



THE SECOND PHASE OF THE EDUCATIONAL REFORM FOR KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY PROJECT (ERFKE II)

Component One: School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP)

Monitoring & Evaluation of School and Directorate Development Program (SDDP) – 2013

Interim Report – Data Analysis

Prepared by

Head of Division of Monitoring & Evaluation

Farouq Bani Hamad

Statistical Analysis

Division Member of Monitoring & Evaluation

Samer Mahmoud "Al-Haj Ahmad"

Supervision

Managing Director of Planning & Educational Research

Dr. Mohammad Abu Ghazleh

&

Director of Educational Research & Development

Dr. Myasser Al-Habashneh

Translation

Division of Translation & Educational Publications

Mahmoud Suhailah

Ilham Sadeq

Sa'eda Al-Sayyed

Mervat Makahleh

June 30, 2013

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
Mean score (1.0): Increased effective participation of the local community, directorates of education and Ministry's Center in school development processes.												
1.1 Qualitatively: Degree to which schools are implementing improvement plans	Percentage of activities implemented as per plan	N/A	All schools in Jordan implement their Improvement Plans as per schedule to a high degree (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	Degree of application rate by school development teams is 4.14 out of 5.0, equivalent to 83% the percentage rate for the application of the plans. Boys schools scored a higher degree of the application rate where the average reached to 4.29 which is the higher than grade attained by girls schools and mixed schools, which were 4.00 The highest degree plans implementation was scored by directorates according to supervisors was 3.43 and was the lowest degree was in Directorate of Education in the North-Eastern Badia, reaching to 1.0	School development team members: An average score of 4.3 of 5.0 which equals 86% of implementation of plan. Girls/mixed schools scored higher (4.75) than boys schools (3.62). Supervisors: average score of (3.5) particularly low in Al-Qaser (1.0)		Degree of application rate by school development teams is 3.2 out of 5.0 which is equivalent to 64% the percentage rate for the application of the plans. Girls and mixed schools scored higher score than average in terms of the application of 3.5 which is higher than the degree of boys' schools which was 2.8 The average degree of application by educational supervisors was 3.0	Degree of application rate by school development teams is 3.9 out of 5.0 which is equivalent to 78% the percentage rate for the application of the plans. Girls and mixed schools scored higher score than average in terms of the application of 4.1 which is higher than the degree of boys' schools which was 3.8 The average degree of application by educational supervisors was 4.5	Degree of application rate by school development teams is 4.0 out of 5.0 which is equivalent to 80% the percentage rate for the application of the plans. Girls and mixed schools scored higher score than average in terms of the application of 4.3 which is higher than the degree of boys' schools which was 3.7 The average degree of application by educational supervisors was 4.0	Degree of application rate by school development teams is 3.9 out of 5.0 which is equivalent to 78% the percentage rate for the application of the plans. Girls and mixed schools scored higher score than average in terms of the application of 4.0 which is higher than the degree of boys' schools which was 3.8 The average degree of application by educational supervisors was 3.5	Degree of application rate by school development teams is 3.7 out of 5.0 which is equivalent to 74% the percentage rate for the application of the plans Girls and mixed schools scored higher score than average in terms of the application of 4.0 which is higher than the degree of boys' schools which was 3.5 The average degree of application by educational supervisors was 3.7	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical Support provided for schools by directorates of education Availability of the financial grant Motivation, collaboration and teamwork Availability of educational support <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient of the grant provided Lack of documentation pertains to achieved accomplishments of plans implementation and their effects on periodical reports submitted to the directorates of education Nemours number of projects that are carried by the Ministry and international donors Lack of concerned Monitoring personnel from the directorates of education and lack of educational support with school networks and small number of educational supervisors in some of these directorates Difficulty of procedures related to the delivery of grants, donations from different parties Availability of change resistance culture and lack of motivation to work in programs Lack of efficiency of educational councils in school networks in supporting school development plans. Unsuitable school environment and facilities due to large number of rented and double-shift schools Lack of clarity in roles and responsibilities of the concerned individuals Ministry's delay in delivering grants to the first group of the directorates of education <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase the number of educational supervisors in the needy directorates Reduce field coordinators' work load to help them implement the development plans Postpone the transfer of principals and teachers to the end of the scholastic year along with rehabilitation of new members of development teams Disperse the allocated financial support for the first group of directorates of education in on time Follow up school accomplishments periodically in the field of implementing school development plans along with providing technical support and awareness necessary to implement the development plans Facilitate procedures of accepting donations from the local community Activate the role of development network councils and

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
							Directorate scored highest rate at (4.3) and Directorate of Northern Badia which scored the lowest the rate at (1.9)	Madaba Directorate scored highest rate at (4.9) and Directorate of Northern Mazar & Bani Obied which scored the lowest the rate at (3.6)	and Directorate of Southern Badia which scored the lowest the rate at (2.7)	Petra and Salt Directorates scored highest rate at (4.4) and Directorate of Southern Badia which scored the lowest the rate at (3.0)	and Directorate of Southern Badia which scored the lowest the rate at (4.9)	educate parents and local community about the program and enact their role in this program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrating training programs which have common goals by the Ministry Educate concerned parties about roles and responsibility and capacity building of school development teams continuously
1.2 Qualitatively; Degree to which Field Directorates are implementing their improvement plans	Percentage of procedures/activities implemented as per plan	N/A	All Field directorates implement their Improvement Plans per schedule to a high degree (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics	Degree application rate by directorates' development teams is 3.43 and implementation degrees among the 7 directorates ranged between low at (1.0) and high at (5.0)	Degree application rate by directorates' development teams is 4.56 and implementation degrees among the 9 directorates ranged between low at (4.0) and high at (5.0)		Degree of implementation rate by Directorate development teams is 3.1 Implementation degree in the 7 directorates ranged between low in North-Eastern Badia and Giza at (2.0) and high in South Ghour at (4.0)	Degree of implementation rate by Directorate development teams is 4.3 Implementation degree among directorates ranged between low in North Mazar (3.0) and high in Madaba at (5.0)	Degree of implementation rate by Directorate development teams is 3.8 Implementation degree among directorates ranged between low in Marka & South Badia at (3.0) and high in Rusaifa and Ein Albasha at (5.0)	Degree of implementation rate by Directorate development teams is 3.5 Implementation degree among directorates ranged between low in Tafela, Taiba, Ajlun & Qwaisma at (3.0) and high in Petra at (5.0)	Degree of implementation rate by Directorate development teams is 3.6 Implementation degree among directorates ranged between low in North – Eastern Badia & at (2.0) and high in Madaba, Bani Obeid, Rusaifa & Petra at (5.0)	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration and the availability of educational support Technical support represented in the various professional development programs Financial grant offered by the SDDP <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The large number of programs with common goals provided by various donors and preoccupation of many supervisors with other programs while others are freed Lack of clarity in the roles and responsibilities of many who involved in the implementation of the program and the absence of many sections of the directorates to implement plan activities and the existence of resistance to change culture Ministry's delaying in distributing grants allocated to the first group of the directorates of education and insufficient financial grant provided by the project The absence of the active role of the councils of educational development Geographical spacing of schools and the lack of means of transportation sometimes in some directorates of education The small number of supervisors and educational supporters and instability educational leaders The existence of specialized plans in sections that must be implemented upon the instructions issued by the Ministry which are difficult to integrate with the development plans of the directorates the need for prior approval from the ministry for the implementation of capacity building leading to impede the implementation of some of the activities in the plan, and the ministry's lack of cooperation in the implementation of training workshops that are to address it for approval Complicated procedures that relate to the acceptance of grants and donations from the local community Lack of motivation and enthusiasm by the directors of

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
												some of directorates of education <u>Recommendations:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry's center needs to follow up implementation of the program in the districts periodically along with enacting managers' roles to support the program and the implementation of the principle of accountability Documentation of all achievements according to the timetable included the plan and send completion periodic reports to the Ministry Standardization of programs provided by various donors and channeled them to support the implementation of development plans Clarification the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the directorates and building their capacity continuously The Ministry should disburse the allocated financial grants allocated to the directorates in a timely manner and according to the plan implementation requirements Taking measures and procedures to insure the activation the roles of development councils Increasing the number of supervisors and educational supporter in the needy directorates The Ministry should pay more attention to professional development programs prepared by the directorate and avoid delaying its approval to these programs Facilitation of the participation of all divisions and the integration of their plans in the development plan of the directorate of education
1.3 Qualitatively; Degree to which education councils at school cluster level are operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councils formation Members know their roles and responsibilities Three meetings are held during the scholastic year at least They take decisions They implement them 	N/A	All School Clusters' Education Councils are operational to a high degree (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	Effectiveness degree reached to 2.90. The Educational councils in North-Eastern Badia scored a lost degree at 1.6 but the councils of South Ghour scored the highest degree at 4.6 Regarding standards of council formation scored the highest degree and they scored 4.0.	Effectiveness rate reached to 3.89. Educational councils in Ramtha district scored the lowest degree at 2.7 and the highest was scored by those in Amman/4 at 4.8 Regarding criteria, membership matching standards in the formation		Effectiveness rate reached to 2.1. The educational councils for schools networks in North-Western Badia, & Mafraq district scored the lowest degree at 1.0 and the highest were scored by Al-Mowqar at 3.5. Regarding standards of councils formation standards	Effectiveness rate reached to 3.4. The educational councils for schools networks in North Mazar scored the lowest degree at 2.1 and the highest were scored by Madaba at 4.6. Regarding	Effectiveness rate reached to 3.0. The educational councils for schools networks in Marka scored the lowest degree at 2.2 and the highest were scored by Al-Qaser at 3.6. Regarding standards of councils formation standards scored the	Effectiveness rate reached to 3.4. The educational councils for schools networks in Al-Taiba scored, the lowest degree at 2.7 and the highest were scored by Petra at 4.1. Regarding standards of councils formation standards scored the highest degree at 4.9 and the lowest those who implement decisions at 2.4	Effectiveness rate reached to 2.9 The educational councils for schools networks in North-Western Badia & Mafraq scored, the lowest degree at 1.0 and the highest were scored by Madaba at 4.6. Regarding standards of councils formation standards scored the	<u>Strengths:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the standards for membership are applied to councils On average two meetings were held in the scholastic year Some decision were taken and some were implemented <u>Weaknesses:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roles and responsibilities of many members of the councils are ambiguous Decisions that had been taken and implemented didn't fit the roles of the council Lack of balance in terms gender in the structure of development councils <u>Recommendations:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educate members of the educational councils of school networks on their roles and responsibilities It is necessary to motivate the councils to make decisions that help schools operate in the implementation of their development plans and work following up their implementation

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
					of the councils scored the highest degrees through holding three meetings in the scholastic year		scored the highest degree at 3.1 and the lowest those who implement decisions at 1.7	standards of councils formation standards scored the highest degree at 4.0 and the lowest those who implement decisions at 4.0 while knowing roles and responsibilities was 2.9	highest degree at 4.3 and the lowest those who implement decisions at 2.1		highest degree at 4.0 and the lowest those who implement decisions at 2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The directorates of education need to restructure ineffective educational councils of the school networks, taking into account the standards for efficiency and the desire of the members and not to appoint them based on their career or social positions along with creating a balance in terms of gender
1.4 Qualitatively; Degree to which Education Development Councils at the level of Field Directorates are operational	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Membership Roles and responsibilities Meetings held Decision made Decision implemented 	N/A	All Field Directorates' Education Development Councils are operational to a high degree (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics	Effectiveness rate of the educational councils was 3.1 according to the estimations of directorates development teams and 2.9 for member of the Educational Reform Council	Effectiveness rate of the educational councils by their members was lower than the degree according to the estimations of directorates development teams which was 4.28 members and 3.5 for directorates development members		Effectiveness rate of educational reform councils of directorates was 2.6 according to the estimations of the directorates development teams and 2.2 for members of educational reform councils General Average was (2.4) South Ghour scored the highest degree at (3.5) while Mowaqr Directorate scored the lowest degree at (1.5)	Effectiveness rate of educational reform councils of directorates was 3.6 according to the estimations of the directorates development teams and 3.8 for members of educational reform councils General Average was (3.7) Madaba scored the highest degree at (4.2) while Mowaqr Directorate	Effectiveness rate of educational reform councils of directorates was 3.2 according to the estimations of the directorates development teams and 2.6 for members of educational reform councils General Average was (2.9) Russaifah scored the highest degree at (3.7) while Marka Directorate scored the lowest degree at (2.2)	Effectiveness rate of educational reform councils of directorates was 3.3 according to the estimations of the directorates development teams and 3.7 for members of educational reform councils General Average was (3.5) Petra scored the highest degree at (4.1) while Ajlun Directorate scored the lowest degree at (2.3)	Effectiveness rate of educational reform councils of directorates was 3.0 according to the estimations of the directorates development teams and 3.1 for members of educational reform councils General Average was (3.0) Petra scored the highest degree at (2.4) while Ajlun Directorate scored the lowest degree at (4.2)	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the standards of membership are applied to councils On average two meetings were held in the scholastic year Some decision were taken and some implemented <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roles and responsibilities of many members of the councils are ambiguous Decisions that had been taken and implemented didn't fit the roles of the council Failure to take effective decisions to serve the activities of the development plan <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders in the departments of Education should hold awareness workshops for members of councils of education development of the directorate to familiarize them with their roles and responsibilities The directorates of education need to restructure councils of education to create a balance in terms of gender The necessity of activating the roles of the councils in order to take effective decisions to assist the directorates in the implementation of their development plan

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
								scored the lowest degree at (3.1)				
1.5 Qualitatively; Degree of satisfaction of Field Directorate staff with support from directorates of education to implement Field Directorate Improvement Plans	Supported provided based on the needs of school (see questionnaire item 1.5)	N/A	High level of satisfaction with the support they receive from the field directorate (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	All districts score 3.43 on this indicator, “acceptable” with the exception of Mafrag which scored 1.0 “marginal”	School principals in all directorates demonstrated degree of satisfaction degree at 4.0 except for South Mazar which scored 3.0 (marginal)		Focus Groups School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at 3.0 (acceptable). The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by North Ghour at (4.0) and least degree was scored by Jerash at (1.7) (marginal) Males scored (2.9) and females scored (3.0)	Focus Groups School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at 3.4 (acceptable). The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by North Ghour at (4.0) and least degree was scored by Madaba at (4.0) and least degree was scored by North Mazar at (2.8) (marginal) Males scored (3.1) and females scored (3.8)	Focus Groups School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at 3.5 (acceptable). The highest degree of satisfaction degree was scored by Al-Quasar at (4.0) and least degree was scored by South Badia at (2.7) (marginal) Males scored (3.4) and females scored (3.6)	Focus Groups School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at 3.6 (acceptable). The highest degree of satisfaction degree was scored by Qwaiseh at (4.5) and least degree was scored by Tafela at (2.8) (marginal) Males scored (3.6) and females scored (3.5)	Focus Groups School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (3.3) (acceptable). The highest degree of satisfaction degree was scored by Qwaiseh at (4.5) and least degree was scored by Jerash at (1.7) (marginal) Males scored (3.3) and females scored (3.4)	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The directorates of education provide technical support to schools through professional development programs for teachers and principals The directorates of education provide equipment, supplies and maintenance work that schools need <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The weakness of directorates of education in the field of providing appropriate and effective environment to communicate with schools. Lack of justice in the distribution of services among schools and the lack of interest of the directorates of education in boys' schools compared with girls' schools Lack of support offered the directorates of education to motivate and stimulate local community to participate in school activities Repetitive transfers among the administrative and teaching staff during the scholastic year and the continuous change of supportive educators of networks with a clear weakness in the attribution of educational roles Lack of follow-up and guidance offered by the directorates of education pertain to the program and lack of providing continuous feedback on the performance of schools in the implementation of activities related to development plans <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The directorates of education need to raise the level of communication and cooperation with schools and to increase the level of support provided to them The directorates of education need to hold periodic workshops which include coordinators of areas and supervisors to educate everyone on their roles and responsibilities Adoption and install networks of schools within the geographical area and not to change them during the period of school development. The directorates of education need to increase interest in boys' schools and support them in the implementation of the development plan activities along with the provision of equal distribution of services among the school The directorates of education need to activate periodic follow-up of schools; especially boy's schools in order to achieve activities of development plans. In addition to

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
							<p>The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by North Eastern Badia at (3.4) and least degree was scored by Mwaqar at (2.4) (marginal) Males scored (3.0) and females scored (3.0)</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 3/ item D “<i>The directorates of education provide schools principals and teachers with suitable professional development activities in the fields of teaching-learning process related to students’ achievement evaluation</i>” and paragraph 5 “<i>the directorates</i></p>	<p>satisfaction at 3.1 (acceptable). The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Madaba at (3.4) and least degree scored by South Mazar at (2.8) (marginal) Males scored (2.9) and females scored (3.3)</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 13 – “<i>The directorate supervise s the implementation of national and international exams and keep records of their results</i>” at 3.6 The least degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 10 “<i>the directorat</i></p>	<p>The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Al-Qaser at (3.6) and least degree was scored by South Badia at (3.0) (marginal) Males scored (3.2) and females scored (3.5).</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 13 – “<i>The directorate supervise s the implementation of national and international exams and keep records of their results</i>” at 4.0</p> <p>The least degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 10 “<i>the directorate help schools work effectively</i></p>	<p>scored by Salt at (3.8) and least degree was scored by Qwaismeh at (2.7) (marginal) Males scored (3.2) and females scored (3.4).</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 1 “<i>The directorate informs schools about changes in curriculum and educational materials that are experimented by Directorate of Curricula and School Textbooks</i>” and paragraph 13 “<i>The directorate supervise the implementation of national and international exams and keep records of their results</i>” and paragraph 26 “<i>The directorate’s staff carry out field</i></p>	<p>The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Salt at (3.8) and least degree was scored by Mwaqar at (2.4) (marginal) Males scored (3.1) and females scored (3.3)</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 13 – “<i>The directorate supervise s the implementation of national and international exams and keep records of their results</i>” at (3.7)</p> <p>The least degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 10 “<i>the directorate help schools work effectively with student with special needs</i>” and “<i>low-achievers and gifted students</i></p>	<p>facilitating administrative procedures which contribute to the implementation of the activities of the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop transferring among principals and teachers during the scholastic year

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
						<p>follow up the implementation of curriculum by teachers” and paragraph 13 “The directorate supervise the implementation of national and international exams and keep records of their results” and paragraph 26 “The directorate’s staff carry out field visits to girls schools to follow up the achievement for the directorate’s plans.” The satisfaction degree reached to 3.4 whereas the least degree was scored on paragraph 11 “the directorate help schools work effectively with student with special needs (Human & Physical Resources) which scored 2.3</p>	<p>e help schools work effectively with student with special needs “low-achievers and gifted students (Human & Physical Resources) which scored 2.4</p>	<p>with student with special needs “low-achievers and gifted students (Human & Physical Resources) which scored 2.9</p>	<p>visits to girls schools to follow up the achievement for the directorate’s plans.” which scored 3.8 while the least degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 3 “The directorates of education provide schools principals and teachers with suitable professional development activities in the fields of teaching-learning process related to students’ achievement evaluation” in the following aspects: E) Teaching of students with special needs (low achievers and gifted students) and F) Knowledge on Pedagogy and health and psychological education. And paragraph No. 11 “the directorate help schools work effectively with student with special needs (Human & Physical Resources) which scored 2.6</p>	<p>(Human & Physical Resources) which scored 2.6</p>		

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
1.6 Qualitatively; Degree of satisfaction of Field Directorate staff with support from MoE center to implement Field Directorate Improvement Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support provide by MoE to ensure the optimal use and continue in developing the database on common needs of schools Support provided by educational supervisors in MoE center to help directorates implement their professional plan to meet their need and the common needs of schools Feedback provided by MoE center on reports submitted by directorates Support provide by MoE center to activate the role of the Educational council. Support provide by MoE center to help directorate implement regulations when disbursing the grant and carry out financial analysis of the grant to 	A N/	High level of satisfaction (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	The degree of satisfaction among directorates differed and it ranged between low in Mafraq at 1.0 to high in North-Eastern Badia at 3.75 while satisfaction rate was 2.07 and the standard of professional development opportunities scored the highest degree of satisfaction.			<p>Focus Groups The degree of satisfaction between Directorate' Development Team which reached to (2.3) but it was (1.6) for supervisors</p> <p>The general satisfaction degree was (1.9) and it ranged between low in Jearsh at (1.0) to high South Ghor at (3.0)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis The general satisfaction degree was (2.2) The degree of the general satisfaction ranged from low in Mafraq at (1.8) to high in North-Eastern Badia at (2.5)</p>	<p>Focus Groups The degree of satisfaction between Directorat e' Developm ent Team which reached to (4.0) but it was (3.0) for supervisor s</p> <p>The general satisfactio n degree was (3.5) and it ranged between low in North Mazar at (2.5) to high Bani Obied at (4.5)</p> <p>Questionn aire Analysis The general satisfaction degree was (2.9) The degree of the general satisfaction ranged from low in Madaba at (2.6) to high in Bani Obied at (3.1)</p>	<p>Focus Groups The degree of satisfaction between Directorate' Development Team which reached to (3.3) but it was (2.3) for supervisors</p> <p>The general satisfaction degree was (2.8) and it ranged between low in South Badia & Ramtha at (2.0) to high Rusaifa & Al-Qaser at (3.5)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis The general satisfaction degree was (2.5) The degree of the general satisfaction ranged from low in Ramtha at (1.8) to high in Rusaifa & Marka at (2.9)</p>	<p>Focus Groups The degree of satisfaction between Directorate' Development Team which reached to (2.5) but it was (3.3) for supervisors</p> <p>The general satisfaction degree was (2.9) and it ranged between low in Taybeh & Wasteyeh at (2.0) to high Petra & Salt at (3.5)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis The general satisfaction degree was (2.6) The degree of the general satisfaction ranged from low in Trafela at (2.0) to high in Petra at (3.3)</p>	<p>Focus Groups The degree of satisfaction between Directorate' Development Team which reached to (2.9) but it was (2.5) for supervisors</p> <p>The general satisfaction degree was (2.7) and it ranged between low in Jerash at (1.0) to high Bani Obeid at (4.5)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis The general satisfaction degree was (2.5) The degree of the general satisfaction ranged from low in Mafraq & Ramtha at (1.8) to high in Petra at (3.3)</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational supervisors' new role which based on offering their experience to any one who wants to benefit from Monitoring and evaluation provided by the Managing Directorate of Planning and Educational Research at the Ministry's center to the SDDP <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor communication and follow-up by the Managing Directorate of Education Training Center at the Ministry's center to SDDP and failure to provide feedback on report submitted by the directorates of education Lack of support provided by the educational supervisors at Ministry's center to assist directorates of education in implementing professional development plans to meet their needs and the common needs of schools Lack of a sufficient number of supervisors to cover the program as required Multiplicity of programs and projects with similar goals, which are carried out by the Ministry and lack of coordination among them. In addition to the large number of incongruent training courses Lack of support offered by Ministry's center to support efforts exerted by the directorates of education to trigger the Educational Development Council because of legislation, regulations and laws <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry should develop a database of the common needs of the directorates of education. The Ministry should amend the instructions pertain to the financial support offered to the directorates of education and schools so that the value of support meets their actual needs. The Ministry should organize and hold ongoing workshops to raise awareness of the importance of the program to clarify the roles and responsibilities of all those involved in the program. Educational supervisors at the Ministry's center should provide the required support to help directorates of education implement professional development plans to meet the needs of the directorates and the common needs of the schools. The Ministry should provide sufficient number of supervisors to cover the program as required. The Ministry's center should provide support the directorates' efforts to activate the Educational Development Council through the amendment of legislation, regulations and laws. The Ministry's center should integrate development programs that have similar objectives.

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
	define aspects of its disbursement at schools and directorates – The effect of data and information resulted from the implementation of SDDP submitted by directorates to MoE on policy development or to reach at new policies or instructions					The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 2 “ <i>The educational supervisors provide support to implement professional development plan to the needs of the directorates of education and schools</i> ” which reached to 2.2 whereas; the least degree was on paragraph 1 “ <i>MoE provides Support to ensure the optimal use and continue in developing the database on common needs of schools</i> ” And paragraph 4 “ <i>MoE provides support to activate the role of the Educational councils</i> ” at (2.0)	The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 2 “ <i>MoE provides support to ensure the optimal use and continue in developing the database on common needs of schools</i> ” and paragraph 1 “ <i>The educational supervisors provide support to implement professional development plan to the needs of the directorates of education and schools</i> ” which reached to 3.0 whereas; the lowest degree was on paragraph 4 “ <i>MoE provides</i>	The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 3 “ <i>The Ministry provides feedback on reports submitted your directorate</i> ” and paragraph 4 “ <i>MoE provides support to activate the role of the Educational council</i> ”, and paragraph 6 “ <i>The effect of data and information resulted from the implementation of SDDP submitted by your directorate to MoE on policy development or to reach at new policies or instructions</i> ” which scored 2.6 whereas the lowest satisfaction degree was on paragraph 1 “ <i>MoE provides Support to ensure the optimal use and continue in developing the database</i>	The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 1 “ <i>MoE provides Support to ensure the optimal use and continue in developing the database on common needs of schools</i> ” which reached to 2.7 whereas; the lowest degree was on paragraph 3 “ <i>The Ministry provides feedback on reports submitted your directorate</i> ” and paragraph 4 “ <i>MoE provides support to activate the role of the Educational councils</i> ” at (2.3)	The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 2 “ <i>The educational supervisors provide support to implement professional development plan to the needs of the directorates of education and schools</i> ” and paragraph 6 “ <i>The effect of data and information resulted from the implementation of SDDP submitted by your directorate to MoE on policy development or to reach at new policies or instructions</i> ” which reached to 2.5 whereas the lowest satisfaction degree was on paragraph 1 “ <i>MoE provides Support to ensure the optimal use and continue in developing the database on common needs of schools</i> ” and paragraph 4 “ <i>MoE provides support to activate the role of the</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry’s center should carry out ongoing follow-up and coordination and provide feedback on the reports submitted which are related to SDDP and intensify field visits to the directorates of education by the supervisors of the Ministry. 	

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
								Support by to activate the role of the Educational council” at (2.7)	on common needs of schools” at (2.3)		Educational councils” and paragraph 3 “The Ministry provides feedback on reports submitted your directorate” at (2.4)	
1.7 Qualitatively Degree to which SDDP Communication Strategy is implemented		N/A	High level of implementation (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	NOT IMPLEMENTED YET								The communication strategy was approved in the second half of the year 2012, training manuals were prepared in addition to the training of a pilot group of staff at Ministry’s center including both the staff of the Managing Directorate of Information and Communal Communication, the staff of Davison of Public Service at the Directorate of General Divan and the staff of Department of Website in the Managing Directorate of the Queen Rania Center for Education and Information Technology. The training manuals were experimented on a sample of specialized directors at Ministry’s center as part of a special training guide of senior management. An awareness session on strategy was held to the heads of departments of information and Communal Communication in the directorates of education.
1.8 Qualitatively; of satisfaction of MoE staff with inter-departmental communications at the Center, Field Directorates and Schools, and with communication with local community in relation to SDDP		N/A	High level of satisfaction (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	NOT IMPLEMENTED YET								It is early to measure this indicator

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
Immediate Outcome 1.1: A whole-school needs-based, gender sensitive development approach at the level of MoE Center, Field Directorates and schools implemented with active participation of local community												
1.1.1	Quantitatively; Percentage of school improvement plans that meet minimum quality standards	N/A	90% of school plans meet minimum standards (4.0 Score) as per the rubrics	Overall average score was (3.0). The lowest district was Mafraq (2.4) and the highest was Giza (4.3). The highest sub-indicator was “results aligned with priorities” (4.1) and the lowest was “responsibilities identified for each procedure (1.7). There were significant difference between boys and girls/mixed schools for girls/mixed schools	Overall average score was 4.2. The lowest district was Madaba and South Badia (3.9) for both, and the highest was Russaifah (4.7). The highest sub-indicator was “results aligned with priorities” (4.5) and the lowest was “responsibilities identified for each procedure (3.8). No significant difference between boys and girls/mixed schools		Overall average score was 3.3. The lowest of quality standard alignment was scored by Jerash at 1.9 and the highest was scored by Mafraq Qasbat at 4.1. The indicator “Procedures and activity are aligned with results” scored the highest degree at 3.9. Whereas the degree was scored by the indicator “The timeframe is Realistic” (NO). Girls’ schools achieve the highest degree which reached to 3.3 while it was 3.2 for boys’	Overall average score was 3.9. The lowest of quality standard alignment was scored by North Mazar at 3.5 and the highest was scored by Madaba Qasbat at 4.2. The indicator “Procedures and activity are linked with results” scored the highest degree at 4.5. Whereas the degree was scored by the indicator “timeframe is Realistic” (No). Girls’ schools achieve the highest degree which reached to 4.0 while it was 3.7 for boys’	Overall average score was 3.9. The lowest of quality standard alignment was scored by Ein Al-Basah at 3.4 and the highest was scored by Russiafah at 4.3. The indicators “Procedures and activity are aligned with results” and “They were endorsed by the educational council of schools network” scored the highest degree at 4.3 where as the indicator “The implantation timeframe is Realistic” scored lowest degree at “NO”. Girls’ schools achieve the highest degree which reached to 4.0 while it was 3.7 for boys’	Overall average score was 4.4. The lowest of quality standard alignment was scored by Ajlun at 4.1 and the highest was scored by Tafela & Quwaimseh at 4.6. The indicator “They were endorsed by the education council of school network” was the highest (YES) at (4.9) while the lowest degree was scored by the indicator “The implementation timeframe is Realistic” (YES) at (4.1). Girls’ schools achieve the highest degree which reached to 4.4 while it was 4.5 for boys’	Overall average score was 4.2. The lowest of quality standard alignment was scored by North Mazar at 3.5 and the highest was scored by Tafelah and Quwasimeh at 3.5. The indicators	<p>GROUP ONE: Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures (activities) are linked to the results of the majority of the plans. Responsibilities were identified for procedures (activities) intended to be implemented for the majority of the plans. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities were not set according to the needs of the school, as shown by self-revision data in many plans. Results were not linked with the priorities of the school in many plans Indicators were not linked with desired results to be achieved in many plans. Implementation timetable is not realistic in many plans. Many of the plans were not approved by the Educational Council for the school network. Many of the plans lacked result-based standards plans and the need to be re-designed comprehensively. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry should develop a database of the common needs of the directorates of education. The Ministry should build the capacity of those who are involved in the schools and directorates of education in the area of results-oriented management. Schools and directorates of education should rebuild all of development & procedural plans through using results-oriented management methodology by the direct supervision and support of those involved at the Ministry’s center level. Concerned staff in the directorates of education should visit schools periodically to ensure implementation of the recommendations contained in the M&E report issued by the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation. <p>GROUP THREE: Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities are set according to the needs of schools as shown in self-revision data in most plans. Results are linked with the priorities of schools in most plans. Indicators are linked with the desired results to be achieved in most plans. Procedures (activities) are linked with results in most of the plans. Responsibilities were identified for the indented action (activities) to be implemented in most of the plans.

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2012 Group 1	June 2012 Group 2&3	June 2012 Group 4	June 2013 Group 1	June 2013 Group 2	June 2013 Group 3	June 2013 Group 4	June, 2013 Average	Notices
	written 6. Indicators are aligned with outcomes 7. Activities, outcomes and results are logically aligned 8. Responsibilities of activities intended to be carried out are defined 9. Realistic implementation timeframe 10. Endorsed by educational development council						plans' alignment with quality standards was (38%)	with (16) plans out of (34) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (41%)	the percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (57%)		"Procedures and activity are aligned with results" and "They were endorsed by the educational council of schools network" scored the highest degree at 4.6 while the lowest degree was scored by the indicator The implementation timeframe is Realistic" at 3.6 (NO) Girls' schools achieve the highest degree which reached to 4.1 while it was 4.3 for boys' Standards aligned with (125) plans out of (227) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (55%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most plans were approved by the educational councils of the school networks. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation timetable of many plans is not realistic. There are some plans need to be re-designed wholly and others need to be re-check to meet the standards. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directorates of Education should continue develop capacity in the field of results-oriented management in collaboration with concerned staff in the Ministry's center and reflect this in the developmental and procedural plans of schools and directorates of education. Concerned staff in the directorates of education should visit schools periodically to ensure implementation of the recommendations contained in the M&E report issued by the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation. <p>GROUP TWO & FOUR:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities are set according to the needs of schools as shown in self-revision data in most plans. Results are linked with the priorities of schools in most plans. Results are correctly written in most plans. Indicators are linked with the desired results to be achieved in most plans. Outcomes are correctly written in most plans. Indicators are linked with outcomes in most plans. There is a logical link between activities, output, and outcomes in most plans. Responsibilities are defined for activities intended to be implemented in most of the plans. Responsibilities & activities are approved by the Board of Educational Development in most plans. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation timetable of many plans is not realistic. There are some plans need to be re-designed wholly and others need to be re-check to meet the standards. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directorates of Education should continue in providing capacity building activities in the field of results-oriented management in collaboration with concerned staff in the Ministry's center and reflect this in the developmental and procedural plans of schools. Concerned staff in the directorates of education should visit schools periodically to ensure implementation of the recommendations contained in the M&E report issued by the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation.

<p>1.1.2 Quantitatively; Percentage of field directorate improvement plans that meet minimum quality standards</p>	<p>For directorates' plans of groups ONE & THREE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> School common needs and directorate needs inform priorities Results aligned with priorities Indicators aligned with results Procedures aligned with results Appropriate responsibilities identified for each activity Realistic implementation timeframe Endorsed by educational development council of schools network Integration of gender <p>For directorates' plans of groups TWO & FOUR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> School common needs and directorate needs inform priorities as shown in data review. Results aligned with priorities Results are clearly written Indicators aligned with desired results Outcomes are correctly written Indicators are aligned with outcomes 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>90% of directorate improvement plans meet minimum standards (4.0/5.0 Score) as per the rubrics</p>	<p>Overall average score of standards alignment was (2.7).</p> <p>South Ghor scored the lowest degree at (1.9) while the highest was scored North-Eastern Badia at (4.1)</p> <p>The standard of "Implementati on timeframe" scored the highest degree at (5.0) whereas the lowest was scored by the two standards "Indicators aligned with desired results" and "They endorsed by educational development council of schools network" at (1.6) for each of them</p>	<p>Overall average score of standards alignment was (4.2).</p> <p>Irbid/2 scored the lowest degree at (3.8) while the highest was scored in Ein Al-Basha at (4.5)</p> <p>The standard of "They consider gender sensitive" which scored (2.2)</p>		<p>Overall average score of standards alignment was 3.7.</p> <p>North-Western Badi scored the lowest degree at 1.9 while the highest was scored by North-Eastern Badia at 4.4</p> <p>The standard of "They consider gender sensitive" scored lowest degree (NO) while the standard of "Implementati on timeframe is realistic" scored the highest scored (YES)</p> <p>"Quality Standards aligned with (4) plans out of (7) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (57%)</p>	<p>Overall average score of standards alignment was 3.9.</p> <p>North Mazar scored the lowest degree at 3.3 while the highest was scored by Madaba at 4.8</p> <p>The standard of "They consider gender sensitive" scored lowest degree (NO) while the standard of "Indicator s aligned with desired results" at 5.0</p> <p>"Quality Standards aligned with (2) plans out of (2) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality</p>	<p>Overall average score of standards alignment was 4.4.</p> <p>Marka scored the lowest degree at 4.0 while the highest was scored by Al-Qaser at 4.9</p> <p>The standard of "They consider gender sensitive" scored lowest degree (NO) while the standard of "Priorities were set" scored the highest degree at 5.0</p> <p>"Quality Standards aligned with (6) plans out of (6) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school developmen t plans' alignment with quality standards was (100%)</p>	<p>Overall average score of standards alignment was 4.5.</p> <p>Perta scored the lowest degree at 3.6 while the highest was scored by Al-Qwaismeh & Salt at 5.0</p> <p>The standard of "They consider gender sensitive" scored lowest degree (NO) while the standards of "Indicators aligned with priorities" at 4.8 and "They endorsed by educational development council of schools network" (YES)</p> <p>"Quality Standards aligned with (5) plans out of (6) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school developmen t plans' alignment with quality</p>	<p>Overall average score of standards alignment was 4.0.</p> <p>North-Eastern Badia scored the lowest degree at 1.9 while the highest was scored Al-Qaser at 4.9</p> <p>The standard of "They consider gender sensitive" scored lowest degree (NO) while the standard of "Setting priorities according to the needs of the directorate" was the highest standard at 4.6</p> <p>Groups: TWO & FOUR Average score overall of standards alignment was 4.2.</p> <p>North Mazar scored the lowest degree at 3.3 while the highest was scored by Al-Qwaismeh & Salt at 5.0</p> <p>The standard of "They consider gender sensitive" scored lowest degree (NO) while the</p>	<p>GROUP ONE: Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities are set according to the needs of directorates of education and the common needs of their schools as shown in self-revision data in most plans. Results are linked with the priorities in most plans. Procedures (activities) are linked with results in most plans. Responsibilities are identified for the indented action (activities) to be implemented in most plans. Implementation timetable of many plans is realistic. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators are not linked with the desired results intended to be achieved in most plans. Most plans are not adopted by the Board of Educational Development. Non-observance of the plans for the difference in needs between males and females (gender). Many plans lack result-based standards and need to be re-designed wholly. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry should build the capacity of those who are involved in the directorates of education in the area of results-oriented management. Directorates of education should re-design all of development & procedural plans through using results-oriented management methodology by the direct supervision and support of those involved at the Ministry's center level. Concerned staff in Ministry's center should visit directorates of education periodically to ensure the implementation of the recommendations contained in the M&E report issued by the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation. <p>GROUP THREE: Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities are set according to the needs of directorates of education and the common needs of their schools as shown in self-revision data in most plans. Results are linked with the priorities in most plans. Indicators are linked with desired results to be achieved. Procedures (activities) are linked with results in most plans. Responsibilities are identified for the indented action (activities) to be implemented in most plans. Implementation timetable of many plans is realistic. Most plans are adopted by the Board of Educational Development.
--	---	------------	---	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	---	---

	<p>7. Activities, outcomes and results are logically aligned</p> <p>8. Responsibilities of activities intended to be carried out are defined</p> <p>9. Realistic implementation timeframe</p> <p>10. Endorsed by educational development council</p> <p>11. They consider the different needs between males and females (Gender)</p>						standards was (50%)		standards was (83%)	standard of “Results are aligned with priorities” was the highest standard at 4.9	<p>“Quality Standards aligned with (17) plans out of (23) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school development plans’ alignment with quality standards was (74%)</p>	<p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-observance of the plans for the difference in needs between males and females (gender). • Some plans are not adopted by the Board of Educational Development. <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All plans should observe the different needs between males and females (Gender). • All plans should be adopted by the councils of educational development. • Directorates of Education should continue in providing capacity building activities in the field of results-oriented management in collaboration with concerned staff in the Ministry’s center and reflect this in the developmental and procedural plans of directorates of education. • Concerned staff in the Ministry’s center should visit the directorates of education periodically to ensure implementation of the recommendations contained in the M&E report issued by the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation. <p><u>GROUP TWO & FOUR:</u></p> <p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priorities are set according to the needs of directorates of education and the common needs of their schools as shown in self-revision data • Results are linked with the priorities of directorates of education and common need of schools in most plans. • Results are correctly written in most plans. • Indicators are linked with the desired results to be achieved in most plans. • Outcomes are correctly written in most plans. • Indicators are linked with output in most plans. • There is a logical link between activities, output, and outcomes in most plans. • Responsibilities are defined for activities intended to be implemented in most of the plans. • Responsibilities & activities are approved by the Board of Educational Development in most plans. <p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation timetable of many plans is not realistic. • Non-observance of the plans for the difference in needs between males and females (gender). <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directorates of Education should continue in providing capacity building activities in the field of results-oriented management in collaboration with concerned staff in the Ministry’s center and reflect this in the developmental and procedural plans of directorates of education. • Concerned staff in the Ministry’s center should visit the directorates of education periodically to ensure implementation of the recommendations contained in the M&E report issued by the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------	--	----------------------------	--	--	--

1.1.3 Qualitatively; Level to which gender is integrated into SDDP		N/A	High level of integration (5.0/4.0 score) as per the rubrics									It is early to measure this indicator
1.1.4 Quantitatively; Number of communication initiatives related to SDDP as per the communication strategy		N/A	All initiatives in the Communication Strategy									It is early to measure this indicator
1.1.5 Quantitatively; Number of School Improvement plans developed		N/A	All schools through out the Kingdom	789 schools and 7 directorates of education	732 schools and 9 directorates of education	824 schools have their own development plans in 7 directorates of education	245 schools have their own development plans in 4 directorates of education	503 schools have their own development plans in 6 directorates of education	506 schools have their own development plans in 6 directorates of education	2078 schools have their own development plans in 23 directorates of education		<p>Group One: Jerash, North-Eastern Badia, North-Western Badia, Mafraq District, Al-Mowqar and Al-Giza.</p> <p>Group Two: Madaba, South Mazar, Bain Obied and North Mazar.</p> <p>Group Three: Marka, Ein Al-Basha, Russaifah, Ramtha, Al-Qsar, and South Badia.</p> <p>Group Four: Petra, Tafela, Al-Tayba & Al-Wasteya, Ajlun, Al-Quwaisma and Salt</p>
1.1.6 Qualitatively; Degree of effectiveness of the process for developing school improvement plans (Perceptions of school leaders)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishment of school development team 2. State of readiness (leadership, community partnership, gender, school development plans) 3. Self-review 4. Needs prioritization 5. Developing school improvement plans 6. Sharing SIP with educational councils 	N/A	High degree of effectiveness (5.0/4.0 score as per the rubrics)	The degree of effectiveness according principals' and school developments teams' estimations were (3.3) and (3.9) respectively. The standard "Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils" scored the lowest degree of effectiveness	The degree of effectiveness according principals and school developments teams' estimations was 4.2. The standard "Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils" scored the lowest degree of effectiveness Also, principals evaluated self-review at a lesser degree than the	The degree of effectiveness according principals and school developments teams' estimations was 3.3 The standard of "Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils" scored the lowest degree of effectiveness at 2.2 whereas "Formation of school development team" scored	The degree of effectiveness according principals and school developments teams' estimations was 4.3 The standard of "Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils" scored the lowest degree of effectiveness at 3.4 whereas	The degree of effectiveness according principals and school developments teams' estimations was 4.1 The standard of "Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils" scored the lowest degree of effectiveness at 2.9 whereas the indicator	The degree of effectiveness according principals and school developments teams' estimations was 4.2 The standard of "Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils" scored the lowest degree of effectiveness at 3.3 whereas the indicator	The degree of effectiveness according principals and school developments teams' estimations was 3.9 The standard of "Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils" scored the lowest degree of effectiveness at 2.9 whereas the indicator "The school conducted comprehensive		<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The principals attended all relevant training programs and they arranged awareness campaigns the program to school community. • The Schools carried out comprehensive self-review through using program methodology and implemented it on teachers, students and local community. • Needs were arranged by levels resulting from the review process and priorities of levels (1 +2) were chosen. • The development plan was designed for the school according to program methodology with the participation of members of the school development team. • The Educational Board of the school network review school development plan which was approved and signed by the director. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principals didn't transfer knowledge/impact of the program to all of those who involved in the schools. • Fields coordination Team did not participate in designing development plans. • Educational Council of schools network didn't discuss development plans for schools and it didn't record any observations on these plans or provide feedback to schools. • Priorities were not chosen upon the standards of the SDDP.

				average.		the highest degree at 4.3 Girls Schools achieved higher degree at (3.6) compared with boys schools which scored (3.0)	“Formation of school development team” scored the highest degree at 4.8 Girls Schools achieved higher degree at (4.6) compared with boys schools which scored (4.1)	“The school conducted comprehensive self-review” scored the highest degree at 4.7 Girls Schools achieved higher degree at (4.3) compared with boys schools which scored (3.9)	“The school conducted comprehensive self-review” scored the highest degree at 4.6 Girls Schools achieved higher degree at (4.3) compared with boys schools which scored (4.2)	self-review” scored the highest degree at 4.5 Girls Schools achieved higher degree at (4.1) compared with boys schools which scored (3.8)	Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directorates of Education should hold awareness workshops to educate both school development teams and the educational councils of schools networks about their roles and responsibilities in order to activate the process of developmental and procedural plans preparation for schools and to motivate schools’ staffs to participate in this process. Activation of accountability mechanisms for school principals and staff
1.1.7 Quantitatively ;Number of Field Directorate plans developed that were prepared according to approved form of SDDP		N/A	All directorates of education through out the Kingdom	19 development plans for the directorates of education		7 directorates of education	4 directorates of education	6 directorates of education	6 directorates of education	23 directorates of education	Group One: Jerash, North-Eastern Badia, North-Western Badia, Mafrq District, Al-Mowqar and Al-Giza. Group Two: Madaba, South Mazar, Bain Obied and North Mazar. Group Three: Marka, Ein Al-Basha, Russaifah, Ramtha, Al-Qsar, and South Badia. Group Four: Petra, Tafela, Al-Tayba & Al-Wasteya, Ajlun, Al-Quwaisma and Salt
1.1.8 Qualitatively; Degree of effectiveness of the process for developing Field Directorate improvement plans (Perceptions of FD staff)	1. Establishment of school development team 2. State of readiness (leadership, community partnership, gender, school development plans) 3. Sitting the common needs of schools 4. Self-review to define the directorate’s needs 5. Needs prioritization 6. Developing	N/A	High degree of effectiveness (5.0/4.0 score as per the rubrics)	Supervisors’ evaluation of the effectiveness of plans development process was lower than that of directorates development teams which was (3.4) and (3.6) respectively because they didn’t participate in the process of plan development	Supervisors’ evaluation of the effectiveness of plans development process was lower than that of directorates development teams which was (3.4) and (4.3) respectively because they didn’t participate in the process of plan development	Supervisors’ evaluation of the effectiveness of plans development process was lower than that of directorates development teams which was (2.8) and (3.3) respectively because they didn’t participate in the process of plan development	Supervisors’ evaluation of the effectiveness of plans development process was lower than that of directorates development teams which was (3.0) and (4.4) respectively because they didn’t participate in the process of plan development	Supervisors’ evaluation of the effectiveness of plans development process was lower than that of directorates development teams which was (3.3) and (3.9) respectively because they didn’t participate in the process of plan development	Supervisors’ evaluation of the effectiveness of plans development process was lower than that of directorates development teams which was (3.3) and (4.4) respectively because they didn’t participate in the process of plan development	Supervisors’ evaluation of the effectiveness of plans development process was lower than that of directorates development teams which was (3.1) and (3.9) respectively because they didn’t participate in the process of plan development	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The directorate development team was formed according to the requirements of the program and field’s coordination teams members were selected based on their job titles. Directorate development team members attended all relevant training programs. The Directorate carried out self-review according to the program methodology through applying it to those who were concerned and its needs were identified based on the results. The Board of Educational Development of directorate examined the development plan of the directorate and it was adopted and signed by the director of the board without discussion. Weaknesses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desire standard was not adopted in teams’ formation. Directorates’ development teams examined samples of the data received from the self-review results of schools; accordingly, common needs among them were identified. Development plans were designed with the participation of some of directorates of education cadres. Directorates’ development teams didn’t educate other staff

	school improvement plans 7. Sharing SIP with educational councils						process of plan development				<p>members about the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs were prioritized in accordance with the levels resulting from the process of self-review, but priorities were selected randomly without putting levels into account. The Board of educational Development of the directorate of education didn't discuss development plans or document their notices in order to provide written feedback to the directorates of education. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry's center should hold awareness workshops to educate both the development teams in the directorates of education and about their roles and responsibilities to activate the processes of developmental and procedural plans preparation in the directorates of education in addition to stimulate other staff members in the directorates to participate in these processes. Activation of accountability mechanisms for directors of the directorates of education and their administrative and technical cadres.
1.1.9	Quantitatively ;Percentage of review process recommendations implemented	N/A	90% of recommendations implemented	Review process hasn't been carried so far.							This indicator will be measured after completing the review process and after looking at its recommendations.
Output 1.1.1: SDDP Communications Strategy was developed											
1.1.1.1	Quantitatively; Presence of SDDP Communications Strategy	N/A	SDDP communications Strategy exists in August , 2012	Communication Strategy was prepared							Communication strategy was approved in the second half of the year 2012.
Output 1.1.2: Training delivered on Strategic Communication Skills & Management of Media Relations with Stakeholders to MoE Center &Field Directorate staff and Education Council members											
1.1.1.2	Quantitatively; Number of members of MoE										

TOTAL: Males Females				Females: 550	Females: 980					
1.1.3.2 Quantitatively; Number of Principals, Principal Assistants, Supervisors and Filed Directorate Division Head Trained on Leadership		N/A	All of principals & principals' assistants in the Kingdom			M:15298 F:54	Total: 1267 Males: 713 Females: 554	Total: 2962 Males: 1363 Females: 1599	Total: 4229 Males: 2046 Females: 2153	
TOTAL: Males Females				1267 Males: 713 Females: 554	1589 Males: 852 Females: 737					
1.1.3.3 Quantitatively; Number of Community Members, Education Council members, Principals, Principal Assistants, Councilors and supervisors trained on Community Engagement Program		N/A	All Education Council members, Principals, P. Assistants, Councilors and supervisors			M:15171 F: 80	Total: 657 Males: 267 Females: 390	Total: 5145 Males: 1915 Females: 3230	Total: 5802 Males: 2182 Females: 3620	
TOTAL: Males Females				657 Males: 267 Females: 390	2813 Males: 1093 Females: 1720					
Output 1.1.4: MoE Field Directorate staff trained to develop and implement results-based gender sensitive Field Directorate Improvement Plans with community participation										

gender-sensitive policies, guidelines, procedures and regulatory recommendations that have been implemented												this framework will be reviewed to determine the extent of taking into account the recommendations in the preparation of the new framework which will be applied upon approval immediately.
2.2 Quantitatively; Single school evaluation Instrument focused on ERfKE outcomes, has been agreed to and is being used for school self-evaluation and for public and professional accountability		N/A	1 (Same instrument used by all schools)	A standardized form was designed and approved by MoE to replace all other forms used before; namely: <i>Planning, and Evaluation Form for SDDP</i>								
2.5 Qualitatively; Degree of satisfaction of stakeholders with extent to which central MoE uses SDDP information to inform national policies, strategic planning, annual priorities and resource allocation		N/A	High degree of satisfaction (5.0/4.0 score as per the rubrics)									Monitoring & Evaluation Framework of the SDDP was prepared. – Work is underway to develop and adopt a mechanism to ensure that the data resulting from the application of SDDP to concerned parties to use these data and information in policy making and in strategic plans preparation and resources allocation.
Immediate Outcome 2.1: Policies and Strategic Planning processes respond to the developmental needs of schools and directorates and accountability mechanism developed												
2.1.1 Qualitatively ; Degree of satisfaction of stakeholders with the quality of SDDP monitoring and		N/A	High degree of satisfaction (5.0/4.0 score as per the rubrics)	The first monitoring report was accomplished in August, 2012								The second Monitoring report of SDDP will the period until the end of June 2013. Satisfaction degree will be studied after the issuance of the second report.

evaluation reports											
2.1.2	Qualitatively ; Degree of Satisfaction of stakeholders with MoE policies, guidelines and procedures related to SDDP	N/A	High degree of satisfaction (5.0/4.0 score as per the rubrics)								This indicator will be examined after reviewing and adopting the general framework of the educational policy immediately.
2.1.3	Qualitatively ; Degree to which monitoring and evaluation reports recommendations are used to inform the implementation and continuous improvements of the SDDP	N/A	High Degree (5.0/4.0 score as per the rubrics)								Preliminary study will be conducted to find out the extent of benefiting from the recommendations of the second report after its issuance.
Output 2.1.1: A Results-based, gender sensitive, Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for SDDP developed											
2.1.1.1	Quantitatively; Number of staff trained in results-based M&E (M/F) A. MoE center: 1. Males 2. females B. Directorates: 1. Males 2. females C. Schools: 1. Males 2. females	N/A	– M&E Division staff – M&E Coordinators in MoE center, directorates of education & schools	Staff trained: M&E Division staff : 4 (M: 3 F:1) 22 M&E Coordinators in SDDP Field Directorates in Groups 1,2,3 &4 (M: 4 F:18)		Refreshing Training was held for M&E coordinators in directorates of education for Group One: (7) coordinators Males (6) Females: (1)	(20) M&E coordinators in directorates of education (Groups: <i>FIVE & SIX</i>). As well as a refreshing training was held for (15) M&E coordinators who were chosen at the beginning of the program, from the directorates of groups TWO, THREE & FOUR . Males: (31) Females: (4) Schools and directorates' center Total: 1679 Males: (849) Females: (830)	(42) M&E coordinators in directorates of education Males: (37) Females: (5) Schools and directorates' center Total: 1679 Males: (849) Females: (830)			
2.1.1.2	Quantitatively; Number of SDDP M&E Reports produced	N/A	4 reports starting 2012	The first M&E Report was issued in August. 2012							The second monitoring report of SDDP will cover period until the end of June 2013.
Output 2.1.2: MoE SDDP related policies to institutionalize coherent planning at school, Field Directorate and MoE central levels developed											

2.1.2.1 Quantitatively; Presence of institutional mechanism that facilitates information flow across all levels & directions.		N/A	The institutional mechanism exists								Work is underway to develop and adopt a mechanism to ensure the delivery of these data and information to the relevant parties to use them in policy formulation and preparation of strategic plans and resources allocation
2.1.2.2 Quantitatively; Existence of SDDP enabling policies and regulations		N/A	Enabling policies and regulations exist	Policy recommendations prepared which support the institutionalization of the SDDP							Necessary supportive and procedural policies recommendations to sustain the SDDP were prepared. The general framework of the new educational policy will be revised upon its approval to determine the extent of integrating the system of supportive policies in the SDDP.
Immediate Outcome 2.2: Improved range sustainable financial and technical support to schools and Field Directorates for the implementation of their improvement plans											
2.2.1 Quantitatively; Percentage of school and Field Directorate Improvement Plans' activities implemented with financial support from MoE budget		N/A	60% of plans' activities				Zero				No activities was carried out through using the financial grant provided by the Ministry to Group One due to disbursement delaying until June 2013 after the end of the scholastic year 2012/2013.
2.2.2 Quantitatively; Amount allocated in MoE annual budget as financial support for the implementation of the schools' and Field Directorates' Improvement Plans		N/A	As allocated by MoE				JD 250000 in MoE's fiscal year/2013				
2.2.3 Quantitatively; Number of schools and directorates having received MoE grants		N/A	All directorates of education & schools				824 schools & 7 directorates of education	-	-	-	824 schools & 7 directorates of education Group One: Jerash, Northern-Eastern Badia, Northern-Western Badia, Mafrq District, Al-Mowqar & Al-Giza.
Output 2.2.2: Financial mechanism to provide financial support for the implementation of School and Field Directorate Improvement Plans established											
2.2.2.1 Quantitatively; Procedures and guidelines for grants developed		N/A	Presence of procedures and guidelines								Instructions and procedures that defined the allocated sums and the bases of grants disbursement was approved and disseminated to directorates of education through his Excellency Minister of Education letter no. 14/6/20359 on 30/05/2013.