

## **CHAPTER IV: LESSON LEARNT, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION.**

### **4.1. Introduction**

This chapter looks into the lessons that have been drawn from the study in general and from specific activities in particular. It further gives recommendations for the way forward and finally gives a general conclusion for the report.

### **4.2. Lessons Learnt**

The following were the lessons learnt arising from evaluating the capacity built during NIPDEP:

- (1) The emphasis on hands on learning with aspects and documents which spiced the training, as theory, proved beneficial because the trainees gained confidence in whatever they were doing. Furthermore, the trainees were implementing the activities with a significant degree of certainty. Besides, the trainees had time to reflect on what they had learned and documented. Actually trainees had time to reflect, liaise with the NIPDEP team members and core trainers as to how best to advance implementation whilst having time to ponder what the ground situation dictated. Thus, capacity development should be advanced from two fronts, namely theory and practice if it is to leave a mark amongst trainees. Otherwise practical learning without backing theory can easily lead to frustration and disaster; likewise theory without practice can not make any difference when training is offered to employees who are already working in a particular mode and fashion.
- (2) The use of core trainers and national trainers under PMT (largely the DEM) was practical because it minimized time wastage in a number of cases and provide a "true" cascade training approach. For example, the districts were able to solicit the views of the DEM and DPD, thereafter proceed with their activity. It may be recognized that this system was not fully appreciated where the DEM and DPD were weak because it negatively affected progress in terms of time management and overall implementation;
- (3) It was observed that there was need for more time when it came to DEP preparation in order to allow districts to complete their first draft and offer better understanding of the issues such as activity budget since a number of the participants, mainly among the non-pilot districts, were new;
- (4) Continuity of the same personnel in reviewing and updating DEPs and implementing them is critical if capacity building is to be fully realized. On the

other hand pilot districts showed that the period for familiarizing and enabling change to take hold must not be underestimated because people have different levels of understanding mainly when activities being pursued are new or not of the usual and obvious type;

- (5) Limiting trainees to those directly in district education activities reinforced the possibility of updating the content in the context of local needs and bringing forth ownership of the DEPs. The continued pairing of DEM and DA proved useful and fruitful because the two complemented each other in understanding education and financial issues;
- (6) Training materials should address key areas that will be practiced comprehensively and should be, as much as possible, in a written format as handouts. Otherwise, trainers have to be forewarned to make a thorough oral presentation of the area of coverage although with adult learners this approach may prove problematic as many of the trainees rely on the written materials given in advance for reference during the actual implementation; and
- (7) The survey used for evaluating capacity development was not exhaustive; therefore it did not capture all, if not most of, the different aspects that could have influenced the results. Thus there is need for a capacity building evaluation mechanism to try to be comprehensive when addressing issues that are not confined/controlled. Specifically, in addition to the questionnaire and interviews based on the same questionnaire, there is need for observation of ex-participants at work based on a checklist and trying to assess real life assignments in relation to the training they underwent.

#### **4.3. Recommendations**

The following recommendations arise from the capacity building evaluation:

- (1) The capacity development (training) which this project followed, like any other training intended to promote decentralization, should be directly linked with other institutional training strategies or national ones. For example there was need for the NIPDEP training to be taken practically as one or part of the normal decentralization capacity building exercise by Local Government. Thus there is need for the Malawi Government to explicitly define its training policy with regard to decentralization so that whoever wishes to assist or/and to execute any training programme should follow certain procedures and be assured of the continuity of trainees to the end once inducted, areas for training and any other factors that may be taken as critical for the success of such training. In turn, the direct association of pilot training, such as NIPDEP training, with the main stream ones would result in

trainees taking it seriously; therefore reducing absconding, absenteeism or delegation;

- (2) Continuation of formatted materials and use of practical lessons such as pilot projects should be the order of the day in all capacity development projects because they improve understanding and have a likelihood of giving high returns to skill acquisition and its retention. However, emphasis on practical lessons should have a proviso for the trainees, who have undergone training from the beginning, and trainers to meet and exchange experiences and views of what they are undergoing at reasonably defined intervals to safeguard both parties (trainees and trainers) from laxity;
- (3) The core trainers, as trainers of trainees, should be actively involved in training by being part of a monitoring/evaluation team through providing assessment reports of district teams and selected individuals such as DPDs, DEMs and DoF as the key players in the decentralization process; and
- (4) A more comprehensive method of evaluating capacity building should be advanced, however such a method should not lose sight of the current one of self-assessment, which was used in this evaluation. The self-assessment should be an "entry point" for determining the type and level of difficulty of specific courses. The other factors which should be taken into account are: actual work related assignments or day to day core work such as project preparation, team work, financial management and others, which can reinforce the theory, use of monitors, such as core trainers, who should base their assessment of capacity development in the field on checklists set by the personnel who design the training and a variety of practical work/pilot projects therein (training, procurement, awareness campaigns and construction).

The evaluation survey has given us an apparent indication that the NIPDEP project partially fulfilled its mandate of capacity development. However, it has also shown us that the full picture of such capacity building to be fully revealed there was need for a more comprehensive survey which should have looked at other intervening factors in addition to systematic observations of the ex-participants.

#### **4.4: Final Remarks**

Overall, this evaluation shows that capacity was developed in both pilot and non-pilot districts through NIPDEP activities although we may argue otherwise, In fact it is the completion of most, if not all, pilot projects and the updating (review and revision) of DEP which reflect that capacity building, at least, took place in all thirty three districts. In addition, the anecdotes from the districts reflected how NIPDEP was changing officers' work ethics for the better. Finally, the INSET, which took place in pilot districts, were also part of district capacity development.

Whether we deploy and/or employ "experts" to evaluate capacity development, in future, we should design and use instruments which will capture objective issues.

Critical examination of the attendance of participants, the procedures used to assess the capacity building process and the results of the survey shows that more has to be done for us to state with authority whether capacity building was completely successful or not. Furthermore there is need for us to move away from generalizations and move towards specifying who should be trained, why, on what, where, how and when. It can be argued that why, in this evaluation, is answered by the fact that a new issue/concept known as decentralization has been introduced in Malawi; therefore, what needs to be addressed are specifics on what to prepare, where to prepare and how to prepare an appropriate training.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix I A. Sample of pilot district questionnaire**

**NIPDEP QUESTIONNAIRE ON  
PLANNING, MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION CAPACITY  
OF THE EDUCATION OFFICERS**

This questionnaire intends to assess your own knowledge and capability and PMT/TF capacity for the following duties and skills. The purpose of this questionnaire survey is to find out whether capacity building is taking place in the district.

Please evaluate your own knowledge and capacity and PMT/TF performance for each of the duties and skills listed below and tick one of the scores from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_ **District:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Your Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Male** /

**Female**

**Your Position:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Your Role in the NIPDEP Project:**

**PMT:** \_\_\_\_\_ **TF:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>I. YOUR OWN CAPACITY IN PILOT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</b>		No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>1. Detailed Planning</b>						
1-1	Preparation of project proposals (profiles)	1	2	3	4	5
1-2	Planning of operation structures	1	2	3	4	5
1-3	Preparation of activity plans and timelines	1	2	3	4	5
1-4	Detailed budget plans	1	2	3	4	5
1-5	Monitoring and reporting	1	2	3	4	5
1-6	Evaluation	1	2	3	4	5
<b>2. Implementation of INSET</b>						
2-1	Needs assessment	1	2	3	4	5
2-2	Formulation of training program	1	2	3	4	5
2-3	Implementation of training	1	2	3	4	5
2-4	Follow-up and evaluation	1	2	3	4	5
<b>3. Implementation of procurement</b>						
3-1	Needs assessment	1	2	3	4	5
3-2	Selection of target schools and site survey	1	2	3	4	5
3-3	Bidding and selection of suppliers	1	2	3	4	5
3-4	Community mobilization	1	2	3	4	5
3-5	Follow-up and evaluation	1	2	3	4	5
<b>4. Implementation of construction</b>						

4-1	Needs assessment	1	2	3	4	5
4-2	Selection of target schools and site survey	1	2	3	4	5
4-3	Bidding and selection of contractors/suppliers	1	2	3	4	5
4-4	Community mobilization	1	2	3	4	5
4-5	Follow-up and evaluation	1	2	3	4	5

<b>II. PMT/TF PERFORMANCE</b>	<u>No</u> <u>improve-</u> <u>ment</u>	←-----→	<u>Greatly</u> <u>improved</u>
-------------------------------	---	---------	-----------------------------------

<b>5. PMT/TF performance has been improved through implementing NIPDEP Pilot Project Phase I?</b>						
5-1	PMT leadership/coordination	1	2	3	4	5
5-2	TF project planning capability	1	2	3	4	5
5-3	TF project implementation capability	1	2	3	4	5
5-4	TF key person's leadership/coordination	1	2	3	4	5
5-5	TF team work	1	2	3	4	5
5-6	TF financial management and transparency	1	2	3	4	5
5-7	Community involvement in the pilot project	1	2	3	4	5
5-8	Social awareness of the NIPDEP project	1	2	3	4	5
5-9	Core trainers' guidance/coordination	1	2	3	4	5
5-10	NIPDEP study team guidance/coordination	1	2	3	4	5
5-11	Project reporting	1	2	3	4	5

<b>III. GENERAL QUESTIONS ON YOUR PROJECT MANAGEMENT CAPABILITY</b>	<u>No</u> <u>improve-</u> <u>ment</u>	←-----→	<u>Greatly</u> <u>improved</u>
---	---	---------	-----------------------------------

<b>6. In general, our capability for the following activities has been build through NIPDEP Pilot Project Phase I? How do you personally evaluate?</b>						
6-1	Data collection and management	1	2	3	4	5
6-2	Planning	1	2	3	4	5
6-3	Project implementation	1	2	3	4	5
6-4	Monitoring	1	2	3	4	5
6-5	Budgeting and financial management	1	2	3	4	5
6-6	Evaluation of outputs and outcomes	1	2	3	4	5
6-7	Facilitation and coordination	1	2	3	4	5
6-8	Sensitization and mobilization of community members	1	2	3	4	5
6-9	Report preparation	1	2	3	4	5

<b>IV. EDUCATION SERVICES IN YOUR DISTRICT</b>	<u>No</u> <u>improve-</u> <u>ment</u>	←-----→	<u>Greatly</u> <u>improved</u>
--	---	---------	-----------------------------------

<b>7. The education services in your district has been improved during NIPDEP Pilot Project Phase I?</b>						
7-1	Supervision and coordination by DEM office	1	2	3	4	5
7-2	Information flow to and from the DEM office	1	2	3	4	5

7-3	Supervision by PEAs	1	2	3	4	5
7-4	School committee involvement in school management	1	2	3	4	5
7-5	Communication between stakeholders and district	1	2	3	4	5
7-6	Communication between schools and zones	1	2	3	4	5
7-7	Communication between zones and district	1	2	3	4	5
7-8	Communication between district and division	1	2	3	4	5
7-9	Communication between district and MoEST HQs	1	2	3	4	5
7-10	Communication between DEM and DA	1	2	3	4	5
<b>V. DEVELOPMENT IN YOUR DISTRICT</b>		<u>Strongly disagree</u>	←-----→			<u>Strongly agree</u>
<b>8. How do you assess the development projects in your district?</b>						
8-1	Projects are planned based on local needs.	1	2	3	4	5
8-2	Projects are planned based on DEP.	1	2	3	4	5
8-3	Projects contribute to education development.	1	2	3	4	5
8-4	DDF is effectively utilized in education development.	1	2	3	4	5
8-5	DEP is effective in implementing DDF	1	2	3	4	5
8-6	Stakeholders are involved in project planning.	1	2	3	4	5
8-7	Stakeholders are involved in project implementation.	1	2	3	4	5
8-8	Stakeholders have ownership of the projects.	1	2	3	4	5
8-9	Information on development projects (by district/ government/donor/NGOs) is well provided.	1	2	3	4	5
8-10	Project funds are properly accounted for.	1	2	3	4	5
8-11	Projects are implemented in a transparent manner	1	2	3	4	5

A. Do you enjoy participating in the NIPDEP pilot project?

1. Yes      2. No.

If "yes", please describe which part of the NIPDEP pilot project does interest you.

If "no", please describe why.

B. What are the good points of the NIPDEP pilot project?

C. What are the constraints of the NIPDEP pilot project?

D. How do you expect the NIPDEP pilot project to change yourself or your community?

E. How do you (or your community) expect to sustain the NIPDEP pilot projects?

F. What attributes can you share with the other members of the project? How can you share them?

**Thank you for your cooperation.  
NIPDEP Study Team.**

**B. Sample of non-pilot district questionnaire**

**NIPDEP QUESTIONNAIRE ON  
PLANNING, MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION CAPACITY  
OF THE OFFICERS UPDATING DEPs**

This questionnaire intends to assess your own knowledge, capability, and capacity for the following duties and skills. The purpose of this questionnaire survey is to find out whether capacity building is taking place in the district.

Please evaluate your own knowledge, capacity and performance for each of the duties and skills listed below and tick one of the scores from 1 (No skill) to 5 (Excellent).

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_ **District:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Your Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Male / Female:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Your Position:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>I. YOUR OWN CAPACITY IN DEP PREPARATION, UPDATING AND MARKETING</b>		No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>1. Collection and handling of education data:</b>						
1-1	Understanding of education data and indicators	1	2	3	4	5
1-2	Data collection	1	2	3	4	5
1-3	Data usage	1	2	3	4	5
1-4	Data management and updating	1	2	3	4	5
<b>2. DEPs Preparation and Updating:</b>						
2-1	Understanding of objectives and roles of DEPs	1	2	3	4	5
2-2	Formulation of policy objectives and strategies	1	2	3	4	5
2-3	Selection of indicators and targets	1	2	3	4	5
2-4	Budgeting	1	2	3	4	5
2-5	Preparation of implementation plan	1	2	3	4	5
<b>3. Marketing of DEPs</b>						
3-1	Planning of DEPs marketing activities	1	2	3	4	5
3-2	Preparation of project proposals	1	2	3	4	5
3-3	Marketing and negotiation with government/districts/donors/NGOs	1	2	3	4	5
<b>II. YOUR OWN CAPACITY IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</b>		No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>4. Detailed Planning</b>						
4-1	Preparation of project proposals (profiles)	1	2	3	4	5
4-2	Planning of operation structures	1	2	3	4	5
4-3	Preparation of activity plans and timelines	1	2	3	4	5
4-4	Detailed budget plans	1	2	3	4	5
4-5	Monitoring and reporting	1	2	3	4	5
4-6	Evaluation	1	2	3	4	5





9-5	Communication between stakeholders and district	1	2	3	4	5
9-6	Communication between schools and zones	1	2	3	4	5
9-7	Communication between zones and district	1	2	3	4	5
9-8	Communication between district and division	1	2	3	4	5
9-9	Communication between district and MoEST HQs	1	2	3	4	5
9-10	Communication between DEM and DA	1	2	3	4	5

<b>V. DEVELOPMENT IN YOUR DISTRICT</b>		<u>Strongly disagree</u>	←-----→			<u>Strongly agree</u>
<b>10. How do you assess the development projects in your district?</b>						
10-1	Projects are planned based on local needs.	1	2	3	4	5
10-2	Projects are planned based on DEP.	1	2	3	4	5
10-3	Projects contribute to education development.	1	2	3	4	5
10-4	DDF is effectively utilized in education development.	1	2	3	4	5
10-5	DEP is effective in implementing DDF	1	2	3	4	5
10-6	Stakeholders are involved in project planning.	1	2	3	4	5
10-7	Stakeholders are involved in project implementation.	1	2	3	4	5
10-8	Stakeholders have ownership of the projects.	1	2	3	4	5
10-9	Information on development projects (by district/ government/donor/NGOs) is well provided.	1	2	3	4	5
10-10	Project funds are properly accounted for.	1	2	3	4	5
10-11	Projects are implemented in a transparent manner	1	2	3	4	5

A. Do you enjoy participating in a project?

1. Yes      2. No.

If "yes", please describe which part of a project interest you.

If "no", please describe why.

B. What are the good points of a project?

C. What are the constraints of a project?

D. How do you expect a project to change yourself or your community?

E. How do you (or your community) expect to sustain projects?

F. What attributes of a project can you share with other people? How can you share these attributes?

**Thank you for your cooperation.  
NIPDEP Study Team.**

C:

**CHECKLIST  
DEPS REVISED DURING THE WORKSHOP**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ District: \_\_\_\_\_

Checked by: \_\_\_\_\_

Item	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very good
1. "Vision Statement" is relevant, is it clearly stated?	1	2	3	4	5
2. "District Socio-Economic Achievement", is it properly captured?	1	2	3	4	5
3. "Major Educational Achievement", are they properly summarized in Table 2-1?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Are the results of the Stakeholder Survey properly and sufficiently summarized in sub-section 2-4?	1	2	3	4	5
5. The tables of GAP Analysis (Table 2-2) are properly done and documented logically based on the careful handling of data?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Problems are logically prioritized based on the GAP Analysis and the Stakeholder Survey and summarized sufficiently in the table (Table 2-3)?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Is the structure of Table 3-1 done and created properly and realistically linked to their analysis in Chapter I and Chapter II?	1	2	3	4	5
8. Their budget plans, are they thorough, accurate and realistic?	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
9. Is the structure of Table 4-1; implementation schedule realistic and clear?	1	2	3	4	5
10. Is the concept of a Resource Mobilization Plan understood? Have they created the Plan properly?	1	2	3	4	5
11. Is there a logical flow to the updated DEP?	1	2	3	4	5
12. Is the handling of data and calculations consistent and accurate?	1	2	3	4	5
13. Is the text clear?	1	2	3	4	5

14. Any comments

## Appendix II: Pilot district results

### A: Details of results from pilot districts – preliminary survey (June 2004)

#### 1. Procurement

##### PMT member implementation of procurement by district

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly Improved
Needs assessment	3.4	11.5	21.8	37.9	25.3
Selection of target schools and site survey	9.2	12.6	34.5	31.0	12.6
Bidding and selection of suppliers	3.4	4.6	31.0	35.6	25.3
Community mobilization	3.4	6.9	25.3	50.6	13.8
Follow up and evaluation	10.3	4.6	34.5	40.2	10.3
Overall aggregate score	5.94	8.04	29.42	48.83	17.46

##### Task force implementation of procurement

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly Improved
Needs assessment	4.0	12.1	21.2	36.4	26.3
Selection of target schools and site survey	9.1	11.1	34.3	33.3	12.1
Bidding and selection of suppliers	4.0	4.0	29.3	37.4	25.3
Community mobilization	4.0	7.1	26.3	48.5	14.1
Follow up and evaluation	9.1	6.1	34.3	38.4	12.1
Overall aggregate score	7.55	10.1	37.03	48.5	22.48

##### District Implementation of procurement

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly Improved
Needs assessment	4.0	12.1	21.2	36.4	26.3
Selection of target schools and site survey	9.1	11.1	34.3	33.3	12.1
Bidding and selection of suppliers	4.0	4.0	29.3	37.4	25.3
Community mobilization	4.0	7.1	26.3	48.5	14.1
Follow up and evaluation	9.1	6.1	34.3	38.4	12.1
Overall aggregate score	7.55	10.1	37.03	48.5	22.48

#### 2. Service Improvement

##### District education services improvement by PMT members

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly Improved
Supervision and coordination by DEM office	2.0	1.0	16.3	49.0	31.6
Information flow to and from the DEMs office	1.0	3.1	30.6	43.9	21.4
Supervision of PEAs	1.0	4.1	28.6	45.9	20.4

School committee involvement in school management	2.0	0.0	37.8	43.9	16.3
Communication between stakeholders and districts	1.0	0.0	27.6	50.0	21.4
Communication between schools and zones	1.0	1.0	22.4	46.9	28.6
Communication between zones and districts	3.1	1.0	22.4	48.0	25.5
Communication between district and division	3.1	5.1	25.5	42.9	23.5
Communications between district and ministry headquarters	3.1	1.0	13.3	45.9	36.7
Communication between DEM and DA	1.0	1.0	16.3	38.8	42.9
Overall aggregate score	1.83	1.73	24.08	45.52	26.83

#### District education service improvement by Task Force

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly Improved
Supervision and coordination by DEM office	2.0	1.0	16.3	49.0	31.6
Information flow to and from the DEMs office	1.0	3.1	30.6	43.9	21.4
Supervision of PEAs	1.0	4.1	28.6	45.9	20.4
School committee involvement in school management	2.0	0.0	37.8	43.9	16.3
Communication between stakeholders and districts	1.0	27.6	0.0	50.0	21.4
Communication between schools and zones	1.0	1.0	22.4	46.9	28.6
Communication between zones and districts	3.1	1.0	22.4	48.0	25.5
Communication between district and division	3.1	5.1	25.5	42.9	23.5
Communications between district and ministry headquarters	3.1	1.0	13.3	45.9	36.7
Communication between DEM and DA	1.0	1.0	16.3	38.8	42.9
Overall average score	1.83	4.49	21.32	45.52	26.83

#### District service improvement by district

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly Improved
Supervision and coordination by DEM office	2.0	1.0	16.3	49.0	31.6
Information flow to and from the DEMs office	1.0	3.1	30.6	43.9	21.4

Supervision of PEAs	1.0	4.1	28.6	45.9	20.4
School committee involvement in school management	2.0	0	37.8	43.9	16.3
Communication between stakeholders and districts	1.0	0	27.6	50.0	21.4
Communication between schools and zones	1.0	1.0	22.4	46.9	28.6
Communication between zones and districts	3.1	1.0	22.4	48.0	25.5
Communication between district and division	3.1	5.1	25.5	42.9	23.5
Communications between district and ministry headquarters	3.1	1.0	13.3	45.9	36.7
Communication between DEM and DA	1.0	1.0	16.3	38.8	42.9
Overall average score	1.83	1.73	24.08	45.52	26.83

## 2. District Development Projects

### Assessment of district development projects by PMT members

Evaluated Item	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Generally agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Project planned to local needs	2.0	2.0	12.9	42.6	40.6
Projects planned to DEP	1.0	0	6.9	37.6	54.5
Contribution of projects to education development	1.0	3.0	32.7	38.6	24.8
DEP effectively utilized in education development	2.0	2.0	25.7	44.6	25.7
DEP effective in implementing DDF	1.0	5.9	13.9	37.6	41.6
Involvement of stakeholders in project planned	1.0	3.0	16.8	36.6	42.6
Ownership by stakeholders of projects	4.0	4.0	22.8	35.6	33.7
Provision of information on development projects	1.0	5.0	14.9	53.5	25.7
Proper accounting of projects funds	2.0	3.0	16.8	48.5	29.7
Transparent implementation of projects	2.0	1.0	18.8	51.5	26.7
Overall average score	1.7	2.39	18.22	42.67	34.56

### Assessment of district development projects by task force

Evaluated Item	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Generally agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Projects planned to DEP	2.0	2.0	12.9	42.6	40.6
Contribution of projects to education development	1.0	0	6.9	37.6	54.5
DEP effectively utilized in education development	1.0	3.0	32.7	38.6	24.8

DEP effective in implementing DDF	1.0	5.9	13.9	37.6	41.6
Involvement of stakeholders in project planning	1.0	3.0	16.8	36.6	42.6
Involvement of stakeholders in projects implementation	4.0	4.0	22.8	35.6	33.7
Provision of information on development projects	1.0	5.0	14.9	53.5	25.7
Proper accounting of projects funds	2.0	3.0	16.8	48.5	29.7
Transparent implementation of projects	99.0	1.0	0	0	0
Overall average score	12.44	2.99	15.3	36.71	32.58

#### Assessment of district development by district

Evaluated Item	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Generally agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Projects planned on local needs	2.0	2.0	12.9	42.6	40.6
Projects planned to DEP	1.0	0	6.9	37.6	54.5
Contribution of projects to education development	1.0	3.0	32.7	38.6	24.8
DEP effectively utilized in education development	2.0	2.0	25.7	44.6	25.7
DEP effective in implementing DDF	1.0	5.9	13.9	37.6	41.6
Involvement of stakeholders in project planning	1.0	3.0	16.8	36.6	42.6
Involvement of stakeholders in projects implementation	4.0	4.0	22.8	35.6	33.7
Ownership by stakeholders of projects	1.0	5.0	14.9	53.5	25.7
Provision of information on development projects	2.0	3.0	16.8	48.5	29.7
Proper accounting of projects funds	2.0	1.0	18.8	51.5	26.7
Transparent implementation of projects	99.0	1.0	0	0	0
Overall average score	10.55	2.26	16.56	38.79	31.42

### 3. Implementation of INSET

#### PMT member by implementation of INSET

Evaluated Item	No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
Needs assessment	4.1	2.0	19.4	49.0	25.5
Formulation of training programme	2.0	3.1	19.4	50.0	25.5
Implementation of training	3.1	2.0	31.6	51.0	12.2
Follow up and evaluation – INSET	6.1	4.1	35.7	32.7	21.4
Overall average score	3.83	2.8	26.53	45.68	21.15

### District implementation of INSET

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly Improved
Needs assessment	5.2	1.7	21.7	47.0	24.3
Formulation of training programme	2.6	3.5	20.0	49.6	24.3
Implementation of training	3.5	4.3	30.4	47.8	13.9
Follow up and evaluation – INSET	6.1	4.3	30.4	33.0	26.1
Overall average score	4.35	3.45	25.63	44.35	22.15

### 5. Detailed Planning

#### General - NIPDEP pilot project – PMT by detailed planning

Evaluated Item	No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
Preparation of project proposal	3.3	3.3	34.1	42.9	16.5
Planning operational structures	1.1	3.3	25.3	54.9	15.4
Preparation of activity plans and timelines	4.4	5.5	36.3	36.3	17.6
Detailed budget plans	2.2	4.4	18.7	57.1	17.6
Monitoring and reporting	3.3	2.2	30.8	48.4	15.4
Evaluation	5.5	1.1	22.0	53.8	17.6
Overall average score	3.3	2.57	27.87	48.9	16.68

#### District detailed planning

Evaluated Item	No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
Preparation of project proposal	3.7	2.8	31.2	45.0	17.4
Planning operational structures	1.8	3.7	23.9	53.2	17.4
Preparation of activity plans and timelines	4.6	4.6	33.9	34.9	22.0
Detailed budget plans	2.8	3.7	18.3	56.9	18.3
Monitoring and reporting	3.7	1.8	31.2	47.7	15.6
Evaluation	5.5	1.8	22.9	51.4	18.3
Overall average score	3.68	3.07	26.9	48.18	18.17



**B: Details of the results from pilot districts – First follow-up (December 2004)**

**Table 2.1: Own Capacity in DEP preparation, updating and marketing (% score)**

Evaluated Item	No improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly Improved
<b>1. Collection and handling of education data</b>	4.3	2.2	27.8	45.7	19.9
Understanding of education data and indicators	2.9	0	25.7	51.4	20.0
Data collection	5.7	2.9	25.7	40.0	25.7
Data usage	2.9	2.9	25.7	48.6	20.0
Data management and updating	5.7	2.9	34.3	42.9	14.0
<b>2. DEP preparation and Updating</b>	5.7	6.9	22.3	42.9	10.3
Understanding of objectives and roles of DEPs	2.9	2.9	5.7	42.9	25.7
Formulation of policy objectives and strategies	8.6	11.4	20.0	42.9	17.1
Selection of indicators and targets	11.4	0	34.3	37.1	17.1
Budgeting	2.9	11.4	22.9	48.6	14.3
Preparation of implementation plan	2.9	8.6	28.6	42.9	17.1
<b>3. Marketing of DEPs</b>	9.6	19.1	40.0	25.7	5.7
Planning of DEPs marketing activities	11.5	22.9	42.9	20.0	2.9
Preparation of project proposals	8.6	11.4	34.3	37.1	8.6
Marketing and negotiation with Government/districts/donors/NGOs	8.6	22.9	42.9	20.0	5.7

**Table 2.2: Own capacity in project implementation**

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>1. Detailed planning</b>	2.4	5.7	30.9	42.4	18.6
Preparation of project proposals (profile)	2.9	8.6	40.0	37.1	11.4
Planning of operation structures	2.9	11.4	31.4	37.1	17.1
Planning of activity plans and timelines	2.9	0	22.9	57.1	17.1
Detailed budget plans	0	5.7	34.3	34.3	25.7
Monitoring and reporting	2.9	2.9	25.7	48.6	20.0
Evaluation	2.9	5.7	31.4	40.0	20.0
<b>2. Implementation of in-service training</b>	5.7	5.0	24.3	43.6	21.4
Needs assessment	11.4	2.9	17.1	37.1	31.4
Formulation of training program	2.9	5.7	34.3	37.1	20.0
Implementation of training	2.9	5.7	20.0	48.6	22.9
Follow –up and evaluation	5.7	5.7	25.7	51.4	11.4

<b>3. Implementation of procurement</b>	5.2	4.0	30.3	36.0	24.6
Needs assessment	5.8	8.6	31.4	34.3	20.0
Selection of target schools and site survey	2.9	5.7	28.6	37.1	25.7
Bidding and selection of suppliers	11.5	2.9	37.1	22.9	25.7
Community mobilization	2.9	0	20.0	48.6	28.6
Follow up and evaluation	2.9	2.9	34.3	37.1	22.9
<b>4. Implementation of construction</b>	12.5	6.9	26.3	36.6	17.7
Needs assessment	11.4	5.7	31.4	34.3	17.1
Selection of target schools and site survey	11.4	8.6	25.7	31.4	22.9
Bidding and selection of suppliers	17.1	17.1	22.9	25.7	17.1
Community mobilization	11.4	0	22.9	45.7	20.0
Follow up and evaluation	11.4	2.9	28.6	45.7	11.4

Table 2.3: PM/TF performance

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>PMT/TF performance has been improved through implementing NIPDEP pilot projects</b>	1.8	2.4	20.2	48.0	27.5
PMT leadership/coordination	0	2.9	25.7	37.1	34.3
TF project planning capability	0	0	11.4	62.9	25.7
TF project implementation capability	2.9	2.9	11.4	45.7	37.1
TF key person's leadership/coordination	2.9	2.9	14.3	51.4	28.6
TF team work	0	0	14.3	45.7	40.0
TF financial management and transparency	0	0	11.4	51.4	37.1
Community involvement in the pilot project	5.7	2.9	25.7	42.9	22.9
Social awareness of the NIPDEP project	0	2.9	40.0	34.3	22.9
Core trainers' guidance/coordination	2.9	5.7	22.9	57.1	11.4
NIPDEP study team guidance/coordination	2.9	2.9	20.0	51.4	22.9
Project reporting	2.9	2.9	25.7	48.6	20.0

Table 2.4: General project management capability

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>Capability for following activities has been build through NIPDEP pilot project Phase I</b>	2.9	1.3	21.6	48.9	25.4
Data collection and management	2.9	2.9	22.9	45.7	25.7
Planning	2.9	0	28.6	42.9	25.7
Project implementation	2.9	2.9	17.1	45.7	31.4
Monitoring	2.9	0	20.0	54.3	22.9
Budgeting and financial management	2.9	0	20.0	51.4	25.7
Evaluation of outputs and outcomes	2.9	5.7	25.7	51.4	14.3
Facilitation and coordination	2.9	0	14.3	54.3	28.6
Sensitization and mobilization of community members	2.9	0	22.9	42.9	31.4
Report preparation	2.9	0	22.9	51.4	22.9

Table 2.5: Education services in the district

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>The education services in your district has improved during NIPDEP pilot project Phase I</b>	5.7	3.7	26.0	43.7	20.8
Supervision and coordination by DEM office	2.9	5.7	22.9	45.7	22.9
Information flow to and from the DEM office	2.9	2.9	28.6	34.3	31.4
Supervision by PEAs	2.9	8.6	31.4	42.9	14.3
School committee involvement in school management	2.9	0	37.1	48.6	11.4
Communication between stakeholders and district	2.9	0	28.6	60.0	8.6
Communication between schools and zones	8.6	2.9	22.9	48.6	17.1
Communication between zone and district	5.7	0	20.0	48.6	25.7
Communication between district and division	11.4	8.6	20.0	42.9	17.1
Communication between district and MoE HQs	11.4	5.7	31.4	31.4	20.0
Communication between DEM and DA	5.7	2.9	17.1	34.3	40.0

Table 2.6: Development in the district

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>Assessment of the development projects in own district</b>	4.7	5.7	18.4	33.8	36.9
Projects planned based on local needs	2.9	5.7	20.0	17.1	54.3
Projects planning based on DEP	2.9	0	5.7	51.4	40.0
Projects contribute to education development	8.6	0	2.9	22.9	65.7
DDF is effectively utilized in education development	2.9	2.9	17.1	37.1	40.0
DEP is effective in implementing DDF	5.7	5.7	17.1	42.9	28.6
Stakeholders are involved in project planning	8.6	11.4	22.9	34.3	22.9
Stakeholders are involved in project implementation	5.7	2.9	17.1	42.9	31.4
Stakeholders have ownership of the projects	2.9	8.6	40.0	28.6	20.0
Information on development projects (by district/government/donor/NGOs) is well provided	2.9	8.6	42.9	28.6	17.1
Project funds are properly accounted for	5.7	8.6	14.3	31.4	40.0
Project are implemented in a transparent manner	2.9	8.6	8.6	34.3	45.7

**Details of the second and final follow-up survey results from pilot districts (May/June 2005)**

Table 2.1: Own Capacity in DEP preparation, updating and marketing (% score)

Evaluated Item	No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>1. Collection and handling of education data</b>					
Understanding of education data and indicators	8.1	4.7	20.3	52.7	14.2
Data collection	8.8	4.7	18.9	52.0	15.5
Data usage	10.1	3.4	27.0	47.3	12.2
Data management and updating	13.5	6.1	33.1	35.1	12.2
<b>2. DEP preparation and Updating</b>					
Understanding of objectives and roles of DEPs	7.4	2.0	30.4	41.2	18.9
Formulation of policy objectives and strategies	12.2	9.5	36.5	31.8	10.1

Selection of indicators and targets	13.5	8.8	29.1	38.5	10.1
Budgeting	10.8	4.7	26.4	47.3	10.8
Preparation of implementation plan	11.5	2.7	22.3	46.6	16.9
<b>3. Marketing of DEPs</b>					
Planning of DEPs marketing activities	20.3	9.5	39.9	21.6	8.8
Preparation of project proposals	15.5	7.4	31.8	35.1	10.1
Marketing and negotiation with Government/districts/donors/NGOs	21.6	13.5	25.0	29.1	10.8

Table 2.2: Own capacity in project implementation

Evaluated Item	No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>1. Detailed planning</b>					
Preparation of project proposals (profile)	8.8	10.8	27.0	41.2	12.2
Planning of operation structures	8.1	5.4	37.2	35.1	14.2
Planning of activity plans and timelines	6.1	8.1	25.7	40.5	19.6
Detailed budget plans	6.8	6.1	30.4	37.2	19.6
Monitoring and reporting	5.4	3.4	20.3	41.9	29.1
Evaluation	6.8	4.7	23.0	48.6	16.9
<b>2. Implementation of in-service training</b>					
Needs assessment	8.1	4.7	21.6	50.0	15.5
Formulation of training program	8.8	6.1	19.6	42.6	23.0
Implementation of training	10.1	4.1	20.9	47.3	17.6
Follow –up and evaluation	8.8	3.4	26.4	46.6	14.9
<b>3. Implementation of procurement</b>					
Needs assessment	15.5	8.1	21.6	35.1	19.6
Selection of target schools and site survey	16.9	6.1	19.6	33.8	23.6
Bidding and selection of suppliers	16.2	12.2	23.6	29.1	18.9
Community mobilization	13.5	4.7	16.9	35.1	29.7
Follow up and evaluation	14.9	6.1	25.7	33.8	19.6
<b>4. Implementation of construction</b>					
Needs assessment	22.3	6.1	24.3	31.1	16.2
Selection of target schools and site survey	20.9	8.1	18.2	32.4	20.3
Bidding and selection of suppliers	28.4	14.9	17.6	28.4	10.8
Community mobilization	23.6	3.4	22.3	29.7	20.9
Follow up and evaluation	27.0	6.8	20.3	27.0	18.9

Table 2.3: PM/TF performance

Evaluated Item	No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>PMT/TF performance has been improved through implementing NIPDEP pilot projects</b>					
PMT leadership/coordination	6.1	3.4	24.3	45.9	20.3
TF project planning capability	4.1	2.0	16.2	50.7	27.0
TF project implementation capability	4.1	1.4	21.6	48.0	25.0
TF key person's leadership/coordination	4.1	2.7	23.0	48.0	22.3
TF team work	4.1	3.4	17.6	37.8	37.2
TF financial management and transparency	4.1	4.1	15.5	45.3	31.1
Community involvement in the pilot project	3.4	2.0	25.0	41.9	27.7
Social awareness of the NIPDEP project	6.8	6.1	24.3	37.8	25.0
Core trainers' guidance/coordination	4.7	1.4	33.8	42.6	17.6
NIPDEP study team guidance/coordination	6.1	3.4	20.3	43.2	27.0
Project reporting	3.4	2.7	18.9	46.6	28.4

Table 2.4: General project management capability

Evaluated Item	No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>Capability for following activities has been build through NIPDEP pilot project Phase I and II</b>					
Data collection and management	6.8	2.0	21.6	43.9	25.7
Planning	4.1	3.4	14.9	48.6	29.1
Project implementation	4.7	2.7	12.8	49.3	30.4
Monitoring	3.4	1.4	20.3	48.0	27.0
Budgeting and financial management	4.1	4.1	23.6	40.5	27.7
Evaluation of outputs and outcomes	6.1	2.0	30.4	43.9	17.6
Facilitation and coordination	3.4	.7	18.2	54.1	23.6
Sensitization and mobilization of community members	2.7	2.0	21.6	37.2	36.5
Report preparation	2.7	3.4	18.9	51.4	23.6

Table 2.5: Education services in the district

Evaluated Item	No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>The education services in your district has improved during NIPDEP pilot project Phase I and II</b>					
Supervision and coordination by DEM office	6.8	9.5	52.7	31.1	
Information flow to and from the DEM office	6.1	.7	12.2	46.6	34.5
Supervision by PEAs	8.1	2.7	26.4	43.9	18.9
School committee involvement in school management	4.7	1.4	21.6	54.1	18.2
Communication between stakeholders and district	6.1	3.4	31.8	41.9	16.9
Communication between schools and zones	9.5	1.4	14.2	56.8	18.2
Communication between zone and district	8.1	1.4	12.2	51.4	27.0
Communication between district and division	10.1	2.7	16.2	50.0	20.9
Communication between district and MoE HQs	12.8	2.7	24.3	43.2	16.9
Communication between DEM and DA	12.2	.7	12.8	45.3	29.1

Table 2.6: Development in the district

Evaluated Item	No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>Assessment of the development projects in own district</b>					
Projects planned based on local needs	4.1	1.4	11.5	40.5	42.6
Projects planning based on DEP	7.4	4.7	20.9	36.5	30.4
Projects contribute to education development	4.1	1.4	7.4	35.1	52.0
DDF is effectively utilized in education development	7.4	4.7	27.7	34.5	25.7
DEP is effective in implementing DDF	12.2	2.7	25.0	43.2	16.9
Stakeholders are involved in project planning	7.4	6.1	24.3	34.5	27.7
Stakeholders are involved in project implementation	8.1	3.4	18.9	37.8	31.8
Stakeholders have ownership of the projects	10.8	6.1	18.9	35.8	28.4
Information on development	6.1	5.4	23.6	41.2	23.6

projects by district/government/donor/NGOs) is well provided					
Project funds are properly accounted for	6.1	6.1	16.2	39.2	32.4
Project are implemented in a transparent manner	7.4	4.1	14.9	41.2	32.4



### Appendix III: Details of results of non-pilot districts

#### A: Details of results from non-pilot districts - preliminary survey (August 2004)

Table 2.1: Own Capacity in DEP preparation, updating and marketing (% score)

Evaluated Item	No improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly Improved
<b>1. Collection and handling of education data</b>					
Understanding of education data and indicators	6.2	2.5	35.8	43.2	12.3
Data collection	7.4	2.5	27.2	53.1	9.9
Data usage	9.9	4.9	33.3	40.7	11.1
Data management and updating	8.6	6.2	53.1	24.7	7.4
<b>2. DEP preparation and Updating</b>					
Understanding of objectives and roles of DEPs	2.5	3.7	34.6	46.9	12.3
Formulation of policy objectives and strategies	6.2	11.1	58.0	22.2	2.5
Selection of indicators	4.9	7.4	56.8	24.7	6.2
Budgeting	4.9	8.6	43.2	32.1	11.1
Preparation of implementation plan	6.6	11.1	50.6	29.6	2.5
<b>3. Marketing of DEPs</b>					
Planning of DEPs marketing activities	19.8	19.8	48.1	3.7	8.6
Preparation of project proposals	18.5	21.0	39.5	17.3	3.7
Marketing and negotiation with Government/districts/donors/NGOs	23.5	17.3	35.8	19.8	3.7

Table 2.2: Own capacity in project implementation (% score)

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>1. Detailed planning</b>					
Preparation of project proposals (profile)	29.9	14.9	34.5	18.4	2.3
Planning of operation structures	29.9	10.3	47.1	10.3	2.3
Planning of activity plans and timelines	24.1	8.0	44.8	19.5	3.4
Detailed budget plans	25.3	8.0	35.6	23.0	8.0
Monitoring and reporting	24.1	1.1	33.3	36.8	4.6
Evaluation	24.1	1.1	41.4	28.7	4.6
<b>2. Implementation of in-service training</b>					
Needs assessment	19.5	8.0	25.3	42.5	4.6
Formulation of training program	21.8	10.3	26.4	35.6	5.7

Implementation of training	20.7	5.7	27.6	35.6	10.3
Follow –up and evaluation	19.5	4.6	36.8	33.3	5.7
<b>3. Implementation of procurement</b>					
Needs assessment	21.8	4.6	32.2	35.6	5.7
Selection of target schools and site survey	23.0	8.0	32.2	26.4	10.3
Bidding and selection of suppliers	28.7	18.4	29.9	14.9	8.0
Community mobilization	19.5	2.3	25.3	37.9	14.9
Follow up and evaluation	19.5	3.4	35.6	31.0	10.3
<b>4. Implementation of construction</b>					
Needs assessment	26.4	10.3	29.9	28.7	4.6
Selection of target schools and site survey	21.8	9.2	29.9	31.0	8.0
Bidding and selection of suppliers	34.5	16.1	24.1	17.2	8.0
Community mobilization	21.8	3.4	23.0	37.9	13.8

Table 2.3: Project management capability (% score)

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>Personal evaluation on capacity built through DEP preparation under NIPDEP project</b>					
Data collection and management	28.7	1.1	25.3	37.9	6.9
Planning	26.4	2.3	28.7	31.0	11.5
Project implementation	29.9	6.9	29.9	27.6	5.7
Monitoring	33.3	5.7	25.3	26.4	9.2
Evaluation of outputs and outcomes	33.3	6.9	27.6	26.4	5.7
Facilitation and coordination	32.2	5.7	26.4	25.3	10.3
Sensitization and mobilization of community members	32.2	3.4	19.5	29.9	14.9
Report preparation	33.3	4.6	23.0	31.0	8.0

Table 2.4: Education services in the districts (% score)

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>Improved education services through preparing and having DEPs</b>					
Supervision and coordination by DEM office	26.4	3.4	21.8	36.8	11.5
Information flow to and from DEM office	24.1	2.3	20.7	44.8	8.0
Supervision by PEAs	25.6	2.3	25.6	33.7	12.8
School committee involvement in	25.3	9.2	31.0	24.1	10.3

school management					
Communication between stakeholders and district	24.1	8.0	35.6	28.7	3.4
Communication between schools and zones	25.3	3.4	17.2	43.7	10.3
Communication between zones and district	25.3	6.9	20.7	34.5	12.6
Communication between district and division	26.4	6.9	23.0	34.5	9.2
Communication between district and MoE Hqs	25.3	11.5	29.9	26.4	6.9
Communication between DEM office and District assembly	24.1	5.7	18.4	33.3	18.4

Table 2.5: Development in district (% score)

Evaluated Item	Strongly disagree	Poor	Average	Good	Strongly agree
<b>Assessment of development in district</b>					
Project based on local needs	8.0	0	25.3	42.5	24.1
Projects planned based on DEP	8.0	13.8	35.6	34.5	8.0
Projects contribute to education development	6.9	2.3	17.2	47.1	26.4
District Development Fund (DDF) utilized in education development	13.8	5.7	26.4	28.7	25.3
DEP effective in implementing DDF	16.1	9.2	29.9	31.0	13.8
Stakeholders involved in planning	8.0	8.0	36.8	32.2	14.9
Stakeholders involved in project implementation	8.0	11.5	26.4	35.6	18.49
Information on development projects by district/government/donors/NGO well provided	11.5	23.0	28.7	29.9	6.9
Project funds properly accounted for	9.2	11.5	27.6	33.3	18.4
Projects implemented in transparent manner	9.2	17.2	28.7	25.3	19.5

**B: Details of results from non-pilot districts – first follow-up (November 2004)**

**Table 2.1: Own Capacity in DEP preparation, updating and marketing (% score)**

Evaluated Item	No improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly Improved
<b>1. Collection and handling of education data</b>	12.15	6.75	24.3	45.925	10.8
Understanding of education data and indicators	10.8	5.4	29.7	37.8	16.2
Data collection	8.1	10.8	13.5	56.8	10.8
Data usage	16.2	5.4	21.6	45.9	10.8
Data management and updating	13.5	5.4	32.2	43.2	5.4
<b>2. DEP preparation and Updating</b>					
Understanding of objectives and roles of DEPs	13.5	13.5	8.1	48.6	16.2
Formulation of policy objectives and strategies	18.9	5.4	32.4	43.2	0
Selection of indicators	16.2	10.8	27.0	43.2	2.7
Budgeting	16.2	16.2	21.6	37.8	8.1
Preparation of implementation plan	13.5	8.1	24.3	51.4	2.7
<b>3. Marketing of DEPs</b>					
Planning of DEPs marketing activities	24.3	16.2	37.8		
Preparation of project proposals	24.3	13.5	32.4	24.3	5.4
Marketing and negotiation with Government/districts/donors/NGOs	32.4	16.2	21.6	24.3	5.4

**Table 2.2: Own capacity in project implementation**

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>1. Detailed planning</b>					
Preparation of project proposals (profile)	18.9	16.2	35.1	24.3	5.4
Planning of operation structures	16.5	13.5	48.6	16.2	5.4
Planning of activity plans and timelines	13.5	10.8	35.1	32.4	8.1
Detailed budget plans	13.5	10.8	32.4	29.7	13.5
Monitoring and reporting	10.8	10.8	27.0	37.5	13.5
Evaluation	10.8	16.2	35.1	24.3	13.5
<b>2. Implementation of in-service training</b>					
Needs assessment	13.5	10.8	27.0	35.1	13.5
Formulation of training program	16.2	21.6	18.9	32.4	10.8
Implementation of training	10.8	8.1	35.1	32.4	13.5
Follow-up and evaluation	10.8	10.8	24.3	40.5	13.5

<b>3. Implementation of procurement</b>					
Needs assessment	10.8	18.9	32.4	27.0	10.8
Selection of target schools and site survey	13.5	10.8	29.7	32.4	13.5
Bidding and selection of suppliers	21.6	13.5	29.7	21.6	13.5
Community mobilization	10.8	8.1	18.9	43.2	18.9
Follow up and evaluation	13.5	8.1	21.6	45.9	10.8
<b>4. Implementation of construction</b>					
Needs assessment	8.1	18.9	35.1	32.4	5.4
Selection of target schools and site survey	8.1	16.2	32.4	37.8	5.4
Bidding and selection of suppliers	24.3	16.2	18.9	24.3	16.2
Community mobilization	5.4	10.8	16.2	45.9	21.6
Follow Up Evaluation	8.1	10.8	27.0	48.6	5.4

Table 2.3: Project management capability

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>Personal evaluation on capacity built through DEP preparation under NIPDEP project</b>					
Data collection and management	10.8	16.2	21.6	35.1	16.2
Planning	10.8	13.5	35.1	27.0	13.5
Project implementation	10.8	8.1	37.8	29.7	13.5
Monitoring	5.4	10.8	29.7	43.2	10.8
Budgeting and financial manage	10.8	13.5	35.1	32.4	8.1
Evaluation of outputs and outcomes	8.1	13.5	40.5	24.3	13.3
Facilitation and coordination	10.8	10.8	27.0	35.1	16.2
Sensitization and mobilization of community members	8.1	5.4	18.9	43.2	24.3
Report preparation	10.8	16.2	27.0	29.7	16.2

Table 2.4: Education services in the districts

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>Improved education services through preparing and having DEPs</b>					
Supervision and coordination by DEM office	13.5	10.8	18.9	37.8	18.9
Information flow to and from DEM office	10.8	10.8	21.6	40.5	16.2
Supervision by PEAs	13.5	13.5	27.0	35.1	10.8
School committee involvement in	13.5	13.5	32.4	35.1	5.4

school management					
Communication between stakeholders and district	13.5	10.8	35.1	35.1	5.4
Communication between schools and zones	21.6	5.4	10.8	51.4	10.8
Communication between zones and district	21.6	5.4	13.5	48.6	10.8
Communication between district and division	27.0	8.1	16.2	37.8	10.8
Communication between district and MoE Hqs	29.7	5.4	18.9	40.5	5.4
Communication between DEM office and District assembly	18.9	13.5	18.9	32.4	16.2

Table 2.5: Development in district

Evaluated Item	Strongly disagree	Poor	Average	Good	Strongly agree
<b>Assessment of development in district</b>					
Project based on local needs	2.7	2.7	21.6	43.2	29.7
Projects planned based on DEP	13.5	13.5	35.1	27.0	10.8
Projects contribute to education development	8.1	2.7	21.6	37.8	29.7
District Development Fund (DDF) utilized in education development	8.1	5.4	29.7	35.1	21.6
DEP effective in implementing DDF	21.6	10.8	18.9	35.1	13.5
Stakeholders involved in planning	8.1	13.5	18.9	43.2	16.2
Stakeholders ownership of project	8.1	8.1	24.3	43.2	16.2
Information on development projects by district/government/donors/NGO well provided	8.1	10.8	40.5	24.3	16.2
Project funds properly accounted for	8.1	16.2	45.9	16.2	13.5
Project funds properly accounted for	18.9	2.7	32.4	21.6	24.3
Projects implemented in transparent manner	16.2	8.1	32.4	16.2	27.0

**C: Details of the second and final follow-up survey results from non-pilot districts  
(May/June 2005)**

**Table 2.1: Own Capacity in DEP preparation, updating and marketing (% score)**

Evaluated Item	No Skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>1. Collection and handling of education data</b>					
Understanding of education data and indicators	17	8.5	17	27.7	29.8
Data collection	14.9	2.1	19.1	46.8	17
Data usage	17	8.5	23.4	38.3	12.8
Data management and updating	21.3	6.4	27.7	31.9	12.8
<b>2. DEP preparation and Updating</b>					
Understanding of objectives and roles of DEPs	17	10.6	19.1	42.6	10.6
Formulation of policy objectives and strategies	19.1	6.4	38.3	29.8	6.4
Selection of indicators	14.9	10.6	38.3	25.5	10.6
Budgeting	17	2.1	27.7	38.3	14.9
Preparation of implementation plan	17	6.4	40.4	25.5	10.6
<b>3. Marketing of DEPs</b>					
Planning of DEPs marketing activities	25.5	19.1	29.8	25.5	
Preparation of project proposals	17	21.3	27.7	27.7	6.4
Marketing and negotiation with Government/districts/donors/NGOs	21.3	21.3	31.9	21.3	4.3

**Table 2.2: Own capacity in project implementation (% score)**

Evaluated Item	No Skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>1. Detailed planning</b>					
Preparation of project proposals (profile)	17	10.6	25.5	34	12.8
Planning of operation structures	14.9	12.8	38.3	23.4	10.6
Planning of activity plans and timelines	14.9	8.5	19.1	48.9	8.5
Detailed budget plans	10.6	10.6	25.5	38.3	14.9
Monitoring and reporting	10.6	8.5	29.8	36.2	14.9
Evaluation	10.6	14.9	29.8	34	10.6
<b>2. Implementation of in-service training</b>					
Needs assessment	10.6	8.5	40.4	38.3	2.1
Formulation of training program	12.8	6.4	46.8	29.8	4.3
Implementation of training	12.8	8.5	36.2	27.7	14.9
Follow-up and evaluation	12.8	17	34	31.9	4.3

<b>3. Implementation of procurement</b>					
Needs assessment	14.9	10.6	25.5	40.4	8.5
Selection of target schools and site survey	19.1	10.6	27.7	34	8.5
Bidding and selection of suppliers	17	17	14.9	36.2	14.9
Community mobilization	10.6	6.4	19.1	38.3	23.4
Follow up and evaluation	12.8	8.5	23.4	38.3	17
<b>4. Implementation of construction</b>					
Needs assessment	14.9	8.5	25.5	44.7	6.4
Selection of target schools and site survey	17	4.3	31.9	40.4	6.4
Bidding and selection of suppliers	14.9	17	23.4	29.8	14.9
Community mobilization	12.8	6.4	17	40.4	23.4

Table 2.3: Project management capability (% score)

Evaluated Item	No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>Personal evaluation on capacity built through DEP preparation under NIPDEP project</b>					
Data collection and management	17	2.1	23.4	48.9	8.5
Planning	14.9		31.9	40.4	12.8
Project implementation	14.9	6.4	29.8	36.2	12.8
Monitoring	14.9	8.5	25.5	29.8	21.3
Evaluation of outputs and outcomes	17	10.6	27.7	38.3	6.4
Facilitation and coordination	14.9		17	55.3	12.8
Sensitization and mobilization of community members	12.8	6.4	19.1	38.3	23.4
Report preparation	14.9	6.4	23.4	36.2	19.1

Table 2.4: Education services in the districts (% score)

Evaluated Item	No skill	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
<b>Improved education services through preparing and having DEPs</b>					
Supervision and coordination by DEM office	9.6	12.8	6.4	61.7	8.5
Information flow to and from DEM office	10.6	6.4	14.9	53.2	14.9
Supervision by PEAs	10.6	6.4	14.9	53.2	14.9
School committee involvement in school management	8.5	10.6	25.5	38.3	17
Communication between stakeholders and district	8.5	6.4	25.5	46.8	12.8
Communication between schools	8.5	2.1	19.1	46.8	23.4



and zones					
Communication between zones and district	8.5	4.3	19.1	46.8	21.3
Communication between district and division	10.6	8.5	12.8	42.6	25.5
Communication between district and MoE Hqs	12.8	8.5	21.3	36.2	21.3
Communication between DEM office and District assembly	8.5	12.8	10.6	42.6	25.5

Table 2.5: Development in district (% score)

Evaluated Item	Strongly disagree	Poor	Average	Good	Strongly agree
<b>Assessment of development in district</b>					
Project based on local needs	4.3	23.4	34	36.2	2.1
Projects planned based on DEP	4.3	10.6	31.9	34	19.1
Projects contribute to education development	4.3		14.9	55.3	25.5
District Development Fund (DDF) utilized in education development	10.6	6.4	17	38.3	27.7
DEP effective in implementing DDF	8.5	10.6	25.5	31.9	23.4
Stakeholders involved in planning	4.3	6.4	19.1	55.3	14.9
Stakeholders involved in project implementation	4.3	4.3	12.8	57.4	21.3
Stakeholders have ownership of the projects	6.4	4.3	12.8	57.4	19.1
Information on development projects by district/government/donors/NGO well provided	4.3	4.3	48.9	31.9	10.6
Project funds properly accounted for	4.3		17	57.4	21.3
Projects implemented in transparent manner	4.3	4.3	21.3	42.6	27.7

## D: Core trainers' survey results (May/June 2005)

Table 2.1: Own Capacity in DEP preparation, updating and marketing (% score)

Evaluated Item	No improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly Improved
<b>1. Collection and handling of education data</b>					
Understanding of education data and indicators	0	0	16.7	16.7	66.7
Data collection	0	0	16.7	0	83.7
Data usage	0	0	16.7	16.7	66.6
Data management and updating	0	0	16.7	16.7	66.6
<b>2. DEP preparation and Updating</b>					
Understanding of objectives and roles of DEPs	0	0	16.7	33.3	50.0
Formulation of policy objectives and strategies	0	0	16.7	33.3	50.0
Selection of indicators and targets	0	0	16.7	16.7	66.6
Budgeting	0	0	16.7	33.3	50.0
Preparation of implementation plan	0	0	16.7	16.7	66.6
<b>3. Marketing of DEPs</b>					
Planning of DEPs marketing activities	0	0	33.3	50.0	16.7
Preparation of project proposals	0	0	33.3	50.0	16.7
Marketing and negotiation with Government/districts/donors/NGOs	0	0	33.3	33.3	33.3

Table 2.2: Own capacity in project implementation

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>1. Detailed planning</b>					
Preparation of project proposals (profile)	0	0	0	16.7	83.3
Planning of operation structures	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
Planning of activity plans and timelines	0	0	0	16.7	83.3
Detailed budget plans	0	0	0	0	100
Monitoring and reporting	0	0	0	0	100
Evaluation	0	0	0	33.3	66.7
<b>2. Implementation of in-service training</b>					
Needs assessment	0	0	0	100	0
Formulation of training program	0	0	16.7	66.6	16.7

Implementation of training	0	0	0	83.3	16.7
Follow –up and evaluation	0	0	0	83.3	16.7
<b>3. Implementation of procurement</b>					
Needs assessment	0	0	0	66.7	33.3
Selection of target schools and site survey	0	0	0	66.7	33.3
Bidding and selection of suppliers	0	0	0	66.7	33.3
Community mobilization	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
Follow up and evaluation	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
<b>4. Implementation of construction</b>					
Needs assessment	0	16.7	16.7	0	66.6
Selection of target schools and site survey	0	16.7	16.7	0	66.6
Bidding and selection of suppliers	0	16.7	16.7	50	16.7
Community mobilization	0	16.7	16.7	33.3	33.3
Follow up and evaluation	0	16.7	16.7	16.7	50.0

Table 2.3: PM/TF performance

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>PMT/TF performance has been improved through implementing NIPDEP pilot projects</b>					
PMT leadership/coordination	0	0	0	66.7	33.3
TF project planning capability	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
TF project implementation capability	0	0	0	83.3	16.7
TF key person's leadership/coordination	0	0	0	100	0
TF team work	0	0	0	100	0
TF financial management and transparency	0	0	33.3	16.7	50.0
Community involvement in the pilot project	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
Social awareness of the NIPDEP project	0	0	0	66.7	33.3
Core trainers' guidance/coordination	0	0	0	16.7	83.3
NIPDEP study team guidance/coordination	0	0	0	16.7	83.3
Project reporting	0	0	16.7	33.3	50.0

Table 2.4: General project management capability

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>Capability for following activities has been build through NIPDEP pilot project Phase I and II</b>					
Data collection and management	0	0	0	33.3	66.7
Planning	0	0	0	16.7	83.3
Project implementation	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
Monitoring	0	0	0	33.3	66.7
Budgeting and financial management	0	0	16.7	0	83.3
Evaluation of outputs and outcomes	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
Facilitation and coordination	0	0	0	16.7	83.3
Sensitization and mobilization of community members	0	0	0	33.3	66.7
Report preparation	0	0	16.7	16.7	66.6

Table 2.5: Education services in the district

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>The education services in your district has imprtroved during NIPDEP pilot project Phase I</b>					
Supervision and coordination by DEM office	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
Information flow to and from the DEM office	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
Supervision by PEAs	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
School committee involvement in school management	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
Communication between stakeholders and district	0	0	0	100.0	0
Communication between schools and zones	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
Communication between zone and district	0	0	0	83.3	16.7
Communication between district and division	0	0	0	50.0	50.0
Communication between district and MoE HQs	0	0	16.7	83.3	0
Communication between DEM and DA	0	0	0	33.3	66.7

Table 2.6: Development in the district

Evaluated Item	No Improvement	Poor	Average	Good	Greatly improved
<b>Assessment of the development projects in own district</b>					
Projects planned based on local needs	0	0	0	0	100
Projects planning based on DEP	0	0	0	33.3	66.7
Projects contribute to education development	0	0	0	0	100
DDF is effectively utilized in education development	0	0	0	33.3	66.7
DEP is effective in implementing DDF	0	0	0	33.3	66.7
Stakeholders are involved in project planning	0	0	0	16.7	83.3
Stakeholders are involved in project implementation	0	0	0	16.7	83.3
Stakeholders have ownership of the projects	0	0	0	16.7	83.3
Information on development projects by district/government/donor/NGOs) is well provided	0	0	16.7	66.6	16.7
Project funds are properly accounted for	0	0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Project are implemented in a transparent manner	0	0	33.3	33.3	33.3

**All core trainers stated that they enjoyed participating in the NIPDEP project.**