

EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation Criteria/Sub-criterion	Evaluation Scope	Method
1. Relevance		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consistency with the national development strategy ii. Consistency with ADB's assistance strategy iii. Project justification iv. Appropriateness of the design and financing instruments to the development problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of national government's development plan/strategy, including in the education sector ▪ Ownership and commitment of leaderships in government and project institutions ▪ Analysis of ADB's institutional objectives and strategies, sector strategy, and the Indonesia Country Program Strategy ▪ Degree of coordination and/or complementarity with development partners ▪ Adequacy of the assessment of problems, opportunities and lessons at the time of approval ▪ Analysis of the project logic, activity sequencing, project complexity, project feasibility and implementability, risk identification and mitigation, implementation period ▪ Extent to which project design adopted the correct solution for the identified problem ▪ Appropriateness of the investment modality compared with available options 	<p>Review documentation – RRP, PCR, BTORs, papers</p> <p>Interviews with ADB staff, Government officials in Jakarta and different regions (includes MONE officials), beneficiaries, and key donors</p>
2. Effectiveness		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Achievement by the Project of its targets ii. Factors contributing to the success/failure of the Project iii. Factors contributing to the timeliness/delays in project implementation iv. Changes in scope and/or implementation arrangement v. Implementation arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of project outputs and outcome ▪ Identification and analysis of any unanticipated effects of the Project ▪ Analysis of problems affecting project success/failure and project implementation and their resolution ▪ Assessment of the response of the Government and project-assisted institutions to the financial crisis, timing of component implementation, and public awareness and support obtained ▪ Analysis of the reason(s) for the change(s) ▪ Assessment of the effect(s) of the change(s) on project outcome 	<p>Review documentation including budget papers</p> <p>Interviews with ADB, Government officials, and key donors in Jakarta</p> <p>Interviews with beneficiaries</p> <p>Results of Survey</p>
3. Efficiency		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Achievement of the justification for government intervention, e.g., efficiency and equity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ System efficiency, e.g. graduation rate, progression rate, employment rate, and length of time to find jobs and the relationship between employment and professional training 	<p>Review documentation – annual budget papers, project report, consultants'</p>

Evaluation Criteria/Sub-criterion	Evaluation Scope	Method
ii. Achievement of the economic benefits at least cost	received <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of benefits achieved and reasons behind any deviation from the targets, e.g. employment, capacity development ▪ Calculation of the EIRR or NPV with the discount rate at 12% ▪ Analysis of positive and negative externalities, unquantifiable costs and benefits ▪ Analysis of costs incurred and reasons for any deviation ▪ Analysis of unit costs across institutions, including utilization of project facilities 	reports, BTORs Interviews with Government officials, ADB staff Results of Survey
4. Sustainability		
i. Ownership and commitment of the leaders in government, project institutions and industries ii. Institutional capacity iii. Financial sustainability iv. Adequacy and appropriateness of policies and strategies, and the legal framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment of ownership and commitment of stakeholders in the changes brought about by the Project ▪ Assessment of government and private industry stakeholders in continuing their interaction that was facilitated, if not initiated, by the Project ▪ Assess the capacity of institutions and groups established by the Project to carry-out their Project-assisted regular activities, including academic and financial planning and implementation ▪ Assess cost recovery/financial sustainability measures adopted by project institutions and the Government for project-assisted activities, including operations and maintenance of equipment and cost of training materials ▪ Assess the demand for enrolment places in the project-assisted institutions ▪ Assess the demand or utilization of quality assurance mechanisms put into place by the Project ▪ Assess the appropriateness and adequacy of policies and regulations project-assisted and -established institutions to retain staff assisted by the Project and continue performing regular activities assisted by the Project, including budget allocations and academic personnel regulations 	Review documentation Interviews with ADB, Government officials, beneficiaries and key donors Review Annual Budget/Expenditures Review documentation – RRP, PCR, BTORs, papers Interviews with Government officials
5. Impact		
i. Impact on institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment of project impact on the engineering education system, e.g., quality assurance, institution-industry links, networking of institutions ▪ Assessment of project impact on project-assisted institutions, e.g. enrolment capacity, relevance and quality of programs, management 	

Evaluation Criteria/Sub-criterion	Evaluation Scope	Method
	capacity	
ii. Socioeconomic impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment of the Project's measures and impact in terms of the number, gender, geographical and income distribution, among others, of beneficiaries 	Review documentation – RRP, PCR, BTORs, papers
iii. Environmental impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment of the project's activities impact on the environment, e.g. civil works and conducting laboratory classes ▪ Assessment of environment-related project activities, e.g. waste disposal measures and awareness-raising activities in the project-assisted institutions 	Review key indicators Interviews with Government officials Expert opinion Results of Survey
6. ADB Performance		
i. Quality at entry ii. Quality of supervision iii. Quality of communication between ADB and the EA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of relevant economic literature and sector work, institutional and stakeholder analyses, incorporation of lessons identified ▪ Assessment of ADB supervision at various stages of the project cycle, including the resident mission's role and staff continuity ▪ Assessment of the coordination between ADB and the EA ▪ Assessment of the communication between ADB and the EA, including on procurement and disbursement matters ▪ Types of missions fielded, frequency of mission, mission expertise composition, length of mission (including field time) ▪ Project performance monitoring system 	Review documentation– RRP, PCR, BTORs, papers Interviews with ADB staff
7. Borrower Performance		
i. Quality at entry ii. Quality of implementation and supervision iii. Quality of communication between ADB and the EA iv. Adequacy of M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provision of counterpart personnel and counterpart resources during the PPTA and project implementation ▪ Compliance with loan covenants ▪ Assessment of government supervision at various stages of the project cycle, including the roles of the finance and/or planning ministry counterpart, the EA, the IA, the provincial governments and the PSC ▪ Adequacy of CPIU and LPIU staffing ▪ Assessment of the coordination and communication between ADB and the EA; EA and the IA; CPIU and LPIUs; and the CPIU, LPIU and the employers ▪ Assessment of the communication between ADB and the EA, including on procurement and disbursement matters ▪ Project performance monitoring and evaluation system 	Review documentation– RRP, PCR, BTORs, papers Interviews with ADB staff Interviews with Government officials