Internal Ex-Post Evaluation for Technical Cooperation Project

Country Name	[Phase 1] The Support for Improvement of Primary School Management
Nepal	[Phase 2] Support for Improvement of Primary School Management (SISM) Phase- 2

I. Project Outline

Background	Based on the Education for All (EFA) program (2004-2009), the Government of Nepal (GON) promoted the access to the quality basic education through community participation. GON introduced a new system to request all the primary schools to organize a school management committee (SMC) to prepare School Improvement Plans (SIPs) and to manage the school according to the SIP. However, problem analysis was not properly conducted and appropriate budget allocation for school improvement based on education data and plan was not fully in place. Phase 1 of this project was implemented to improve the school management capacity of SMC and to strengthen the support for school management by District Education Office (DEO) in Dhading and Rasuwa Districts. The project achieved effects such as improvement of community of awareness and nationwide distribution of training guidelines. In addition, Department of Education (DOE) developed the SIP Formulation Guidebook during the follow-up of SISM 1. Most schools prepared the SIP but did not fully implement the planned activities.
Objectives of the Project	**[Phase 1]** In Nepal, through improvement of the capacity of SMC to manage school by community participation, improvement of DEO/DDC/VDC to technically and financially support school-based management, and nationwide development of policy options to suggest measures to be taken by MOE/DOE to achieve minimum education quality, the project aimed at improvement of school management with community participation and government support in the target area, thereby contributing to improvement of the enrollment rate and dropout rate of primary school in the target area. *DDC: District Development Committee VDC: Village Development Committee MOE: Ministry of Education 1. Overall Goal: The enrollment rate and dropout rate of primary school in the target area are improved. 2. Project Purpose: School management is improved with community participation and with government support in the target area. **[Phase 2]** In Nepal, through development of refined model to make effective use of SIP process, validation of effective and practical model for training and monitoring mechanism/contents in the target (testing) area, strengthening of capacity of central and local education authorities to support school management though SIP process, and emergency support of providing teaching and learning materials for all of the community schools located in the three earthquake-affected districts (Sindhuli, Ramecchhap, Okhaldhunga), the project aimed at nationwide management of schools through SIP process, thereby contributing to maintenance of the technical and financial mechanism for enhancing school management through SIP process at the national and district levels. 1. Overall Goal: The technical and financial mechanism for enhancing school management through SIP process is maintained at the national and district levels. 2. Project Purpose: Schools are managed through SIP process nationwide for improving access to and quality of basic education.

Activities of the Project	1. Project Site:
	 [Phase 1] Dhading and Rasuwa districts
	 [Phase 2] Target (testing) districts for validation: Solukhumbu, Doti, Jumla and Rupandehi districts
	    Districts for dissemination: 75 districts
	    Follow-up districts: Dhading and Rasuwa districts
	2. Main Activities:
	 [Phase 1]
	 (1) Awareness raising on school management among community, Facilitation of the participatory process of SIP development and implementation, Facilitation of school/SMC to take measures to enroll out-of-school children and to reduce dropouts, etc.
	 (2) Support of DEO to clarify problems and to support disadvantaged schools, Support for VDC to incorporate village-side education in village plans, Strengthening of the network of stakeholders in education, etc.
	 (3) Analysis of the disparities among schools in target areas, Examination of possible measures to improve schools, Provision of policy suggestions to MOE/DOE, etc.
	 [Phase 2]
	 (1) Revision of SIP Formulation Guidebook, Analysis of capacity gaps of institutions and their human resources, Development of training and monitoring tools/formats on SIP/school management, Development and revision of refined model for school management, etc.
	 (2) Support conducting training/orientation to SMCs in the target area, Support monitoring and follow-up on the progress of SIP formulation/implementation, Holding workshops for validating the refined model and consolidating recommendations, etc.
	 (3) Support conducting trainings for staff at central and local levels, Support development and finalization of a

	medium-term SIP implementation strategy, etc.
	(4) Needs assessment of the districts, Procurement of items and delivery to the target districts, Resource Centers (RCs) and schools, Conducting an orientation workshop for Resource Persons (RPs) on curriculum and teachers' guide, etc.
	3. Inputs (to carry out above activities)
	[Phase 1]
	Japanese Side
	1) Experts: 8 persons
	2) Trainees received: 13 persons (in Japan), 6 persons (in Indonesia)
	3) Equipment: Vehicle, motorbike, office equipment, etc.
	4) Local cost
	      Nepalese Side
	      1) Staff allocated: 20 persons
	      2) Project Office
	      3) Local cost (cost for training courses, utility cost for office space, etc.)
	[Phase 2]
	Japanese Side
	1) Experts: 11 persons
	2) Trainees received: 20 persons (in Japan)
	3) Equipment: Vehicle, office equipment, etc.
	4) Local cost
	      Nepalese Side
	      1) Staff allocated: 23 persons
	      2) Project Office
	      3) Local cost (cost for SIP activities, etc.)

Project Period	**[Phase 1]** (ex-ante) February 2008 – February 2011 (actual) February 2008 – February 2011 **[Phase 2]** (ex-ante) May 2013 – January 2017 (actual) May 2013 – July 2018	Project Cost	**[Phase 1]** (ex-ante) 279 million yen, (actual) 270 million yen **[Phase 2]** (ex-ante) 403 million yen, (actual) 611 million yen
Implementing Agency	**[Phase 1] [Phase 2]** Department of Education (DOE), Ministry of Education (MOE)* *Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) at the time of signing of R/D. It was reorganized into MOE in 2008. After project completion, MOE was reorganized again into the Ministry of Education, Sports and Technology (MOEST) and DOE into the Center for Education and Human Resource Development (CEHRD). At district level, DEO was reorganized into Education Development and Coordination Unit (EDCU). Following the reorganization, RCs were abolished.		
Cooperation Agency in Japan	**[Phase 1] [Phase 2]** International Development Center of Japan		

II. Result of the Evaluation

<Constraints on Evaluation>

・In this Ex-Post Evaluation, an evaluation judgment was made primarily by analyzing information acquired by sending and collecting questionnaires, and through telephone and e-mail interviews with persons concerned due to the impact of COVID-19.

<Special Perspectives Considered in the Ex-Post Evaluation>

・We evaluated the two phases together in the following way: for Relevance, evidence was confirmed for each phase, based on which the two phases were evaluated as combined; for Effectiveness/Impact, the status of achievement of the project objectives was judged for each phase, based on which the two phases were evaluated as combined; for Efficiency, each phase was evaluated, based on which the two phases were evaluated as combined; for Sustainability, the two phases were evaluated as combined.

・In both phases, end-line survey was conducted to collect data, especially for quantitative indicators. However, due to the resource limitation of the ex-post evaluation, it was difficult to collect data in the same scale and accuracy as the end-line survey. Therefore, for some indicators, qualitative information is utilized through questionnaire and telephone/e-mail interview.

・For the Indicators 1-1 to 1-3 of the Project Purpose of the Phase 1 project, quantitative targets were not defined. Therefore, the judgement of the terminal evaluation was adopted in the evaluation of the achievement status. As to the continuation status, judgement was made based on the completion rate of activities indicated in each target.

・The Indicator 1-4 of the Project Purpose of the Phase 1 project (increase of the completion rate of activities) could not be assessed at the terminal evaluation because the comparison data before the project was not available. Therefore, the continuous status of this Indicator was not assessed.

・Regarding the Phase 2 Project, although the project period was extended, the achievement status at the project completion was not stated in the Project Completion Report. Therefore, the results of the terminal evaluation are adopted as achievement status at the project completion.

・In judgement in ex-post evaluation, the influence of the great earthquake in April 2015, which was one of the worst natural disasters in Nepal and caused considerable physical and human damages, was taken into consideration as unexpected external conditions. Also, in evaluation judgement of continuation status, the influence of COVID-19 pandemic was taken into consideration.

1 Relevance

<Consistency with the Development Policy of Nepal at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation>

[Phase 1] [Phase 2] At the time of ex-ante evaluation, both Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects were consistent with the development policies as follows. The achievement of the targets defined in the EFA program was the priority of GON. Following the EFA program, GON formulated and implemented the School Sector Reform Program (SSRP) (2009-2014) to improve school management based on SIP prepared by SMC. GON was also committed to reform agenda including capacity development and put priority on decentralization of education administration and school management through community participation.

<Consistency with the Development Needs of Nepal at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation>

[Phase 1] [Phase 2] At the time of ex-ante evaluation, both Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects were consistent with the development needs as follows. Each SMC was expected to prepare a SIP and to manage the school according to the SIP. In spite of GON's efforts to promote the decentralization and the school-based management, disparity among schools and communities was increased due to the capacity at the school and the community levels, which impeded the improvement in the enrollment and the dropout rates of the primary schools. In addition, rapid

expansion of basic education caused new challenges such as lack of teachers and low quality of education.

<Consistency with Japan's ODA Policy at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation>

[Phase 1] At the ex-ante evaluation in 2007, in the Japanese assistance towards Nepal, the priority was placed on assistance for poverty alleviation at district level and assistance for democratization and peace-building. As a part of poverty alleviation, assistance to develop social foundations was included[1].

[Phase 2] In the Country Assistance Policy for Nepal (2012), one of the three priority areas in the Japanese assistance towards Nepal was establishment of peace and stable development toward democratic nation, including capacity development of local government as well as response to the needs of community especially those socially disadvantaged.

<Evaluation Result>

[Both phases] In light of the above, the relevance of Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects as combined is high.

2 Effectiveness/Impact

<Status of Achievement of the Project Purpose at the Time of Project Completion>

[Phase 1] The Project Purpose was achieved by the project completion. The pilot schools achieved completion rate of activities in SIP and conducted audits and other school management events to a satisfactory level and the parents and community members were satisfied with school management. Therefore, it is judged that the school management activities were actively implemented with community participation.

The status of the completion rate of activities planned in SIP was satisfactory[2] (Indicator 1-1 to 1-3). As to non-budgetary activities, according to end-line survey, although the number of pilot schools which completed 100% of the non-budgetary activities was limited, more than half of the 90 pilot schools (Dhading and Rasuwa in total) completed more than 80% of the non-budgetary activities and 85 (94.4%) of the pilot schools completed more than 50% of the pilot activities. As to low-budgetary activities, more than 34% of the pilot schools (31 out of 90 schools) completed more than 80% of the low budgetary activities and more than 70% (64 schools) of the pilot schools completed more than 50% of the pilot activities. As to budgetary activities, more than 22% of the 90 pilot schools completed more than 80% of the budgetary activities, while more than 70% of the pilot schools completed more than 50% of the pilot activities. In regards to the increase of the completion rate, although the comparison was not possible due to the lack of the pre-SISM records, more schools had access to funds of VDC and DDC compared to the fiscal year 2007/08[3], as shown by Indicator 6. Therefore, it was likely that the schools were able to complete budgetary activities more than before (Indicator 1-4).

The average satisfaction level of parents and community members regarding school management was 3.54 by 5-level rating, according to the end-line survey (Indicator 2). The amount (converted into NRs) contributed to school activities by parents and community members, in the form of cash, labor and in kind, in pilot VDCs in 2009/10 increased from the previous year by 358.7% (Indicator 3). As per legal provision, 58 pilot schools (64.5%) shared the financial audit report with the SMCs, while 64 pilot schools (71.1%) shared the social audit report with the SMCs (Indicator 4). Regarding events, 119 events related to school management including training and workshops were conducted in the pilot VDCs in 2007/08 while 507 events took place in 2009/10, which was 326% increase (Indicator 5-1). DOE conducted various training and workshops related to the teacher's professional development program, for the new curriculum dissemination and capacity development of the SMCs (Indicator 5-2). According to the end-line survey, the number of the pilot schools which received funds from VDC and DDC increased during the period from 62 in 2007/08 to 77 in 2009/10. (Indicator 6).

[Phase 2] The Project Purpose was partially achieved by the project completion. School management through SIP was introduced nationwide and a majority of sample schools updated SIP as expected, although the achievement rate of SIP activities, especially budgetary activities, did not reach the target at some sample schools.

Among the target districts and schools of the Phase 2 project, at the terminal evaluation, the percentage of schools that updated the annual action plan of SIP was increased from 43% in 2013/14 to 71% in 2016/17 (Indicator 1). As to the completion of SIP activities, according to the results of the end-line survey, 86 out of 100 sample schools planned the budgetary activities in SIP, of which 30 schools (35%) completed 50% of these planned activities. Regarding non-budgetary activities, 74 schools planned these activities in SIP, and 28 schools (38%) completed 80% of the planned non-budgetary activities. The implementation rate of both non-budgetary activities and budgetary activities did not reach 60% (Indicator 2). Significant improvements were observed in teachers', parents', and SMCs' perspectives of planning and implementing SIP activities to reduce dropout and out-of-school children, although the target value was not specified. This implied that teachers, parents, and SMCs were gradually recognizing the SIP as an effective and useful tool to reduce dropout students and out-of-school children (Indicator 3).

<Continuation Status of Project Effects at the Time of Ex-Post Evaluation>

[Phase 1] The project effects have continued to the time of ex-post evaluation[4]. Activities related to school management such as activities in SIP and audits are continuously implemented with community participation in general.

Regarding activities in their latest school year SIP, according to interview, in Dhading district, 75% activities are non-budgetary and out of those 90% are completed on average. Around 20% activities are low budgetary and out of those 50% are completed on average. Around 5% activities are budgetary activities and out of those around 25% are completed on average. In Rasuwa district, according to interview, 70% activities are non-budgetary and out of those 80% are completed on average. Around 20% activities are low budgetary and out of those 50% are completed on average. Around 10% activities are budgetary activities and out of those around 20% are completed on average (Indicator 1-1 to 1-3).

Parents are satisfied with school management, according to interview[5]. In Dhading, parents take collective decision with teachers and SMC members and they meet regularly and support to develop a child-friendly school environment. In Rasuwa, parents, teachers, students,

---

[1] Source: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "ODA Country Data Collection in 2007"

[2] Before the project, even though activities were planned, many of them had not been implemented. Taking this fact into consideration, it was agreed that the results of the completion rate at the terminal evaluation were satisfactory (source: Terminal Evaluation Report).

[3] The Nepalese fiscal year is from mid-July to mid-July next year.

[4] It should be noted that the continuation status of the Project Purpose of the Phase 1 project may be benefited by the follow-up activities by the Phase 2 Project.

[5] The survey of satisfaction level was conducted as a part of endline survey of the terminal evaluation and the survey is not stipulated as standard activities of SIP, therefore, no survey of satisfaction level has been conducted since project completion.

and SMC members jointly develop a child-friendly school environment and conduct school-level planning (Indicator 2). Although the actual amount of contribution is not clear, parents and community members are supporting temporary teachers in case schools need more teachers. They also support to build school infrastructure (in labor). These facts show that the same level of the activities have been continuously conducted since project completion (Indicator 3). Regarding audit, all surveyed schools mentioned that they have received a grant for financial and social audits and both financial and social audits were continuously done from the beginning of the project until 2019 (before COVID-19 pandemic) and 100% of pilot schools shared the social and financial audit report in the parents' meeting or in SMC's meeting, according to interview. They are planning to conduct audits once COVID situation improves. (Indicator 4). Although the number of events is not clear, most of the local government support preparation of SIP as well as implementation of some activities such as orientation for SMC's members and teachers training (Indicator 5-1, 5-2). The local government has continuously provided funds for SIP planning and implementation, classroom maintenance, and salary of temporary teachers if needed at schools as well as funds for provision of school furniture and scholarship for poor and talent students, although quantitative survey has not been conducted on the number of schools receiving increased funds, for the previous quantitative survey was conducted as a part of the Terminal Evaluation (Indicator 6).

[Phase 2] The project effects have partially continued to the time of ex-post evaluation. Activities related to school management through SIP are continuously implemented although budgetary activities in SIP are not implemented as expected.

In regards to updating SIP, 100% schools prepared SIP in 2015 and updated annual action plan based on SIP Formulation Guidebook. Annual action plans are updated from 2018 to 2019 but only 5% schools update five- year SIP for 2020 and annual SIP for 2021 due to the impact of COVID-19. They are planning to update after pandemic, when schools are opened (Indicator 1). As to implementation of SIP activities, among six districts surveyed (4 Target (testing) districts and 2 Follow-up districts), 74.2% of non-budgetary activities are implemented while 47.5% of budgetary activities are implemented, according to interview (Indicator 2). A variety of activities to improve access and quality of basic education are planned and implemented. Examples are; Home visits of student by teachers and SMC's member, Appointment of temporary teachers, Creation of child friendly environment in classroom by teachers, Activities related to children's learning such as singing a song related to the topic or playing some game, Provision of lunch for children of 1-5 class, Provision of sanitary pads and medicine for girls, Provision of student hostel (Indicator 3).

<Status of Achievement of the Overall Goal at the Time of Ex-Post Evaluation>
[Phase 1] The Overall Goal has not been achieved. There is no clear improvement in enrollment and dropout.

In regards to the net enrollment rate (Indicator 1), the precise data of net enrollment rate in Dhading and Rasuwa was not obtained as the data for the total number of children of the enrollment age at district level was not available. Therefore, it is not verifiable. The total number of enrolled children in public schools is decreasing[6]. As to the dropout rate (Indicator 2), no clear and steady tendency has been observed since project completion, therefore, it is not verifiable. The enrollment and dropout have been affected by the earthquake in 2015 and by COVID-19. In addition, it is considered that there was a gap between the indicators of the Overall Goal (net enrollment rate and dropout rate) and project activities (improvement of school management) as there are other factors involved in the net enrollment rate and the dropout rate, for example, family environment of children[7].

[Phase 2] The Overall Goal has been achieved. The block grants for formulation and updating SIP are secured, SIP promotion team has been established, and SIP is incorporated into the National Centre for Educational Development (NCED) training.

According to Annual Strategic Implementation Plan (ASIP)/Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) data, 90% of school made SIP and some block grants are allocated through ASIP/AWPB for SIP formulation/updating (Indicator 1). The formulation/update of SIP is mentioned in Program Implementation Manual (PIM) and government support for SIP has been continued, for example, support grant for basic school for capacity development of community and SMC, parental education, and extra-curricular activities (Indicator 2). Every school has SMC and the duty of SMC is designated as promotion of SIP formulation and implementation, while the ultimate responsibility for SIP is placed at municipality and school. Based on the request, municipality and EDCU facilitate the preparation of SIP (Indicator 3). The role and responsibility of EDCU (DEO before) and Local Education Units under each local government in implementing SIP are specified. EDCU and concerned organizations (i.e., local governments) provide suggestions during the formulation of SIP if the school needed. In addition, EDCU and concerned organization clarify the needs to be addressed (Indicator 4). In regards to orientation by EDCU, according to interview during ex-post evaluation, 10% of SMC members got orientation from EDCU and concerned organizations while 90% of SMC members got orientation from only school principal (Indicator 5). According to the Head Teacher Capacity Building Training Curriculum (Ministry of Education /then National Center for Educational Development, February, 2017), SIP is incorporated in the leadership capacity development training curriculum and leadership capacity development training. Other resource materials are; supplementary training materials (STM) for annual implementation plan preparation for disaster risk reduction, School Self-Assessment (SSA) checklist, materials for SIP appraisal school level workshop for SIP formulation. They are uploaded in the CEHRD website and being utilized by the as needed. It is described that SIP is planned and implemented for better school, better teaching, and better learning (Indicator 6).

<Other Impacts at the Time of Ex-Post Evaluation>
[Both phases] Through questionnaire and telephone interview, it was reported that women's participation in SMC has been promoted. The government instructed that at least 33% of SMC members should be women and now every SMC has women's participation. No negative impact has been observed.

<Evaluation Result>
[Both phases] In summary, in phase 1, out of 10 indicators of the Project Purpose, 9 were achieved and 7 are continued although the indicators of the Overall Goal were not verifiable. In phase 2, out of 3 indicators of the Project Purpose, 1 was achieved and 2 are continued, while 5 indicators out of 6 indicators of the Overall Goal were achieved. It means that the majority of Indicators were achieved/are continued. In evaluation, consideration was given to the fact that there were influence of the earthquake. Therefore, the effectiveness/impact of Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects as combined is high.

[Phase 1] Achievement of Project Purpose and Overall Goal

---

[6] At some schools surveyed during the ex-post evaluation, the number of enrolled students was increasing.

[7] In the Phase 2 project, the net enrollment rate and the dropout rate were defined as indicators for the Super Goal.

Aim	Indicators	Results	Source
(Project Purpose) School management is improved with community participation and with government support in the target area.	Indicator 1-1: Number of the target schools which get the 100% of the completion rate (%) of the non-budgetary activities in their latest school year SIPs.	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): achieved (continued) (Project Completion) Completion rate of the non-budgetary activities (total schools surveyed: 90 pilot schools) 　100% completion: 7.8% (7 out of 90 pilot schools) 　More than 80 % completion: 54.4% (49 out of 90 pilot schools) 　More than 50% completion: 94.4% (85 out of 90 pilot schools) (Ex-Post Evaluation) Average achievement rate of the planned no-budgetary activities (based on interview) | Dhading	Rasuwa
---	---
90%	80%		source : Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
	Indicator 1-2: Number of the target schools which get the 80% and above average completion rate (%) of the low budgetary activities in their latest school year SIPs.	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): achieved (partially continued) (Project Completion) Completion rate of the low budgetary activities (total schools surveyed: 90 pilot schools) 　More than 80 % completion: 34.4% (31 out of 90 pilot schools) 　More than 50% completion: 71.1% (64 out of 90 pilot schools) (Ex-Post Evaluation) Average achievement rate of the planned low budgetary activities (based on interview) | Dhading	Rasuwa
---	---
50%	50%		source : Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
	Indicator 1-3: Number of the target schools which get the 30% and above average completion rate (%) of the budgetary activities in their latest school year SIPs.	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): achieved (partially continued) (Project Completion) Completion rate of the budgetary activities (total schools surveyed: 90 pilot schools) 　More than 80% completion: 22.2% (20 out of 90 pilot schools) 　More than 50% completion: 71.1% (64 out of 90 pilot schools) (Ex-Post Evaluation) Average achievement rate of the planned budgetary activities (based on interview) | Dhading	Rasuwa
---	---
25%	20%		source : Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
	Indicator 1-4: Completion rate of the budgetary activities is to increase comparing to the before-SISM situation.	Status of the Achievement: partially achieved (Project Completion) - Comparison was not possible because of the lack of the baseline data, but more schools had access to funds of VDC and DDC compared to 2007/08, as shown in the Indicator 6, therefore, it was likely that the schools were able to complete budgetary activities more than before.	source: Terminal Evaluation Report
	Indicator 2: The average of the satisfaction level of parents and community members with school management of the schools is to become "3.5" and above by 5-level rating.	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): achieved (continued) (Project Completion) - The end-line survey shows that the average satisfaction level regarding school management was 3.54 by 5-level rating. (Ex-Post Evaluation) - Parents are satisfied with school management, according to interview. In Dhading, parents take collective decision with teachers and SMC members and they meet regularly and support to develop a child-friendly school environment. In Rasuwa, parents, teachers, students, and SMC members jointly develop a child-friendly school environment and conduct school-level planning.	source: Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
	Indicator 3: The amount (converted into NRs) contributed to school activities by parents and community members in the latest school year at the timing of the end-line survey is to increase 20% from	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): achieved (continued) (Project Completion) - In the pilot VDCs, a total of NRs. 16,597,752 was provided for school activities in the form of cash, labor and in kind by the community members in 2009/10, which was 358.7% increase from the previous year. (Ex-Post Evaluation) - Parents and community member are supporting temporary teachers in case schools need more teachers. They also support to build school infrastructure (in labor). These facts show that the same level of the activities have been continuously conducted since project completion.	source: Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members

	the year 2065 (2008/09) in the target schools.		
	Indicator 4: As per legal provision, 75% and above of the target schools are to share the financial audit reports and the social audit reports of the latest school year with the SMCs.	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): achieved (continued) (Project Completion) No. of pilot schools sharing audit (90 pilot schools surveyed) |	Schools that shared report
---	---
Financial audit	58 (64.5%)
Social audit	64 (71.1%)	 (Ex-Post Evaluation) No. of pilot schools sharing audit (based on interview) 		Schools that shared report
---	---
Financial audit	100%
Social audit	100%	 -All surveyed schools mentioned that they have received a grant for financial and social audits. Both audits were continuously done from the beginning of the project until 2019 (before COVID-19 pandemic) and 100% of pilot schools shared the social and financial audit report in the parents' meeting or in SMC's meeting. They are planning to conduct audits once COVID-19 situation improves.	source: Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
	Indicator 5-1: No. of events, related to the school management, supported by the local government is to increase comparing to the before-SISM situation.	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): achieved (continued) (Project Completion) No. of events 	Year 2007/08	Year 2009/10	Increase
---	---	---
119	507	326% | (Ex-Post Evaluation) - Although the number of events is not clear, most of the local government support preparation of SIP as well as implementation of some activities.	source : Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
	Indicator 5-2: The contents and the areas of the support.	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): achieved (continued) (Project Completion) - DOE conducted various training and workshops related to the Teacher's Professional Development program, for the new curriculum dissemination and capacity development of the SMCs. (Ex-Post Evaluation) - The local government support planning and implementing of the SIP, orientation for SMC's members, and teachers' training	source : Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
	Indicator 6: Increase in the accessing to the VDC/DDC funds by the target schools.	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): achieved (continued) (Project Completion) - According to end-line survey, the number of the pilot schools which received funds from VDC and DDC increased from 62 in 2007/08 to 77 in 2009/10. (Ex-Post Evaluation) - The local government has continuously provided funds for SIP planning and implementation, classroom maintenance, and salary of temporary teachers if needed at schools as well as funds for provision of school furniture and scholarship for poor and talent students, although quantitative survey has not been conducted on the number of schools receiving increased funds.	source : Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
(Overall Goal) The enrollment rate and dropout rate of primary school in the target area are improved.	Indicator 1: Increase in the net enrollment rate in primary education in the target area.	(Ex-Post Evaluation) not verifiable - The precise data of net enrollment rate in Dhading and Rasuwa was not available. The number of children enrolled in public schools is decreasing. No. of children enrolled (1-5 class in public schools of target districts) | Year		2011/12 (project completion)	2014/15 (target year)	2018/19	2019/20
---	---	---	---	---	---
Dhading	Boys	29,816	24,361	18,920	15,410
	Girls	31,940	25,615	19,139	15,574
	Total	61,756	49,976	38,059	30,984
Rasuwa	Boys	3,756	2,638	2,065	1,857
	Girls	3,999	3,014	2,241	1,960
	Total	7,755	5,652	4,306	3,817		source : CEHRD Flash Report, Questionnaire survey and telephone interview with EDCU chief, Education Chief of Municipality, principals and SMC members.

Indicator 2: Improvement of the dropout rate in primary education in the target area.	(Ex-Post Evaluation) not verifiable						source : Interview with CEHRD, CEHRD Flash Report, Questionnaire survey and telephone interview with EDCU chief, Education Chief of Municipality, principals and SMC members.
	Dropout rate (%) (1-5 class in public schools of target districts)						
	Year		2011/12	2014/15	2018/19	2019/20	
	Dhading	Boys	6.1	1.6	4.0	3.6	
		Girls	5.4	0.7	3.4	2.8	
		Total	5.8	1.2	3.7	3.2	
	Rasuwa	Boys	8.4	8.2	3.6	10.6	
		Girls	7.1	8.1	3.3	10.6	
		Total	7.7	8.2	3.4	10.6	

[Phase 2] Achievement of Project Purpose and Overall Goal

Aim	Indicators	Results	Source
(Project Purpose) Schools are managed through SIP process nationwide for improving access to and quality of basic education.	Indicator 1: At least 80% of the sample schools update 2073 (2016/17) annual action plan of SIP based on the updated SIP Formulation Guidebook. *target (testing) area: Solukhumbu, Doti, Jumla and Rupandehi	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): partially achieved (continued) (Project Completion) - At the terminal evaluation, the percentage of schools that updated the annual action plan of SIP was increased from 43% in 2013/14 to 71% in 2016/17. (Ex-Post Evaluation) - 100% schools prepared SIP in 2015 and updated annual action plan based on SIP Formulation Guidebook. Annual action plans are updated from 2018 to 2019 but only 5% schools update five- year SIP for 2020 and annual SIP for 2021 due to the impact of COVID-19.	source : Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
	Indicator 2: At least 60% of the sample SMCs implement the planned activities of 2072 (2015/16) annual action plan of SIP*. *80% of the planned non-budgetary activities and 50% of the planned budgetary activities	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): partially achieved (partially continued) (Project Completion) - According to the results of the end-line survey, 86 out of 100 sample schools planned the budgetary activities in SIP, of which 30 schools (35%) completed 50% of these planned activities. Regarding non-budgetary activities, 74 schools planned these activities in SIP, and 28 schools (38%) completed 80% of the planned non-budgetary activities. (Ex-Post Evaluation) - Among 26 schools in six districts surveyed (4 Target (testing) districts and 2 Follow-up districts), 74.2% of non-budgetary activities are implemented while 47.5 % of budgetary and low budgetary activities are implemented, according to interview. Implementation rate of SIP activities | %	Non budgetary	Budgetary	Low Budgetary
Dhading	90	26	50
Rasuwa	80	20	50
Solukhumbu	80	50	-
Doti	57.5	50	-
Jumla	65	50	-
Rupandehi	72.5	50	-
Average*	74.2	41 / 47.5**	-	 *Average of the value of each district **Calculated based on the ratio between budgetary and low-budgetary activities in Dhading and Rasuwa 　Dhading　low budgetary: 20%, budgetary: 5%→low:bud=4:1 　Rasuwa　low bugetary: 20%,budgetary:10%→low:bud=2:1 (Refer to "Continuation Status" of Phase 1)	source : Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
	Indicator 3: Activities* related to improvement of access and quality of basic education are planned and implemented in SIP. *They include: 1)	Status of the Achievement (Status of the Continuation): achieved (continued) (Project Completion) - Although the target value was not specified, significant improvements were observed in teachers', parents', and SMCs' perspectives of planning and implementing SIP activities to reduce dropout and out-of-school children. (Ex-Post Evaluation)	source : Terminal Evaluation Report, Questionnaire and telephone interview with

	reducing drop-out, 2) reducing out-of-school children, 3) increasing learning achievement, and 4) non-budgetary activities.	- Activities planned and implemented: Home visits of student by teachers and SMC's member, Appointment of temporary teachers, Creation of child friendly environment in classroom by teachers, Activities related to children's learning such as singing a song related to the topic or playing some game, Provision of lunch for children of 1-5 class, Provision of sanitary pads and medicine for girls, Provision of student hostel.	principals and SMC members
(Overall Goal) The technical and financial mechanism for enhancing school management through SIP process is maintained at the national and district levels.	Indicator 1: The budget for formulation/update and implementation of SIP is specifically included in the ASIP/AWPB.	(Ex-Post Evaluation) achieved - 90% of school made SIP and, also, some block grants are allocated through ASIP/AWPB for SIP formulation/updating.	source : ASIP/AWPB data
	Indicator 2: The formulation/update of SIP is specified in the PIM.	(Ex-Post Evaluation) achieved - The formulation/update of SIP is mentioned in PIM and government support for SIP has been continued, for example, support grand for basic school for capacity development of community and SMC, parental education, and extra-curricular activities.	source : PIM documents
	Indicator 3: The designated team for promoting SIP formulation and implementation is in place.	(Ex-Post Evaluation) achieved - Every school has SMC and the duty of SMC is designated as promotion of SIP formulation and implementation. The ultimate responsibility for SIP is placed at municipality and school. Based on the request, municipality and EDCU facilitate the preparation of SIP.	source: Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
	Indicator 4: The role and responsibility of DEOs and RCs for implementing SIP are specified.	(Ex-Post Evaluation) achieved - The role and responsibility of EDCU (DEO before) and Local Education Units under each local government for implementing SIP are specified. EDCU and concerned organizations (i.e., local governments) provide suggestions during the formulation of SIP if the school needs. In addition, EDCU and concerned organization clarify the needs to be addressed.	source: Questionnaire and telephone interview with EDCU Chief, Municipality Education Chief, principals
	Indicator 5: All DEOs conduct SIP orientation for newly appointed SMC members at least once after the completion of the project.	(Ex-Post Evaluation) not achieved - 10% of SMC members got orientation from EDCU and concerned organizations. 90% of SMC members got orientation from only school principal, according to interview during ex-post evaluation.	source: Questionnaire and telephone interview with principals and SMC members
	Indicator 6: The content of SIP formulation/update is incorporated in the NCED's training.	(Ex-Post Evaluation) achieved - According to Head Teacher Capacity Building Training Curriculum (Ministry of Education /then National Center for Educational Development, February, 2017) documents, SIP is incorporated in the leadership capacity development training curriculum and leadership capacity development training. Other resource materials are; supplementary training materials (STM) for annual implementation plan preparation for disaster risk reduction, School Self-Assessment (SSA) checklist, materials for SIP appraisal school level workshop for SIP formulation. They are uploaded in the CEHRD website and being utilized by the as needed It is described that SIP is planned and implemented for better school, better teaching, and better learning.	source : Documents on capacity development and training

3 Efficiency

[Phase 1] Both the project cost and the project period were within the plan (ratio against the plan: 97% and 100%, respectively). The outputs of the project were produced as planned. Therefore, the efficiency of the project is high.

[Phase 2] Both the project cost and the project period exceeded the plan (ratio against the plan: 152% and 138%, respectively). The outputs of the project were produced as planned. The project cost exceeded due to addition of extra activities related to emergency support after the 2015 earthquake. The project period was extended in July 2015 to respond to the needs for emergency support after the earthquake, and then, extended again in June 2017 upon request from GON during the terminal evaluation, due to the activity delay caused by budget constraints and government reorganization as well as by the prolonged impacts of the earthquake. The outputs were produced as planned. Taking into consideration the influence of the earthquake, the efficiency of the project is fair

[Both phases] Therefore, the efficiency of Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects as combined is fair (See "Special Perspectives Considered ").

4 Sustainability

<Policy Aspect>

[Both phases] In the Fifteenth Plan (2019/20 – 2023/24), ensuring of free and compulsory basic education is listed as one of strategies and involvement of stakeholders at all levels including district and community levels is mentioned. The School Sector Development Plan (2016/17-2022/23) mentions the importance of the effective implementation of SIP, describing that school will prepare SIP for implementation education program and this is obligation. In addition, SIP Formulation Guidebook is mentioned in CEHRD documents and website.

<Institutional/Organizational Aspect>

[Both phases] The staff at district and local government are carrying out their daily duties, including planning and implementation of SIP, without major problem. Although there are not sufficient staff members assigned to district and school levels to promote the school management and to effectively follow up the project activities, according to interview with CEHRD ex-counterparts and ex-staff of the

project, the number of staff is increasing at province, district, and local government levels. Previously, in the district, there were 15-17 staff members on average to support for school management. However, now there are over 20 education staff members in the local government in each district and even more in some districts. Furthermore, federal restructuring has created positive effects to promote school management through more decentralization and devolution of power and additional resources to local governments and schools.

<Technical Aspect>

[Both phases] Government officials and principals have skills to implement and support SMC activities without major problem, although activities are affected by COVID-19. The trainings are being organized at central, district and local government levels. At central level, there are different types of training for principals and teachers for skill development such as NCED training package. At district level, there are opportunities for whole district principals to share their own experiences and knowledge with others. When project was implemented, there were trainings for teachers and SMC members. After the project, several trainings were conducted, however, the number of the training is not enough because it was difficult to conduct the training in the time of shifting federal system and COVID-19. In the curriculum for Head Teachers Leadership and Capacity Building, 3 sessions are sanctioned on SIP formulation, appraisal, and monitoring matters. At community level, parents meeting and SMC's meeting are held to share each other knowledge. The SIP materials provided by the project are continuously used.

<Financial Aspect>

[Both Phases] ASIP/AWPB for the fiscal year 2021/22 allocates the budget for grants for school operation and management which includes activities for SIP. The budget for the SIP activities is allocated mainly by local governments. For SIP training, monitoring, and formulation, CEHRD provides NRs.15,000-20,000 per year to each basic and secondary school respectively. The budget for SIP is also utilized for capacity development of community and SMC members, parental education, and extra-curricular activities. Since the completion rate of budgetary activities is low compared to non-budgetary activities, as described above, securing budget at school level may be a concern in implementing activities planned in SIP. Even though the SIP budget had been secured at the central level, it was not allocated as planned at the local government level smoothly.

<Evaluation Result>

[Both phases] In light of the above, slight problems have been observed in terms of the technical, and financial aspects of the implementing agency. Therefore, the sustainability of the project effects is fair.

5 Summary of the Evaluation

Phase 1 project achieved the Project Purpose (improvement of school management) by the time of project completion. The effects of the Phase 1 project such as completion rate of SIP activities and parents' satisfaction have continued to the time of ex-post evaluation, but the Overall Goal (enrollment rate and dropout rate) has not been achieved partly because the indicators were defined a bit far from project activities. Phase 2 project partially achieved the Project Purpose (school management through nationwide SIP process) and the effects of the Phase 2 project, such as updating of SIP and implementation of SIP activities, have been partially continued. The Overall Goal of the Phase 2 project (mechanism for enhancing school management) has been achieved as SIP is incorporated into leadership training and SIP promotion team is in place.

Regarding the sustainability for both phases, some problems were observed in the technical and financial aspects mainly due to lack of training and budget. As for the efficiency, both project cost and project period were within plan in the Phase 1 project, while both project cost and project period exceeded the plan in the Phase 2 projects, partly due to the influence of the earthquake.

Considering all of the above points, this project (Phase 1 and Phase 2 as combined) is evaluated to be satisfactory.

III. Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Recommendations for Implementing Agency:

- SIP can be used as important tool/basis for any kind of support to schools for enhancing synergy effects and avoiding any possible duplications of activities. To promote SIP, GON should take stronger measures in order that SIP should be more clearly and specifically described in government documents at all three levels including Municipal Education Plans as a crucial means to enhance coordinated engagements with local governments for improved school performance. For example, measures such as securing resources and improving linkages among the plans for better results in school management and student's learning achievement should be taken.

- Field survey revealed relatively low level of achievement of implementation of budgetary and even low-budgetary activities of SIP due to lack of necessary budget at school level. It seems that this confusion was caused among the stakeholders by the unclear roles of the three tiers of government in the timing of the shift to federalism, and consequently the SIP budget that had been secured at the central level was not allocated as planned at the local government level smoothly. Therefore, as mentioned in SSDP and School Education Sector Plan (SESP), federal (central), provincial, and local governments should continuously conduct monitoring of the future needs of additional resources and to use the SIP as an important funding tool for the school.

- It is recommended that CEHRD make a clear guideline for improving capacity and leadership of school principals through training in order to facilitate effective implementation of SIP and guide teachers for improving students' learning outcomes at schools.

- It is desirable that the local governments conduct capacity development of SMCs, especially in prioritizing, planning, and being accountable for activity implementation to improve quality of education and learning environment.

Lessons Learned for JICA:

- SIP is important tool to plan and implement activities at school level but only strengthening of SIP is not sufficient to immediately improve enrollment rate and dropout rate. In that sense, the indicators for the Overall Goal in the Phase 1 project might be too ambitious. To evaluate the effects of the project, it is important to define appropriate and realistic indicators in planning stage. Indicators closely related to project activities and showing the expansion and sustainability of the project activities would be preferable, for example, indicators related to legal arrangement of government, and monitoring system of implementing agencies. Indicators such as those in the phase 2 project might be some examples.

- As to response to a major natural disaster during project implementation, preparing a disaster mitigation plan during the project formulation time should be considered especially in disaster prone areas in Nepal and other counties.

-In regards to response to a major policy change during the project implementation, formulation of a project with necessary flexibility is important to adopt the changed structure of the system.

- The project has created positive effects to revitalize the SIP practices nationwide and enhanced the awareness of its effectiveness at different levels such as schools, local government, and district and federal agencies. As a result, SIP remains an important tool for the on-going national policies and national education plan/programs. Some examples of advantage of SIP process are a common platform provided for the school level stakeholders to sit together and discuss the problem, and clarification of the need of the schools that foster the ownership in the entire plan for the smooth implementation. So, the project shows that SIP is effective to contribute to improving the student's academic performances in the situation where good understanding of head teacher and SMC members is fostered. Important factors for promotion of SIP are: orientation for newly appointed SMC members about the SIP, awareness of school-level stakeholders on own problems, so that they identify and implement activities with their own initiatives and available resources, as well as with minimum financial support from the relevant agencies. Moreover, regular and periodic follow-up meeting/discussion for the planning and implementation of SIP and monitoring of SIP activities by the local levels (local governments and EDCU) are also important factors to sustain the SIP initiative.

EDCU officer conducting SIP orientation to principals and SMC members

A group photo after the SIP orientation