of the two main official examinations, beginning with the examinations in the year 2000. The MENJS "Examining Committee" chaired by the General Director of National Education will be the steering committee for this activity, which will be coordinated by a member of the CNRDP Evaluation Unit staff. The CNRDP Examination Development Committees in the various subjects will undertake content review of examination papers against specifications and manual question analysis of a sample of worked answer books. There will be an analysis of the statistical properties of the examination that may affect efficiency or equity. An annual report with recommendations for the coming

year's examination papers will be prepared, and submitted to the Examining Committee. The project will support establishment of regular quality review with one person month of international and two person months of national consultancy in the 2000-01 financial year, and again in the 2001-02 financial year. The consultants would train the statisticians on the job in the essential statistical procedures, assist the Examination Development Committees in carrying out the content/skills review and question analyses, and the drafting team in producing the report. In the second consultancy period, they would assist in establishing the process of developing, implementing and reviewing action plans.

The Evaluation Unit will also undertake sample-based national assessment of student achievement in four subjects (Arabic, mathematics, science, French) in grades 3 and 6. The primary purpose of this activity is to provide quality assurance information to MENJS and other stakeholders. In particular, it will assure stakeholders that standards are being maintained nationally in the first six grades, following the introduction of automatic and facilitated promotion. The secondary purpose is to gather "diagnostic" information, about which objectives are being achieved or not achieved. In the longer term, it is envisaged that "diagnostic" tests for local use will be derived from the item banks developed for the national assessment. The first tests will be administered in 2002 and the administration will be repeated in 2004.

Following initial training in Lebanon and overseas, the CNRDP Evaluation Unit will establish subject teams who will develop attainment targets and items during the 2000-01 financial year. These items will be piloted during the 2000-01 financial year, calibrated using one-parameter Item Response Theory (IRT), and banked.

Tests will be drawn from the banks and administered to a national sample of approximately 4,000 students towards the end of the 2001-02 academic year. Separate evaluative reports will be prepared for policy makers, educators and the general public. The administration will be repeated towards the end of the 2003-04 academic year, and in addition to the previous "diagnostic" reports, trends in student achievement will be analyzed and reported. The CNRDP will also develop the item banks during the project period by producing, piloting and banking further items. Ways will be found to make tests drawn from the banks available to schools and directorates, to enable them to undertake their own diagnostic testing.

The project will support this activity with three person months of international and three of national consultancy in 2000-01, and a further two of each in 2001-02. The project will also provide the CNRDP Evaluation Unit with the OMR scanner equipment required for capturing test data.

The Evaluation Unit will undertake a three-year evaluation of the impact of the reform, beginning in the 2000-01 academic year. This will give the CNRDP feedback on the success of the reform as a whole, as a basis for further development. The evaluation will be overseen by a Coordinating Committee, and committees will be established to design questionnaires, interview schedules etc. and prepare reports.

During the 1999-2000 academic year, stakeholders' views on critical areas for investigation will be gathered; classroom observation schedules, questionnaires for teachers, principals and parents, and structured interview schedules for teachers and principals will be developed and piloted. Data will be gathered during 2000-01 in

grades 1, 4, 7 and 10, 2001-02 in grades 2, 5, 8 and 11, and 2002-03 in grades 3, 6, 9 and 12. Evaluative reports will be prepared, incorporating data from the quality review of official examinations and sample survey of student achievement as they become available. Annual reports will be prepared during the three academic years 2000-03, and a final report during the 2003-04 academic year. A national conference will be held during the 2003-04 academic year to review the outcomes of the first phase of the reform, and prepare proposals for the second. The project will support this activity with one person month of international and two person months of national consultancy in 2000-01, two each of national and international consultancy in 2001-02, and one person month of international and two of national consultancy in 2002-03 and 2003-04.

During the 2002-03 academic year, the Evaluation Unit will undertake a self-evaluation, to enable CNRDP to review the achievements of the Evaluation Unit, and plan for its further development. The staff of the unit will review the achievements of the unit during the project period, including gathering feedback from stakeholders, and prepare an evaluative report, draft strategic plan, staffing plan etc. for submission to the CNRDP Board. On this basis, a revised Evaluation Unit mission statement and job descriptions will be prepared, and CNRDP will determine the staffing and future activities of the Unit. The project will support this activity with one month of international and one month of national consultancy during the 2002-03 academic year.

4. INPUTS

4.1 Consultancy (person days)

	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04
National	80	260	140	60	80
International	44	186	142	54	54

4.2 Overseas Training and Study Tours

No. Persons	No. Weeks	F.Y.	Objective
2	12	99-00	Training in test statistics and quality review/assurance for CNRDP staff
2	12	99-00	Training in IRT and National Assessment for CNRDP staff
8	2	99-00	Orient participants in setting criteria to international experience in inspection
2	12	00-01	Training in quality assurance, exams for CNRDP staff and associates
4	12	01-02	Training in field research, program evaluation, social research design and analysis
2	12	01-02	Tailored training in examinations for key CNRDP staff or associates

4.3 In-Country Training

No. Persons	No. Days	F.Y.	Objective
100	5	00-01	Train inspectors and pedagogic counselors to apply new criteria

4.4 Hardware and Software

Hardware to be purchased in 1999-2000 financial year:

Hardware: 10 high-end personal computers w/ modems and network cards
 3 laser printers, 1 wide-carriage dot-matrix printer
 2 flat-bed scanners
 2 mass storage devices (e.g., rewritable CD-ROM drive)

Software: 10 copies - MS Windows 98 (Arabic)
 10 copies - MS Office Professional (Arabic)
 10 copies - Anti-virus software
 4 copies - SPSS PC
 2 copies - MicroCAT item banking package
 Allowance for specialized software

Hardware to be purchased in 2000-2001 financial year: 2 OMR scanners

4.5 Studies

None proposed.

4.6 Local Costs

CNRDP staff (p.m.)	38	43	36	43	36
Committees (p.m.)	167	253	213	175	98
Computing and clerical (p.m.)	4	23	37	19	37
Travel Allowances (\$)	8,000	4,800	4,800	6,400	4,800
Materials (\$)	2,000	31,600	46,000	26,000	30,500

5. OUTPUTS

Output	Measurable Indicators
1. A functioning Evaluation Unit within CNRDP, with mission statement, strategic plan, job descriptions and qualified, trained staff	1.1 10 permanent staff appointed by 2000, trained internationally by 2003 1.2 Mission statement, strategic plan, job descriptions for 10 permanent staff prepared by 2000, revised by 2004 1.3 Activities in strategic plan budgeted for beginning in 2000
2. Systems for reviewing the quality of education in Lebanon established and functioning	2.1 Annual quality review of Brevet and Bac. examinations carried out and reported from 2000 onwards

	2.2 National assessment of student achievement at grades 3 and 6 carried out by 2002, and repeated by 2005
3. Monitoring and evaluation systems for national education developed and implemented	3.1 System for gathering feedback from a variety of stakeholders by 2000 3.2 Exams database established by 2000, used for evaluating developments in examination system by 2004 3.3 Comprehensive impact evaluation planned, carried out, reported by 2004

6. SCHEDULE: An indicative Implementation Schedule for Developing the CNRDP Evaluation Unit

Year	Component	Activities
1 (1999-2000)	Focus Groups	Establish and orient focus groups; hold regular meetings; prepare reports, hold meetings with concerned individuals to explain findings and propose follow-up.
	Setting Criteria	Review international experience; orient Coordinating Committee and Specialist Committees; consult stakeholders; develop draft criteria, instruments; revise as necessary
	Database of Examinations	No activity
	Quality Review of Examinations	Train two core CNRDP staff members internationally in test statistics and quality review
	Sample-Based National Assessment	Train two core CNRDP staff internationally in Item Response Theory (IRT)
	Evaluation of Impact of Reform	Establish Coordinating Committee, committees to design instruments and prepare reports. Gather feedback from stakeholders. Develop and pilot questionnaires, structured interview schedules and classroom observation schedules.
	Self-Evaluation	No activity
2 (2000-2001)	Focus Groups	Ongoing as in year 1
	Setting Criteria	Train 100 inspectors, pedagogic counsellors, in using criteria and instruments; they pilot and critique criteria and instruments; teams review outcomes and revise as necessary.
	Database of Examinations	Gather copies of specifications, papers, marking schemes for the year 2000 examinations, plus all analytical reports and detailed information about procedures used.
	Quality Review of Examinations	Conduct statistical review, content/skills review and question analysis. Prepare analytical report to Examinations Committee with detailed recommendations.
	Sample-Based National Assessment	Develop attainment targets and items. Pilot, calibrate and bank items.
	Evaluation of Impact of Reform	Gather data in grades 1, 4, 7 and 10; process data; prepare reports
	Self-Evaluation	No activity

3 (2001-2002)	Focus Groups	Ongoing as in year 1
	Setting Criteria	Inspectors, pedagogic counsellors begin applying criteria and instruments nationally; teams monitor application and if necessary further revise criteria and instruments
	Database of Examinations	Repeat Year 2 activity
	Quality Review of Examinations	Repeat Year 2 activity; also follow up implementation of previous recommendations
	Sample-Based National Assessment	Administer tests nationally, prepare and enter data; prepare analyses and reports. Develop, pilot, calibrate and bank additional items
	Evaluation of Impact of Reform	Gather data in grades 2, 5, 8 and 11; process data; prepare reports
	Self-Evaluation	No activity
4 (2002-2003)	Focus Groups	Ongoing as in year 1
	Setting Criteria	Ongoing application
	Database of Examinations	Repeat Year 2 activity
	Quality Review of Examinations	Ongoing
	Sample-Based National Assessment	Develop, pilot, calibrate and bank additional items
	Evaluation of Impact of Reform	Gather data in grades 3, 6, 9 and 12; process data; prepare reports
	Self-Evaluation	Review achievements of the unit; gather feedback from stakeholders; prepare evaluative report, draft strategic plan, staffing plan, revised mission statement, job descriptions. Submit to CNRDP Board
5 (2003-2004)	Focus Groups	Ongoing as in year 1
	Setting Criteria	Ongoing application
	Database of Examinations	Repeat Year 2 activity; prepare evaluative report on the development of examinations over project period, using comparative data from the database.
	Quality Review of Examinations	Ongoing
	Sample-Based National Assessment	Draw tests for second national administration; administer tests, prepare and enter data; prepare analyses and reports. Develop, pilot, calibrate and bank additional items
	Evaluation of Impact of Reform	Prepare final comprehensive report. Hold national conference to review evaluation and prepare plan for further development of the reform
	Self-Evaluation	No activity

7. MODALITIES OF EXECUTION

Executing agencies: The CNRDP will be responsible for implementation of the sub-project. A steering or coordinating committee will be established for each major activity, with a staff member of the Evaluation Unit as its secretary where appropriate. The steering or coordinating committee will implement the activity either through existing committees such as the CNRDP examinations subject committees, or by establishing a sub-committee. The CNRDP Bureau de Recherche and Evaluation Unit will provide specialist technical expertise where required.

Project oversight and policy setting: Overall responsibility for oversight of the proposed sub-project would be vested in the Minister of National Education, Youth

and Sport, who would be supported and advised in this by the President of the CNRDP and the Director-General of the DGEN.

Project coordination: Each activity will have its own steering committee or coordinating committee. Overall coordination will be carried out through the PIU.

Accounting, financial reporting and auditing arrangements: The PIU will establish a system of accounting and financial reporting that maintains records and accounts acceptable to the Bank, and will maintain a consolidated account of all resources and expenditures under the sub-project. Under the supervision of the PIU, each implementing agency will maintain a set of records reflecting the resources and expenditures related to project implementation for their respective programs. These accounts will be audited annually by private independent auditors satisfactory to the Bank, and a certified copy of the agreed audit reports submitted to the Bank no later than six months after the end of each calendar year.

Monitoring and evaluation arrangements: Project implementation will be regularly monitored by the Office of General Inspection, which will carry out beneficiary surveys and field impact evaluations as an input to project monitoring. Quarterly and annual progress reports for this purpose will be produced by the project executing agencies. The PIU will produce consolidated quarterly and annual progress reports for the sub-project as a whole. World Bank supervision missions will take place at least half-annually, with intensive implementation support, especially in year one. A comprehensive mid-term review will be carried out not more than thirty months after loan effectiveness. An Implementation Completion Report to be prepared jointly by the CNRDP and the World Bank no later than six months after the closing date. The annual quality reviews carried out by the CNRDP Evaluation Unit will also contribute to the mid-term review and the Implementation Completion Report. In addition, the CNRDP Evaluation Unit will prepare a report on the Examinations Database and the changes seen in it during the project period, as an input to the Implementation Completion Report.

8. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

8.1 Present Institutional Framework

CNRDP has an Evaluation Unit within its Bureau de Recherche. This has only one permanent staff member, the unit head. In addition, there is a seven-member *ad-hoc* Evaluation Commission which has to this point primarily been concerned with student evaluation.

8.2 Measures Required for Project Execution

The CNRDP will need to appoint a sufficient number of staff to enable the unit to carry out its functions. It is envisaged that the staff of the unit will consist of a unit head, up to five specialists, one field research coordinator and up to eight researchers. In addition, there should be at least two clerical staff, two computer operators, and two general support staff, plus at least ten computers and associated equipment. In the first instance, the staff may be appointed on contract; but at least the core staff (unit head, specialists and field research coordinator) should be

appointed to the permanent staff of the CNRDP within three years of the beginning of the project.

In the longer term, CNRDP will need to determine whether the Evaluation Unit should remain within the Bureau de Recherche, as at present, or become a special unit reporting directly to the CNRDP President, perhaps as a step on the way to becoming a full Bureau within the Center.

A sufficient budget will also be needed to cover the program of evaluation activities to be undertaken by the Unit during the project period. Estimates of local costs are given below. In the first instance, these local costs may be funded from the project; but by the time of the mid-term review, firm plans should have been made for sustainable funding for the Evaluation Unit, and activity in the second half of the project should be adjusted accordingly.

9. ESTIMATED COSTS

Cost estimates by category and year for the life of the project.

	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04
National Consultancy	12,000	39,000	21,000	9,000	12,000
International Consultancy	42,800	170,200	131,400	49,800	49,800
Overseas Training	48,000	24,000	72,000	-	-
Study Tours	56,000	-	-	-	-
In-Country Training	-	10,000	-	-	-
Hardware and Software	35,000	10,000	-	-	-
CNRDP staff (\$)	47,988	55,986	47,988	57,319	47,988
Committees (\$)	222,611	322,586	269,266	218,612	115,971
Computing and clerical (\$)	2,000	12,500	18,500	9,500	18,500
Travel Allowances (\$)	8,000	4,800	4,800	6,400	4,800
Materials (\$)	2,000	31,600	46,000	26,000	30,500
Total	471,999	662,072	596,754	371,231	274,159

10. INDICATORS

10.1 Staff Appointed and Trained

Indicator	Means of Verification
5 CNRDP personnel trained in planning, implementing and reporting stakeholder consultation activities by June 2001.	Project progress reports Disbursement reports Course evaluation reports Muhafazat reports on local training
1 CNRDP staff member trained in maintaining and using examinations database by June 2001.	
40 CNRDP full-time and temporary personnel trained in setting evaluation criteria and designing inspection instruments by June 2001.	
100 MENJS inspectors and pedagogic counsellors trained in the use of the evaluation criteria and instruments by June 2002.	
3 CNRDP permanent staff plus 5 Evaluation Commission members trained in designing, managing and implementing sample-based national assessment by June 2004.	
40 Subject Committee members trained in criterion-referenced item writing by June 2004.	
3 permanent and 30 temporary CNRDP staff trained in evaluation instrument design, piloting, administration and processing by June 2004.	

10.2 Products

Indicator	Means of Verification
Feedback reports from focus groups about stakeholders' views on key issues produced, the first set by June 2001.	Project progress reports Disbursement reports External qualitative evaluations Feedback gathered by Evaluation Unit from local coordinators, teachers, pedagogic counselors, inspectorate
A standard set of criteria and instruments developed by which school management, teaching methodology (including lesson planning) and school buildings and facilities can be judged by June 2001.	
Inspection data for wider use in developing a database of inspection reports and ultimately contributing to status reports on Lebanese education gathered, the first set by June 2002.	
Baseline of current examinations practice established by June 2000.	
Comprehensive analysis and review of developments in public examinations carried out by June 2004.	
First analytical report on examinations including statistical review, content/skills review and question analysis, with recommendations submitted to examinations committee produced by December 2000, and annually thereafter.	
Item banks in four subjects (mathematics, Arabic, science, French) consisting of at least 500 items covering all major attainment targets in grades 1-6 prepared by June 2001, and further developed thereafter.	
Sample-based national assessment in 4 subjects (Arabic, mathematics, science, French) carried out by June 2002, reported by December 2002, and repeated by June 2004.	
Evaluative reports prepared on the reform as a whole and specifically the curricula, instructional materials, teaching methodology and student assessment instruments developed. Reports on grades 1, 4, 7 and 10 will be produced by June 2001, on grades 2, 5, 8 and 11 by June 2002 and on grades 3, 6, 9 and 12 by June 2003. A final report will be produced by June 2004.	
National Conference to prepare plans for further development of the reform held by June 2004.	
Evaluative review of the achievements of the Evaluation Unit with a draft strategic plan, staffing plan etc. submitted to the CNRDP Board by June 2003.	

11. CONDITIONS, RISKS, ASSUMPTIONS AND SUSTAINABILITY

11.1 Conditions Necessary for Project Implementation

- CNRDP Evaluation Unit created and staff appointed by June 2000. Permanent staff appointed by June 2003.
- Government contribution to local costs of activities defined before project effectiveness.

11.2 Risk Analysis

Risk	Rating	Minimization Measure
Evaluation Unit does not become an established CNRDP Department	Low	MENJS/CNRDP to establish Unit before project effectiveness; make a commitment by mid-term review to appoint permanent staff
Resources for local costs of activities are not forthcoming	Moderate	MENJS to commit contribution to local costs of project; project to include allowance for local costs
Resources for ongoing activities are not forthcoming after project ends	Moderate	Discuss long-term budget at mid-term review; link further activities to long-term financing
Excessive use of temporary and part-time expertise limits impact on institution building	Moderate	Increase no. of CNRDP permanent staff. Maximize their role in activities and committees
Lack of trust among stakeholders leads to poor quality information	Low	National publicity for activities; CNRDP, MENJS seen to respond positively to stakeholder concerns
System fails to respond to stakeholders' expressed concerns	Low	Senior management to follow up response to expressed concerns
New evaluation criteria are not applied consistently	Moderate	Quality review; in-service training
Quality review (e.g., new criteria, national assessment) seen as designed to punish not help	Moderate	Publicity, follow up application to ensure constructive use.
Impact evaluation and quality review of examinations not responded to centrally	Low	Follow up response at mid-term review stage

11.3 Likely Sustainability

The sub-project will deliver comprehensive capacity building, and an initial program of activities relevant to the intended role of the Unit. Long-term sustainability will depend on three main factors:

- institutionalization of the Evaluation Unit within CNRDP, with permanent staff;
- an adequate budget for activities; and
- development of a mission statement, strategic plan and job descriptions for the Unit, which are agreed by the CNRDP Board of Directors.

ANNEXES