

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00097574
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Turkey's Engineer Girls
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2016-07-12 / 2021-12-31

**Strategic**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- 3: *The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

**Evidence:**

A wide variety of methods were put into practice with in the framework of the high school program. Different tools were developed, each application period was planned in a way that the participants were interactive. Within this scope several methods were implemented, and each implementation period was followed by evaluation reports whose recommendations were used as a guide for shaping the next period. This method has created the opportunity to respond to the changing needs of the field, to consider unforeseen effects, to manage risks, to maintain successful practices, to improve or develop implementation tools. As a result of these experience of different modalities, following intervention areas were identified as lessons learned of the high school program.

1. Increasing awareness of new approaches in the field of vocational guidance
2. Strengthening vocational guidance services in schools
3. Strengthening student, school and family cooperation in selection of profession
4. Providing equal opportunities for male and female students

Another example, the project responded immediately to the changes that occurred during the pandemic. We changed the modality for high school program and adapted to new pandemic conditions. Within the scope of high school program, we were carrying out some face-to-face activities like role model meetings, board games and trainings etc. With the effect of the pandemic, we moved all these activities to the online platform. And so we reached more people.

Role model meeting videos:

<https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLMMWe2IKjSPkcPuQmYsIFZWERy8tCBWPF>

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TMKProjesiLiseProgramıGenelDeğerlendirmeÖnerilerRaporu_11101_301">TMKProjesiLiseProgramıGenelDeğerlendirmeÖnerilerRaporu_11101_301</a> ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TMKProjesiLiseProgramıGenelDeğerlendirmeÖnerilerRaporu_11101_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TMKProjesiLiseProgramıGenelDeğerlendirmeÖnerilerRaporu_11101_301.pdf</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:05:00 AM

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- 3: *The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings<sup>1</sup> as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

**Evidence:**

The project responds to the following development setting: Eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions and the signature solution is strengthen genders equality and the empowerment of women and girls. It directly serves UNDP SP output 1.6.1 Country led measures accelerated to advance gender equality and women's empowerment and the output indicator 1.6.1.1 Number of key measures in place that set and monitor progress towards numeric targets for women's leadership in (b) the private sector.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Relevant**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- 3: *Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)*
- 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

The project team feedback from beneficiaries, including the main beneficiaries Ministry of Family and Social Services, Ministry of National Education and implementing partner and donor Limak. All important decisions are taken by Steering Committee members. Additionally, High school and university program are evaluated annually. The views of students who are benefiting from the mentorship of the program are also taken into consideration. They share their views about the mentorship program to the online platform which the project team regularly reads and takes stock of. With the feedback received from these meetings, a platform was created on internship and employment. <http://tmkariyer.com/> Additionally, feedback is also received from teachers who are part of the trainers to ameliorate the program activities. Within this scope several meetings were realized with project mentors and scholars to collect their suggestions for better implementation. Another novelty of the Project is that those students who have more disadvantaged backgrounds compared to the average are being given a chance in the program namely students of Syrian origin, the daughters of veterans and martyres and orphans. Additionally top universities are mostly excluded from the program. It is mostly the high achiever students of average universities in Turkey that are chosen as pilot universities to improve life chances of those female students with more humble origins.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 2: *Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)*
- 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

**Evidence:**

The project is generating knowledge and lessons learned and these are in fact being discussed in Steering Committee meetings and reflected into the project progress. All the lessons learned provide input to the reconstructed programs each year. New online modules for university programme were developed with one of local NGO namely Women in Technology to meet new needs of the scholars for 2020-2021 period. Rapid assessment was completed which is attached. The rapid assessment report has identified lessons learned during to whole implementation period.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EngineerGirlsofTurkeyProjectRapidAssessmentReport_11101_304">EngineerGirlsofTurkeyProjectRapidAssessmentReport_11101_304</a> ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EngineerGirlsofTurkeyProjectRapidAssessmentReport_11101_304">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EngineerGirlsofTurkeyProjectRapidAssessmentReport_11101_304</a> .docx)	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:21:00 AM

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- 2: *While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).*
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

**Evidence:**

The project has proved to be a well-planned and workable model to encourage STEM education in Turkey and has been replicated in Kuwait, a sister-project is being executed since 2017. Also, the EGT project have been replicated across the region where the UNDP is in operation including Uzbekistan, Macedonia and Moldova. A number of meetings were held to discuss the sustainability of the project and to evolve it into sustainable and independent platform. Several scenarios were developed for this future structure. One expert was required to develop business plans and search model for the future structure of the project. New project proposal is designed for the operationalization of this platform namely EGT 2.0 for promoting female students' participation in engineering professions, empowering female engineer students and transforming "Engineer Girls of Turkey" (EGT) into an independent and sustainable platform.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TMKSürdürülebilirlikNotu_Mart2021_Final_11101_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TMKSürdürülebilirlikNotu_Mart2021_Final_11101_305.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TMKSürdürülebilirlikNotu_Mart2021_Final_11101_305.docx</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:23:00 AM
2	EXTENDED SYNOPSIS TMKFINAL_11101_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EXTENDED SYNOPSIS TMKFINAL_11101_305.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EXTENDED SYNOPSIS TMKFINAL_11101_305.docx</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:23:00 AM

**Principled****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- 3:** *The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- 2:** The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 1:** The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

**Evidence:**

This is a GEN3 project which is based on promoting gender equality in the labor market for those professions that traditionally male dominated. The project will concentrate on developing a private sector led support program to promote female students' participation in engineering professions and empowering female engineering students. The long term expected impact of the project is to increase women's high-quality employment and advocate gender equality principles in the leading services and manufacturing sectors to improve inclusiveness of economic growth in a sustainable manner. In the project, gender mainstreaming activities are carried out with UNDP's Gender Equality Seal (GES) Program. First pilot program was carried out in Limak investment. After this experience same program was scaled up into additional 4 Limak tourism companies. With this momentum and experience, gender equality technical support programme was established within UNDP Turkey CO. Program has self-assessment and final assessment processes. So, the rate of improvement in terms of gender equality seal index at the firm level can be measured. Within the scope of the university programme; students in the electrical, electronics, industrial, construction, mechanical, computer and environmental engineering departments of state universities are provided scholarship, mentoring, internship opportunities, participation to the "Tool for Future" program, online English language course, employment in Limak and other organizations in the sector in the framework of needs. For high school students, 'Training of Trainers' program that addressed school counselors was carried out targeting gender-based factors that shape girls' selection of professions and gender-based prejudices in the work environment. An evaluation report is generated at the end of all interventions. Accordingly, improvements are made in line with the new needs of the project and beneficiaries. The total evaluation for year 2021 was made within the scope of the rapid assessment study.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	GESKitapçıkENG_Final_11101_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GESKitapçıkENG_Final_11101_306.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GESKitapçıkENG_Final_11101_306.pdf</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:26:00 AM

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

**Evidence:**

Project risks are routinely tracked in the risk log section of the progress reports. However, a SESP form for this project was not prepared back in 2016 so SESP risks are unfortunately not part of this risk log.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2020_11101_307 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2020_11101_307.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2020_11101_307.pdf</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:30:00 AM

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- 2: *Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.*
- 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

**Evidence:**

Evidence: For 2021, a rapid assessment study was conducted and it was based on in-depth interviews with teachers, mentors and students. In this sense, if there is any grievance or an amelioration needed, the team is able to identify every year with the evaluation report which is forward looking, in the sense that it identifies forecasts for the coming years. Another report called business alternatives for EGT 2.0 was benefited from in depth interviews with project beneficiaries

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Management & Monitoring**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

#### Evidence:

Please kindly find attached progress report and rapid assessment for lessons learned.  
Carried out under three components TMK achieved following accumulated results between 2016-2021.

University program;

- In total 560 engineer girls from 6 different engineering departments (electrical and electronic, industrial, civil, mechanical, environmental and computer engineering) were supported with scholarship programme that includes mentorship, training programme specifically developed for scholars, online English courses, internship and employment opportunities.
- 36 universities from 27 provinces were reached.
- 106 engineers graduated from the program
- 111 internship opportunities were created for project scholars.
- Mentor pool that includes more than 200 women engineers in respective engineering fields was created.
- One digital platform was developed in order to bring companies and engineer girls together for employment and internship opportunities.
- Five Annual Meetings in Istanbul were organized. Each year project scholars got together with their mentors, peers, coaches for 3 full days to enjoy keynote speeches, special training sessions, social events where they had a chance to bond and reflect. The meetings enabled the establishment of channels of communication, solidarity and empowerment, especially among young people.

High school program;

- 1 Training of trainers modality was developed t

o increase awareness of students, parents and teachers regarding the choice of profession and carrying out activities promoting the engineering profession. The programme covers educational content under three separate subjects for students, teachers and parents, an awareness-raising game called "Decision is Yours", virtual reality applications, seminars and role model meetings were delivered at every school.

- 1 board game called "Decision is Yours" was created in collaboration with METU Design Factory. Interdisciplinary team benefited from design thinking approach to develop this board game to showcase engineering decisions for high school students with practical tips. This board game was used in awareness raising events throughout the Project.

- In total 125 schools from 40 provinces were included in high school program.

- In total 135 students, 35 teachers and 56 parents were trained via direct training modality.

- In total 257 teachers out of which 50 were high school principals and 93 volunteer teachers, were trained via training of trainers modality.

- In total more than 50,000 high school students at various places in Turkey were reached via training of trainers modality.

- More than 50 face to face role model meetings were delivered in selected provinces to bring high school students together with experienced women engineers to share their experience, inspiring stories and to introduce them with different engineering departments.

- 6 online role model video contents were developed and published on project youtube channel to share inspiring stories and to introduce engineering departments.

- 1 digital platform was developed for students who study or plan to study in engineering departments which enables an interaction with project mentors and graduates to ask engineering related questions.

Lessons Learned from high school program:

A wide variety of methods were put into practice within the framework of the high school program. Different tools were developed, each application period was planned in a way that the participants were interactive. Within this scope several methods were implemented, and each implementation period was followed by evaluation reports whose recommendations were used as a guide for shaping the next period. This method has created the opportunity to respond to the changing needs of the field, to consider unforeseen effects, to manage risks, to maintain successful practices, to improve or develop implementation tools. As

a result of these experience of different modalities, following intervention areas were identified as lessons learned of the high school program.

1. Increasing awareness of new approaches in the field of vocational guidance
2. Strengthening vocational guidance services in schools
3. Strengthening student, school and family cooperation in selection of profession
4. Providing equal opportunities for male and female students

In gender mainstreaming program;

- 1 Gender Equality Seal Program Pilot Study was completed in one of Limak holding companies as a first implementation in Turkey and in CIS region. Carried out with the technical support of the UNDP, the programme started to implement the global standards for gender equality mainstreaming at corporate level. Thanks to this pilot study, the adaptation of the global tool was possible for Turkey. Focus group meetings, awareness raising training programs and self-assessment studies were carried out and inclusive management practices were applied with high level commitment from management and staff.
- 2 different equality committees were established to lead Gender Equality mainstreaming studies within the companies and successful implementation processes are still ongoing.
- In total 5 companies (4 tourism, 1 investment) participated to UNDP Gender Equality Seal Programme where all processes and results were presented and approved/endorsed by Limak Holding management.
- Complementary gender equality mainstreaming studies/activities/training programs were carried out within this component.

TMK also carried out analysis studies throughout the implementation period and developed several knowledge products to transfer knowledge and experience in order to support and guide ongoing and future initiatives.

- "Equality in Engineering: Engineer Girls of Turkey Experience" report was prepared with the aim of ensuring the comprehension of the model in which the inclusive development and growth perspective is put into action.
- Rapid assessment report was developed to demonstrate the alignment of the project activities of the TMK between 2015-2020 with the global goals and to showcase intervention impact on beneficiaries as well as to reflect the effect of success stories and

women's empowerment, gender equality mainstreaming processes. Same report proposed recommendations for sustainability.

- Within the university and high school programmes, each year internal evaluation reports were developed with expert support. According to findings and recommendations necessary actions were taken and revisions were made for implementation of the activities.
- The vocational guidance handbook for the training of trainers program was developed within the high school program.
- Overall Evaluation and Suggestion Report for high school program was developed. And possible intervention areas were identified as lessons learned.

Progress reports were prepared each year as indicated in project document. A risk to the sustainability of the project was identified in the 2019 processing report. Thereupon, the project was amended for one more year in order to carry out the sustainability studies of the project. As part of these studies, a new project proposal was designed to transform the project into a sustainable platform.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2017_11101_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2017_11101_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2017_11101_309.pdf</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:39:00 AM
2	101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2018_11101_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2018_11101_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2018_11101_309.pdf</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:40:00 AM
3	101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2019_11101_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2019_11101_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2019_11101_309.pdf</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:40:00 AM
4	101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2020_11101_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2020_11101_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/101250-TMK-AnnualProgressReport-2020_11101_309.pdf</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:40:00 AM
5	EngineerGirlsofTurkeyProjectRapidAssesmentReport_11101_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EngineerGirlsofTurkeyProjectRapidAssesmentReport_11101_309.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EngineerGirlsofTurkeyProjectRapidAssesmentReport_11101_309.docx</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:40:00 AM
6	EngineerGirlsofTurkeyPhaseIIProjectDocument_Signed_11101_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EngineerGirlsofTurkeyPhaseIIProjectDocument_Signed_11101_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EngineerGirlsofTurkeyPhaseIIProjectDocument_Signed_11101_309.pdf</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:41:00 AM

10. Was the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- 3: *The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

**Evidence:**

Project Steering Committee is composed of Ministry of Family, Social Services, Ministry of National Education, Presidency of Strategy and Budget Office, Limak and UNDP and the meetings were held on each year. The Steering Committee regularly reviews the progress reports attached and uses the evidence as a basis for management decisions.

Please find attached all progress reports in the previous question.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes02122016_11101_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes02122016_11101_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes02122016_11101_310.docx</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:43:00 AM
2	EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes08022017_11101_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes08022017_11101_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes08022017_11101_310.docx</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:43:00 AM
3	EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes20.06.2019_11101_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes20.06.2019_11101_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes20.06.2019_11101_310.docx</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:44:00 AM
4	EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes03112020_11101_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes03112020_11101_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingNotes03112020_11101_310.docx</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:44:00 AM
5	ENG_EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingMinutes29092021_11101_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ENG_EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingMinutes29092021_11101_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ENG_EGTProjectSteeringCommitteeMeetingMinutes29092021_11101_310.docx</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:44:00 AM

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

**Evidence:**

The project has monitored risks annually. The risk log is reflected into progress reports attached above.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Efficient**

**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

The project was amended once without budget increase to conduct sustainability studies of the project. Since the project has adequate funds, no budget increase has been made.

A number of meetings were held to discuss the sustainability of the project and to evolve it into sustainable and independent platform. Several scenarios were developed for this future structure. One expert was required to develop business plans and search model for the future structure of the project. Expert submitted findings and a new project designed according to project's sustainability studies.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

**Evidence:**

The project has an updated procurement plan and monitoring the plan regularly in close coordination with the Portfolio Administrator, Portfolio Manager and the procurement unit and takes measures to catch up with the timeline of the plan.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- 3: *There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)*
- 2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

**Evidence:**

The project team regularly review its cost in close coordination with the other ongoing projects within the ISG Portfolio. Since all procurement activities are reviewed by the ISG Portfolio Administrator, complementarity among all ongoing projects under ISG portfolio is ensured.

Finally, the cost of the project assistant mobilized for this project is being shared with another UNDP initiative to maximize cost efficiency.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- Yes  
 No

**Evidence:**

The project did not define clear targets as to how many students to reach at the start of the project. The project is aiming incremental progress in numbers according to the means and capacities of the project team and new partnerships forged. The sole exception is the scholarship program where the money allocated for the scholarships and the number of beneficiaries are known in advance which stands at in total 560 engineer girls.

The mentorship program is based on empowering those female engineering students whereas the number of teachers trained, and the number of high school students reached are not pre-determined in this project. The project is on track to deliver its expected outputs and takes necessary measures to catch up with the time plan with high quality deliverables. In 2020 progress report, lack of additional fund for the new structure of project was identified. Thus, project proposals were developed and submitted to the potential donors. The project team regularly informs the stakeholders about the delivery of outputs and updates its delivery plan when necessary.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ISG_Proposal_EngineerGirlsofTurkey2.0_11101_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ISG_Proposal_EngineerGirlsofTurkey2.0_11101_315.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ISG_Proposal_EngineerGirlsofTurkey2.0_11101_315.docx</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 9:59:00 AM
2	ISG_Proposal_EngineerGirlsofTurkey2.0_April2021_v2_11101_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ISG_Proposal_EngineerGirlsofTurkey2.0_April2021_v2_11101_315.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ISG_Proposal_EngineerGirlsofTurkey2.0_April2021_v2_11101_315.docx</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 10:00:00 AM

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- 2: *There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.*
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

**Evidence:**

Progress data prepared yearly for MoFSS. The project team prepared progress reports on yearly basis to review the work plan and present them to the stakeholders. Lessons learned are reflected into these reports to increase efficiency and necessary budget revisions are made in accordance with the decisions taken in the Steering Committee.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

The project engages with high school and university students which cannot be considered marginalized or excluded. However, in terms of engagement and participation, there is solid give and take between project team and the students as well as the Ministry. Feedback is also received from teachers who are part of the trainers to ameliorate the program activities. Several meetings were realized with mentors and students of the program on how to better link students with internship and employment opportunities for instance. The views of students who are benefiting from the mentorship of the program are also taken into consideration. They write their views about the mentorship program to our online platform which the project team regularly reads and takes stock of. Additionally, those students who have more disadvantaged backgrounds compared to the average are being given a chance in the program namely students of Syrian origin, the daughters of veterans and martyres and orphans. Top universities are mostly excluded from the program. It is mostly the high achiever students of average universities in Turkey that are chosen as pilot universities to improve life chances of those female students with more humble origins.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Sustainability & National Ownership**

**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

All relevant stakeholders are actively engaged in the project implementation, monitoring and decision making. This has been ensured with regular coordination meetings, regular e-mails and Steering Committee meetings, etc. All decisions are taken in Steering Committee and Project stakeholders are regularly updated and informed through reports, regular progress reports, etc to ensure timely monitoring. LIMAK also has a responsible party agreement with Women in Technology Foundation which carries the "Tool for Future" training program for project scholars. UNDP has a contract with Öğretmen Akademisi Vakfı (Teachers' Academy Foundation) which carries the ToT trainings as well as trainings with high school students. While the project is a NIM project, the systems used to procure, monitor as well as implementation of activities resides with UNDP.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements<sup>8</sup> adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable*

**Evidence:**

N/A

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)*
- 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

**Evidence:**

Based on the experience and success of the project; the Steering Committee decided to kick off another project with an increased focus to sustainability.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	EngineerGirlsofTurkeyPhaseIIProjectDocument_Signed_11101_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EngineerGirlsofTurkeyPhaseIIProjectDocument_Signed_11101_320.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EngineerGirlsofTurkeyPhaseIIProjectDocument_Signed_11101_320.pdf</a> )	pinar.engin@undp.org	1/18/2022 10:05:00 AM

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**