

Ministry of Education

School and Directorate Development Program (SDDP) First Monitoring Report Indicators Table – Appendix II

Group 1 Field Directorates

June 2012

Intermediate Outcome 1.0: Increased engagement of by community field directorates and the central administration in the school development process

Indicators	Criteria	Baseline	Targets	June 2012	Comments
1.1 Degree to which schools are implementing improvement plans	Percentage of activities implemented as per plan	School Improvement Plans as per SDDP model did not exist	All schools in Jordan implement their Improvement Plans as per schedule to a high degree (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	<p>School development team members: An average score of 4.14/ 5.0 which equals 83% of implementation of plan.</p> <p>Boys schools scored higher (4.29) than girls schools (4.00).</p> <p>Supervisors: average score of (3.43) particularly low in North East Badia (1.0)</p>	<p>Enabling factors:</p> <p>Strong community involvement.</p> <p>Effective involvement of all concerned parties at school and team work.</p> <p>Ongoing technical support from supervisors.</p> <p>Financial support (block grants).</p> <p>Professional development for teachers and school principals.</p> <p>Sharing experiences related to implementing improvement plans amongst schools.</p> <p>School principals' interest in developing their schools.</p> <p>Hindering factors:</p> <p>Lack of clarity regarding the new role of supervisors.</p> <p>Financial regulations make it difficult to fundraise.</p> <p>lack of stability of supervisors and teachers (continuous turnover of staff)</p> <p>Lack of awareness on SDDP amongst new principals. Transportation not always available.</p> <p>Lack of coordination between schools and</p>

Indicators	Criteria	Baseline	Targets	June 2012	Comments
					<p>Education Councils. Poor technical support provided by supervisors for the implementation of school development plan. Teachers' resistance to change. Absence of Field Directorates' response to teacher professional development needs.</p> <p>Recommendations: Capacity building and training for SDT members on SDDP and on Results –Based Management. Involvement of all school staff in the development of School Improvement Plan. Develop an effective monitoring and evaluation system for both school and Field Directorate plus an accountability system. Enhance financial regulations to facilitate local community support to schools Reduce number of classes assigned to subject coordinator. Increase awareness amongst concerned parties on their roles and responsibilities. Minimize staff turnover during scholastic year. Establish community engagement division at FD. Increase block grants in view to support schools implement their improvement plan. Hold annual conference at the level of school clusters to share experiences, success factors and lessons learnt to contribute to SDDP continuous improvement. Ongoing training for supervisors and new principals</p>

Indicators	Criteria	Baseline	Targets	June 2012	Comments
					<p>on SDDP.</p> <p>Provision of transportation to sustain supervisors' support and mentoring for schools especially those in remote locations.</p> <p>Enact educational regulations that ensure educational staff stability.</p>
<p>1.2 Degree to which Field Directorates are implementing their improvement plans</p>	<p>Percentage of activities implemented as per plan</p>	<p>Field Directorates Improvement Plans as per SDDP model did not exist</p>	<p>All Field directorates implement their Improvement Plans per schedule to a high degree (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics</p>	<p>An average score from FDT self-assessment of implementation of the plan was 3.43/5.0. Scores varied from a low of 1.0 to a high of 5.0.</p>	<p>Enabling factors:</p> <p>Field Directorate well informed of SDDP. Realistic plan that meets schools' needs. Financial assistance from SDIP.</p> <p>Hindering factors:</p> <p>Insufficient block grants and lack of clarity on spending guidelines. Poor Field Directorate staff capacities. Lack of clarity regarding roles and responsibilities assigned to all FD staff. Frequent staff turnover.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Provide capacity development for Field Directorate staff on SDDP. Institutionalize M&E system in Field Directorates. Raise awareness on Field Directorate staff roles and responsibilities. Conduct M&E twice a year.</p>

Intermediate Outcome 1.0: Increased engagement of by community field directorates and the central administration in the school development process

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Targets	June 2012	Comments
1.3 Degree to which Education Councils at school cluster level are operational	1-Membership 2- Roles and responsibilities 3-Meetings held (3 per school year) 4-Decisions made 5-Decisions implemented	0	All School Clusters' Education Councils are operational to a high degree (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	Average score of effectiveness scored 2.91 with the lowest in North East Badia (1.6) and the highest in South Aghwar (4.6) . Of the sub-indicators, council membership scored highest (4.0)	<p>Enabling factors: Local community engagement with schools and awareness of local community about importance of its support to schools. Sharing experiences and cooperation in implementing certain activities amongst schools in the same cluster.</p> <p>Hindering factors: Lack of gender balance. Lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities assigned to education councils members. Weak commitment of members to attending Councils' meetings. Students not attending Councils' meetings Education councils not recognized as official entities.</p> <p>Recommendations: More awareness of roles and responsibilities of education councils. More gender balance. Institutionalize Educational Councils' work through regulations. Set up sound criteria to select Educational Councils' members.</p>

<p>1.4 Degree to which Education Development Councils at the level of Field Directorates are operational</p>	<p>1- Membership 2- Roles and responsibilities 3- Meetings held 4- Decision made 5- Decision implemented</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>All Field Directorates' Education Development Councils are operational to a high degree (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics</p>	<p>Education Development Council effectiveness rated at an average of (3.1) according to Field Directorate Development Teams and (2.9) according to the members of the Education Development Councils.</p>	<p>Enabling factors: Involvement of parents and local community and their cooperation with FD through the Education Development Councils meetings. Contribution to finding solutions to problems and providing financial Support. Financial support of local companies and firms.</p> <p>Hindering factors: Lack of regulations providing official status for councils and clarifying roles and responsibilities. Lack of gender balance. Lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities causes conflicts over authorities with FD. Poor documentation for councils minutes of meetings and decisions. MoE regulations restrictions realized on community fundraising Not enough Education Development Councils meetings.</p> <p>Recommendations: Enact Education Development Councils regulation. Conduct awareness raising workshops for Education Development Council members. Establish community engagement division at FD. Spread awareness on gender mainstreaming. MoE and FD follow up for Education Development Councils' work. Provide financial support for Education Development Councils. Encourage highly qualified educators and local community members to be active members of Education Development Councils.</p>
--	--	----------	---	--	--

Intermediate Outcome 1.0: Increased engagement of by community field directorates and the central administration in the school development process

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
1.5 Degree of satisfaction of school principals and teachers with field directorate support toward achievement of School Improvement Plans	Support related to the three directorate priorities and school common needs	N/A	High level of satisfaction with the support they receive from the field directorate (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	Principals' satisfaction in all FDs average score was 3.43 on this indicator, "acceptable" with the exception of Mafraq which scored 1.0 "weak"	<p>Enabling factors: Support provided to schools by FD. Needs-based planning approach of SDDP. Capacity development for education leaders. Enhancement of cooperation and links between school and local community.</p> <p>Hindering factors: Some Field Directorate divisions don't receive the School Improvement Plans. Lack of follow up by the directorate on implementation of School Improvement Plans. Insufficient training courses on the program.</p> <p>Recommendations: Increase organized periodical exchange visits between staff specialized in implementing SDDP. Hold training workshops for both teachers and principals on SDDP. Inform principals on Field Directorate Improvement Plan More funding for schools Apply accountability system to monitor principals' adherence to the assigned plan</p>

<p>1.6 Degree of satisfaction of Field Directorate staff with support from MoE central to implement Field Directorate Improvement Plans</p>	<p>1- Professional development opportunities 2- Mentor coaching 3- Feedback on reports 4- Other support</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>High level of satisfaction with support received from central MoE (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics</p>	<p>The scores of satisfaction level varied in FDs from a low of 1.0 (Mafraq) to a high of 3.75 in (North East Badia). The average score was 2.07. Respondents were the most satisfied with professional development opportunities.</p>	<p>Enabling factors: Block grants allocated to schools Cooperation between MoE and Field Directorates. Trainees are updated with recent development on training programs and their contents and the diversity of training programs offered.</p> <p>Hindering factors: MoE poor monitoring of training courses, overlapping of training courses content along with shortage of financial allocations. Lack of clarity regarding roles and responsibilities. Shortage of funding and ambiguous spending guidelines.</p> <p>Recommendations: More focus on implementation of the program. Enhance MoE monitoring of training courses and Field Directorates performance. MoE to provide feedback to inform FDs on the latest requirements of improvement and development. Spread awareness through holding workshops to highlight roles and responsibilities. Increase financial support provided to FDs. Institutionalize SDDP at MoE and FDs.</p>
<p>1.7 Degree to which SDDP Communication Strategy is implemented</p>		<p>N/A</p>	<p>High level of implementation (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics</p>	<p>Not yet been implemented</p>	<p>Communication Strategy prepared. Not yet been implemented</p>

1.8 Degree 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		NA	High level of satisfaction (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics	Communication Strategy not yet been implemented	Communication Strategy prepared. Not yet been implemented.
---	--	----	---	---	--

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

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
1.1.1 Percentage of School Improvement Plans that meet minimum quality standards	1- Priorities based on school needs 2- Results aligned with priorities 3- Indicators aligned with results 4- Procedure aligned with results 5- Suitable responsibilities assigned for each procedure 6- Realistic timeframe 7- Endorsed by the education council	No SIPs as per SDDP model existed	90% of school plans meet minimum standards (4.0/5.0) Score as per the rubrics	Average quality score was 3.0. The lowest was Mafrag and (2.4), and the highest was Al-Jiza (4.3). The sub-indicator "suitable responsibilities assigned for each procedure" scored the highest (4.1) while the lowest was for "priorities based on school needs" (1.7). Note: it was noticed that there were high significant differences	Observations: Enabling factors: Schools have improvement plans Hindering factors: Most plans are based on objectives rather than outcomes. Not enough performance indicators that are based on outcomes. In most cases, responsibilities not assigned appropriately Lack of improvement plans in some schools for the scholastic year 2011/2012. Implementation time not always realistically allocated Absence of summary of needs and priorities in some plans Outcomes and priorities are not linked in some plans.

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
				of quality levels between girls/mixed schools and boys schools in favor of girls/mixed schools.	<p>Some plans do not meet approved priorities. Most of the plans are not endorsed by the Education Council.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Identify priorities related to underperformance or weakness. Build up clear performance indicators related to outcomes. Reconstruct SIPs according to RBM principles Assign appropriately the responsibilities of implementation Review procedures and their correlations with outcomes and objectives. Allocate realistic timeline for implementation. Ensure SIPs are endorsed education councils. Include summary of needs and priorities in the plans Cover all approved priorities.</p>
1.1.2 Percentage of Field Directorate Improvement plans that meet minimum quality standards	<p>1- School common needs and directorate needs inform priorities</p> <p>2- Results aligned with priorities</p> <p>3- Indicators aligned with results</p> <p>4- Procedures aligned with results</p> <p>5- Appropriate responsibilities identified for each activity</p>	NoFDIPs as per SDDP model existed	90% of directorate improvement plans meet minimum standards (4.0/5.0) Score as per the rubrics	Average score of 2.7/5.0 . Lowest in South Aghwar: 1.9 and highest in North East Badia: 4.1. The sub-indicator “realistic timeline” got the highest 5.0 and the lowest was 1.6 for each of the below: “ indicators aligned with results” and “endorsed by education development council”	<p>Enabling factors:</p> <p>All Field Directorates have improvement plans. Realistic implementation timelines. Responsibilities are assigned clearly and appropriately to the procedures. Procedures are appropriately aligned with results.</p> <p>Hindering factors:</p> <p>Replication between FD priorities and school common needs. Repetition of item numbers in all domains and fields of the plan Lack of accuracy and balance in the plan Unclear indicators that do not meet standards,</p>

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
	<p>6- Realistic timeframe</p> <p>7- Endorsed by educational development council</p> <p>8- Integration of gender</p>				<p>written as incomplete items lacking the features of an indicator.</p> <p>Plans are based on objectives rather than outcomes.</p> <p>Summary of needs, priorities and outcomes doesn't exist</p> <p>Gender sensitive language is not used.</p> <p>Poor alignment between priorities and school common needs</p> <p>Most plans are not endorsed by the Education Development Council.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Enhance capacity building to empower staff and train them on RBM and setting indicators.</p> <p>Redesign plans to be consistent with concepts of RBM.</p> <p>Formulate outcomes to meet the needs appropriately.</p> <p>Develop comprehensive and manifold performance indicators related directly to desired outcomes.</p> <p>Assign item numbers accurately and avoid repetition.</p> <p>More accurate plan timelines.</p> <p>Need to consider gender sensitivity in plans.</p> <p>Identify and bridge the gaps between male and female schools</p> <p>Ensure endorsement of plans by Education Development Council.</p>
1.1.3 Level to which gender is integrated into SDDP		N/A	High level of integration (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics		

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
1.1.4 Number of communication initiatives related to SDDP as per the communication strategy		N/A	All initiatives in the Communications Strategy		Communication Strategy prepared but not yet implemented.
1.1.5 Number of School Improvement plans developed			All Schools	789 Schools in the 7 SDDP Field Directorates (Group 1) have School Improvement Plans	789 schools out of 808 schools have School Improvement Plans.
1.1.6 Degree of effectiveness of the process for developing school improvement plans (Perceptions of school leaders)	1-Establishment of school development team 2-State of readiness 3-Self-review 4-Needs prioritization 5-Developing school improvement plans 6-Sharing SIP with educational councils	N/A	High degree of effectiveness (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics	Principals rated the effectiveness of the SDDP process as 3.3 and school development teams rated the effectiveness 3.9. "Sharing the SIP with the educational councils" was the lowest rated sub-indicator according to both groups.	Enabling factors: Involve all School Development Team members in preparing development plan. Enhance team work. School Development Team has been formed according to experience and interest in work. Priorities are based on school real existing needs and self-assessment questionnaires. Hindering factors: Subject teachers (coordinators) lack required experience. Parents rarely follow up their children or even interact with schools. Insufficient time for self- assessment. Lack of effectiveness and communication with educational council. Insufficient financial support Unclear roles and responsibilities for the teachers in SDDP process-training was restricted to principals and their assistants.

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
					<p>Some items in self-assessment tools are weak.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Institutionalize Education Councils and issue regulations to organize their activities. Give school managements more authorities in dealing with local community within the framework of Education Council. Change school cluster lead school annually. Include school development team members and Education Council members in SDP training and in developing school improvement plan. Increase financial support offered to schools. Review some items of self-assessment tools particularly those related to students.</p>
1.1.7 Number of Field Directorate plans developed			All Field Directorates	All 7 Field Directorates in SDDP Group1 have Improvement Plans	All Field Directorates in Group 1 have Field Directorate Improvement Plans.
1.1.8 Degree of effectiveness of the process for developing Field Directorate Improvement Plans (Perceptions of FD staff)	1- State of readiness 2- Identify school common needs 3- Identify Field Directorate needs 4- Needs prioritization 5- Develop field directorate plan 6- Sharing FD plan with Education Development	N/A	High degree of effectiveness (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics	Supervisors rated the effectiveness of the process significantly lower than Field Directorates Development Teams (3.4 compared to 3.6), probably because they do not participate in the preparation of the improvement plans.	<p>Enabling factors:</p> <p>Plans based on priorities and schools common needs. Strong involvement of the local community and educational development councils in developing FDIPs . Provide technical support to a larger number of schools according to their needs. Share experience among supervisors, School principals and development team. Most of the targeted groups are trained on readiness programs.</p>

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
	Councils				<p>Hindering Factors:</p> <p>Weak gender representation Lack of clarity for roles and responsibilities for FD development team members. Improvement plans are built on objectives rather on outcomes. Absence of criteria required to select local community members to support FD plans. Insufficient monitoring of readiness program implementation processes. Poor local community participation in supporting School Improvement Plan implementation. Monthly progress reports on plan implementation are not submitted. Weak links and coordination between heads of development councils and school principals.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Ensure appropriate gender representation. Provide results based planning training for FD development teams. Increase financial support provided to FD. Develop appropriate selection criteria for local community members to support FD plans implementation. Involve Educational Development Councils more in the development of the Field Directorate Improvement Plan. Avoid replication and overlapping between programs offered by MoE. Explain mechanisms to identify school common needs to be included in FD Improvement Plans.</p>

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
1.1.9 Percentage of review process recommendations implemented			90% of recommendations implemented		Review process hasn't not undertaken yet

Output 1.1.1: SDDP Communications Strategy developed

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
1.1.1.1 Presence of SDDP Communications Strategy		N/A A communications strategy for Component One does not exist	SDDP communication Strategy exists in Q3, 2012	Communications Strategy prepared	Communication Strategy prepared.

Output 1.1.2: Training delivered on Strategic Communication Skills & Management of Media Relations with Stakeholders to MoE Center & Field Directorate staff and Development council members

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
1.1.2.1 Number of members of MoE Communication Team, Field Directorates Media staff and Education council Members trained		0	565	As per plan, training has not yet started	

Output 1.1.3: MoE school leaders and Field Directorates supervisors trained to plan and implement RBM-based gender sensitive School Improvement Plans with community participation

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
1.1.3.1 Number of principals, principal assistants and supervisors trained on School Development Program		0	All School Principals, P. Assistants and supervisors	1167 617 Male/ 550 Female	
1.1.3.2 Number of Principals, Principal Assistants, Supervisors and Filed Directorate Division Head Trained on Leadership			All School Principals, P. Assistants, supervisors and FD Division Heads	1267 713 Male/ 554 Female	

1.1.3.3 Number of Community Members, Education Council members , Principals, Principal Assistants, Councilors and supervisors trained on Community Engagement Program		0	All Education council members , Principals, P. Assistants, Councilors and supervisors	657 276 Male/ 390 Female	
---	--	---	---	-----------------------------	--

Output 1.1.4: MoE Field Directorate staff trained to develop and implement results-based gender sensitive Field Directorate Improvement Plans with community participation

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
1.1.4.1 Number of field directorate staff trained on FDP (M/F)		0	All Field Directors, D. Assistants, Division Heads and Supervisors	147 132 Male/ 15 Female	

Output 1.1.5: Process for reviewing and revising the SDDP implemented

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
1.1.5.1 Number of reviews conducted		N/A	2 Reviews	0	Review is not yet due.
1.1.5.2 Number of education stakeholders involved			10 minimum, in addition to MoE, such as		Review is not yet due.

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
in the SDDP review process			MoPIC, MoHE, universities, MoF, NCHRD, Private Sector, CSOs, community members and others		

Output 1.1.6: MoE staff trained on integrating Gender analysis into daily work to support school improvement

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
1.1.6.1 Number of Field Directorates, schools and MoE Central staff trained to use gender analysis (M/F)		0, in SDIP directorates	All MoE Center staff, Field Directors, FD Assistants, supervisors, School Principals and SP Assistants	559 327 Male/ 272 Female	

Intermediate Outcome 2.0: An effective, school-based education development system as main vehicle to deliver to all young people in Jordan a quality education focused on developing the abilities, skills, attitudes and values associated with knowledge-based economy institutionalized

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
2.1 Percentage of enabling gender-sensitive policies, guidelines, procedures and regulatory recommendations that have been implemented		NA	100% of policies developed	0	Policy recommendations completed.
2.2 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		0	1 (Same instrument used by all schools)	Instrument developed and adopted as SDDP model	MoE developed the School Improvement Plan template that includes performance monitoring elements (Results and indicators). All SDDP schools are currently using this template for planning and school self-evaluation.
2.3 Extent to which mechanisms for professional and public accountability, linked to school improvement cycle, have been established and functioning effectively (Stakeholders views)		NA	High level of effectiveness (4.0/5.0) score as per rubrics		

<p>2.4 Degree of Satisfaction of stakeholders with extent to which decision-making authority and associated resources are being allocated and utilized to enable implementation of school improvement plans</p>		<p>NA</p>	<p>High degree of satisfaction (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics</p>		
<p>2.5 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</p>		<p>Field directorate data is currently not used to inform national policy and procedures for SDDP</p>	<p>High degree of satisfaction (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics</p>	<p>Not yet been used</p>	<p>- SDDP M&E framework prepared. - Work is underway to develop a mechanism for data generated through implementation of SDDP process to be rolled up and analyzed at the national level so that it can be used as a basis for policy decisions.</p>

Immediate Outcome 2.1: Policies and Strategic Planning processes respond to the developmental needs of schools and directorates and accountability mechanism developed

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
2.1.1 Degree of satisfaction of stakeholders with the quality of SDDP monitoring and evaluation reports		Currently there are no SDDP reports produced at the national or directorate levels	High degree of satisfaction (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics	SDDP first monitoring report covers the period until June 2012	
2.1.2 Degree of Satisfaction of stakeholders with MoE policies, guidelines and procedures related to SDDP		0	High degree of satisfaction (4.0 score as per the rubrics)	Will be measured once the updated MoE General Education Policy Framework is implemented	Policy recommendations and operational policies change matrix developed. Policy and Planning Working Group is currently working with The Education Policy Framework Committee on incorporating policies supportive to SDDP in the new GEPF to be adopted by MoE
2.1.3 Degree to which monitoring and evaluation reports recommendations are used to inform the implementation and continuous improvements of the SDDP		N/A	High Degree (4.0 score as per the rubrics)		First report covers the period until June 2012

Output 2.1.1: A Results-based, gender sensitive, Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for SDDP developed

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
2.1.1.1 Number of staff trained in results-based M&E (M/F)		0	M&E Division staff and M&E Coordinators	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)	
2.1.1.2 Number of SDDP M&E Reports produced		No framework exists	4 starting 2012	SDDP M&E Framework prepared	First report covers the period until June 2012

Output 2.1.2: MoE SDDP related policies to institutionalize coherent planning at school, Field Directorate and MoE central levels developed

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
2.1.2.1 Presence of institutional mechanism that facilitates information flow in all directions and within all levels		N/A	The institutional mechanism exists		Activities are ongoing.
2.1.2.2 Existence of SDDP enabling policies and regulations		0	Enabling policies and regulations exist	Policy recommendations prepared	Policy recommendations and operational policies change matrix developed. Policy and Planning Working Group is currently working with The Education Policy Framework Committee on incorporating policies supportive to SDDP in the new EPF to be adopted by MoE

Immediate Outcome 2.2: Improved range sustainable financial and technical support to schools and Field Directorates for the implementation of their improvement plans

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
2.2.1 Percentage of school and Field Directorate Improvement Plans' activities implemented with financial support from MoE budget		N/A	60% of plans' activities		
2.2.2 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		
2.2.3 Number of schools and directorates having received MoE grants		0	All	789 schools received SDIP/CIDA Block Grants 7 Field Directorates received SDIP/CIDA Block Grants	
2.2.4 Degree of satisfaction of Clearing house users with services provided		N/A	High degree of satisfaction (4.0/5.0) scoreas per the rubrics		

2.2.5 Number of stakeholders using the clearinghouse		N/A	- Partners - Experts - School Leaders - Field Directorate staff - MoE Central staff		
--	--	-----	---	--	--

Output 2.2.1: Clearinghouse providing data, information and resources needed by SDDP stakeholders established

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
2.2.1.1 Presence of Clearinghouse		N/A	The establishment of the Clearinghouse		

Output 2.2.2: Financial mechanism to provide financial support for the implementation of School and Field Directorate Improvement Plans established

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
2.2.2.1 Procedures and guidelines for grants developed		N/A	Presence of procedures and guidelines		