



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) – 2014

Interim Report – Data Analysis

Prepared by

Head of Division of Monitoring & Evaluation

Farouq Bani Hamad

Statistical Analysis

Samer Mahmoud "Al-Haj Ahmad"

General Supervision

Managing Director of Planning & Educational Research

Dr. Mohammad Abu Ghazleh

&

Acting Director of Educational Research & Development

Dr. Omar Khasawneh

Translation

Division of Translation & Educational Publications

Mahmoud Suhailah

Ilham Sadeq

Sa'eda Al-Sayyed

Mervat Makahleh

June 30, 2014

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2014 Group 1	June 2014 Group 2	June 2014 Group 3	June 2014 Group 4	June 2014 Group 5	June, 2013 All Groups	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 was (3.8) out of (5.0), equivalent to 67% the percentage rate for the application of the plans. Girls schools and mixed schools scored a higher degree of the application rate where the average reached to (3.9) which is the higher than grade attained by boys schools, which was (3.8). The highest degree of plans implementation was scored by the Directorate of Education of Jerash at (4.2) and the lowest degree was in Directorate of Education of Southern-Eastern Badia, reaching to (3.3) The average degree of application by educational supervisors was (3.7).	Degree of application rate by school development teams was (4.3) of (5.0) which equals (92%) of the targeted implementation of plan. Girls/mixed schools scored higher (4.6) than boys schools (4.0). The highest degree of plans implementation was scored by the Directorate of Education North Mazar at (4.7) and the lowest degree was in Directorate of Education of Madaba Qasbat, reaching to (4.0) The average degree of application by educational	Degree of application rate by school development teams was (3.7) out of 5.0 which is equivalent to (61%) 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 (4.0) The highest degree of plans implementation was scored by the Directorates of Education of Ramtha and Ein Al-Basha at (4.0) and the lowest degree was in Directorate of Education of Al-Qasr, reaching to (3.2) The average degree of application by educational	Degree of application rate by school development teams was (4.2) out of (5.0) which is equivalent to (81%) the percentage rate for the application of the plans. Girls and mixed schools scored higher score than average in terms of the application of (4.7) which is higher than the degree of boys' schools which was (3.6) The highest degree of plans implementation was scored by the Directorates of Education of Al-Taiba and Al-Wasteya at (5.0) and the lowest degree was in Directorates of Education of Quwaisma and Tafela Qasbat reaching to (3.7) The average degree of application by educational	Degree of application rate by school development teams was (3.5) out of (5.0) which is equivalent to (63%) 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 (2.8) The highest degree of plans implementation was scored by the Directorate of Education of Zarq at (4.0) and the lowest degree was in Directorates of Education of Irbid Qasbat reaching to (3.2) The average degree of application by educational	Degree of application rate by school development teams was (3.9) out of (5.0) which is equivalent to (72%) 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 (3.4) The highest degree of plans implementation was scored by the Directorates of Education of Al-Taiba and Al-Wasteya at (5.0) and the lowest degree was in Directorates of Education of Irbid Qasbat and Al-Qaser reaching to (3.2) The average degree of application by educational supervisors was	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical and incorporeal support provided for schools by directorates of education Availability of the financial grant Motivation, Collaboration and teamwork Availability of educational support Students' response Plans are based on the real needs of schools <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 clusters 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 on programs Lack of efficiency of educational councils in school clusters in supporting school development plans. Unsuitable school environment and facilities due to large number of rented and double-shit schools Lack of clarity in roles and responsibilities of the concerned individuals Weak school administration, the instability of school staff, high class loads of teachers and development teams. <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 Follow up school accomplishments periodically in the field of implementing school development plans along with providing technical support and

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2014 Group 1	June 2014 Group 2	June 2014 Group 3	June 2014 Group 4	June 2014 Group 5	June, 2013 All Groups	Notices
Mean score (1.0): Increased effective participation of the local community, directorates of education and Ministry's Center in school development processes.										
					supervisors was (4.0)	supervisors was (4.0)	supervisors was (4.0)	supervisors was (3.0)	(3.7)	<p>awareness necessary to implement the development plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activate the role of development network councils and educate parents and local community about the program and enact their role in this program • 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 • Enact professional accountability mechanisms

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2014 Group 1	June 2014 Group 2	June 2014 Group 3	June 2014 Group 4	June 2014 Group 5	June, 2013 All Groups	Notices
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 (3.5) The implementation degrees among the concerned directorates ranged between low in Southern Ghor and Jiza at (3.0) and high at in Jerash and Mafraq Qasbat at (4.0)	Degree application rate by directorates' development teams is (4.0) The implementation degrees among the sample of directorates (North Mazar and Madaba Qasbat) was (4.0) for both directorates	Degree application rate by directorates' development teams is (4.0) The implementation degrees among the concerned directorates ranged between low in Ramtha at (3.0) and high at in Ein Al-Basha at (5.0)	Degree application rate by directorates' development teams is (4.0) The implementation degrees among the concerned directorates ranged between low in Tafela at (3.0) and high in Petra, Ajlun, Salt, Tiaba and Wasateya at (5.0)	Degree application rate by directorates' development teams is (2.8) The implementation degrees among the concerned directorates ranged between low in Amman Qasbat at (1.0) and high at Qasabit Irbid at (5.0)	Degree application rate by directorates' development teams is (3.8) The implementation degrees among the concerned directorates ranged between low in Amman Qasbat at (1.0) and high at Tiaba and Wasateya, Ajlun and 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

										<p>that must be implemented upon the instructions issued by the Ministry which are difficult to integrate with the development plans of the directorates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Lack of awareness of the concerned parties in the procedures that relate to the acceptance of grants and donations from the local community • Continuous transferring of the directors of the field directorates. <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <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 • Documenting of all achievements according to the timetable included the plan and sending periodic completion reports to the Ministry • Standardizing of programs provided by various donors and channeled them to support the implementation of developmental 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 developmental plan of the directorate of education
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>1.3 Qualitatively; Degree to which education councils at school cluster level are operational</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Councils formation - Members know their roles and responsibilities - Three meeting are held during the scholastic year at least - They take decisions - They implement them 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>All School Clusters' Education Councils are operational to a high degree (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics</p>	<p>Effectiveness degree reached to (2.6). The Educational councils of school clusters in Mafraq Qasbat which scored lowest degree at (1.5) but the councils of Giza scored the highest degree at (3.8)</p> <p>Regarding criteria, "Councils Formation" scored the highest degree at (4.0) and the lowest criteria was "they execute the decisions" at (1.9)</p>	<p>Effectiveness rate reached to (3.9). Educational councils of school clusters in North Mazar which scored the lowest degree at (2.2) and the highest was scored by Madaba Qasbat at (4.7)</p> <p>Regarding criteria, "Councils Formation and they hold meeting" scored the highest degrees at (4.0) and the lowest criteria was "they know their roles and responsibilities" at (1.9)</p>	<p>Effectiveness rate reached to (3.2). Educational councils of school clusters in Ramtha district which scored the lowest degree at (2.6) and the highest was scored by Ein Al-Basha district at (3.8)</p> <p>Regarding criteria, "Councils Formation " scored the highest degrees at (4.6) and the lowest criteria was "They execute the decisions" at (3.1)</p>	<p>Effectiveness rate reached to (3.8). Educational councils of school clusters in Salt district which scored the lowest degree at (2.6) and the highest was scored by Tafela district at (4.7)</p> <p>Regarding criteria, "Councils Formation " scored the highest degrees at (4.6) and the lowest criteria was "They execute the decisions" at (2.1)</p>	<p>Effectiveness rate reached to (3.1). Educational councils of school clusters in Amman Qasbat which scored the lowest degree at (2.0) and the highest was scored by Zarqa Qasbat district at (4.5)</p> <p>Regarding criteria, "Councils Formation " scored the highest degrees at (4.7) and the lowest criteria was "They execute the decisions" at (3.1)</p>	<p>Effectiveness rate reached to (3.3). Educational councils of school clusters in Mafraq Qasbat which scored the lowest degree at (1.5) and the highest was scored by Madaba and Tafela districts at (4.7)</p> <p>Regarding criteria, "Councils Formation " scored the highest degrees at (4.4) and the lowest criteria was "They execute the decisions" at (4.2)</p>	<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"> • Holding awareness workshops for members of education councils to familiarize them with their roles and responsibilities • 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. • The directorates of education need to restructure councils of education to create a balance in terms of gender
<p>1.4 Qualitatively; Degree to which Education Development Councils at the level of Field Directorates are operational</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Councils formed 2. Roles and responsibilities defined 3. Meetings held 4. Decision made 5. Decision implemented 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>All Field Directorates' Education Councils are operational to a high degree at (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics</p>	<p>Effectiveness rate of the educational councils was (4.2) according to the estimations of directorates development teams and (2.3) for member of the Educational Reform Council</p>	<p>Effectiveness rate of the educational councils was (3.4) according to the estimations of directorates development teams and (3.9) for member of the Educational Reform Council</p>	<p>Effectiveness rate of the educational councils was (3.7) according to the estimations of directorates development teams and (4.6) for member of the Educational Reform Council</p>	<p>Effectiveness rate of the educational councils was (3.9) according to the estimations of directorates development teams and (3.9) for member of the Educational Reform Council</p>	<p>Effectiveness rate of the educational councils was (2.8) according to the estimations of directorates development teams and (3.0) for member of the Educational Reform Council</p>	<p>Effectiveness rate of the educational councils was (3.5) according to the estimations of directorates development teams and (3.3) for member of the Educational Reform Council</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the standards of membership are applied to councils • Some of the stated meetings were held in the scholastic year • Some decision were taken and some were implemented <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of balance in the structure of some of the development councils in terms of gender. • 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 directorates 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 plans
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	<p>Focus Groups School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (2.6) (weak).</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Al-Giza district at (3.5) and least degree was scored by Mafraq Qasbat at (1.8) (weak) Males scored (2.9) and females scored (2.4) (acceptable)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (3.0) (weak). The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Jerash at (3.0) (weak) and the least degree was scored by Qasabit Mafraq at (2.6) (weak) Males scored (2.9) and females scored (3.1)</p> <p>The highest degree</p>	<p>Focus Groups School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (3.4) (weak).</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Madaba district at (3.8) (acceptable) and least degree was scored by North Mazar at (3.0) (law) Males scored (3.8) and females scored (3.1)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (3.3) (weak). The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Madaba at (3.4) (weak) and the least degree was scored by North Mazar at (3.3) (weak) Males and females scored (3.3)</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was</p>	<p>Focus Groups School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (3.6) (weak).</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Ein Al-Basha district at (3.8) (strong) and least degree was scored by Ramtha at (3.0) (weak) Males scored (3.7) and females scored (3.5)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (3.3) (weak). The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Ein Al-Basha at (3.8) (acceptable) and the least degree was scored by Ramtha at (2.8) (weak) Males scored (3.4) and females scored (3.2)</p> <p>The highest</p>	<p>Focus Groups School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (3.7) (acceptable).</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Ajlun district at (4.5) (strong) and least degree was scored by Tafela at (2.7) (weak) Males scored (3.2) and females scored (3.8)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (3.3) (weak). The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Tayba and Wasateyeh at (3.9) (acceptable) and the least degree was scored by Tafela at (3.4) (weak) Males scored (3.2) and females scored (3.4)</p>	<p>Focus Groups School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (2.9) (weak).</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Irbid Qasbat at (3.2) (weak) and least degree was scored by Shobak at (2.7) (weak) Males scored (2.6) and females scored (3.2)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (2.9) (weak). The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Shobak at (3.2) (weak) and the least degree was scored by Qasabit Amman at (2.7) (weak) Males scored (2.6) and females scored (3.1)</p> <p>The highest</p>	<p>Focus Groups School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (3.1) (weak).</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Ein Al-Basha and Qwaisma districts at (4.2) (strong) and least degree was scored by Qasabit Mafraq at (1.8) (law) Males scored (2.6) and females scored (3.3)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis School principals and teachers demonstrated degree of satisfaction at (2.9) (weak). The highest degree of satisfaction was scored by Tayba and Wasateyeh at (3.9) (acceptable) and the least degree was scored by Tafela at (2.3) (weak) Males scored (3.0) and females scored (3.2)</p> <p>The highest</p>	<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 • Inefficient training on programs pertain to school and directorate development • 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 clusters 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 • Insufficient number of the educational supporters mainly in certain majors and specializations <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

				<p>of satisfaction was scored on paragraph 1 "The directorate informs school about changes related to curriculum and learning materials that are conducted by the Managing Directorate of School Textbooks and Curriculum" and paragraph 5 "The directorate follows up the implementation of the curriculum and text books" and paragraph 13 "The directorate oversees the implementation of national and international tests and keep records of their results" at (3.4)</p> <p>Paragraph (10) "The directorate helps schools build individual plans for students with special needs "gifted and slow learners" and paragraph (11) "The directorate help schools work effectively with students with special needs (human, materialistic and technical resources." scored the least satisfaction degree at (2.3)</p>	<p>scored on paragraph 13 ""The directorate oversees the implementation of national and international tests and keep records of their results" at (4.0)</p> <p>Paragraph (3) "The directorate provides their schools' principals and teacher with suitable professional development activities in the following learning-teaching aspects: Pedagogical, educational and health knowledge" scored the least satisfaction degree at (2.5)</p>	<p>degree of satisfaction was scored on paragraph 13 ""The directorate oversees the implementation of national and international tests and keep records of their results" where the satisfaction degree arrived at (3.8)</p> <p>Paragraph (11) "The directorate help schools work effectively with students with special needs (human, materialistic and technical resources." scored the least satisfaction degree at (2.7)</p>	<p>The highest degree of satisfaction was scored on paragraph 13 ""The directorate oversees the implementation of national and international tests and keep records of their results" paragraph (14) "The educational supervisors provide training and support for schools included in the Ministry's programs to develop schools" where the satisfaction degree arrived at (3.8) Paragraph (10) "The directorate helps schools build individual plans for students with special needs "gifted and slow learners" scored the least satisfaction degree at (2.6)</p>	<p>degree of satisfaction was scored on paragraph 13 ""The directorate oversees the implementation of national and international tests and keep records of their results" where the satisfaction degree arrived at (3.5)</p> <p>Whereas Paragraph (10) "The directorate helps schools build individual plans for students with special needs "gifted and slow learners" and paragraph (11) "The directorate help schools work effectively with students with special needs (human, materialistic and technical resources." scored the least satisfaction degree at (2.4)</p>	<p>degree of satisfaction was scored on paragraph 13 ""The directorate oversees the implementation of national and international tests and keep records of their results" where the satisfaction degree arrived at (3.7)</p> <p>Whereas Paragraph (10) "The directorate helps schools build individual plans for students with special needs "gifted and slow learners" and paragraph (11) "The directorate help schools work effectively with students with special needs (human, materialistic and technical resources." scored the least satisfaction degree at (2.5)</p>	<p>responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption and fixation of schools clusters 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 facilitating administrative procedures which contribute to the implementation of the activities of the plan • Stop transferring among principals and teachers during the scholastic year
1.6 Qualitatively; Degree of satisfaction of Field Directorate staff with support from MoE center to	– Support provide by MoE to ensure the optimal use and continue in developing the database on common needs of	A N/	High level of satisfaction (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	Focus Groups The degree of satisfaction between Directorates' Development Team which reached at (2.3) but it was (2.5)	Focus Groups The degree of satisfaction between Directorates' Development Team which	Focus Groups The degree of satisfaction between Directorates' Development Team which	Focus Groups The degree of satisfaction between Directorates' Development Team which	Focus Groups The degree of satisfaction between Directorates' Development Team which	Focus Groups The degree of satisfaction between Directorates' Development Team which	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational supervisors' new role which based on offering their experience to anyone who wants to benefit from • Issuance of legislations and regulations related to the educational councils and development councils

<p>implement Field Directorate Improvement Plans</p>	<p>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 provided 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 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 – Others</p>			<p>for supervisors</p> <p>The general satisfaction degree was (2.4) (law) and it ranged between low in Jerash and Mafraq Qasbat at (1.5) to high in Geza at (3.5)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis The general satisfaction degree was (2.3) (low)</p> <p>The degree of the general satisfaction ranged from low in Mafraq at (1.9) to high in Geza at (2.6)</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 3 “Feedback provided by the Ministry on the reports submitted by your directorate” which reached to (2.6) whereas the least degree was on paragraph 4 “Support provided by MoE to enact the role of the educational councils” was (2.0)</p>	<p>reached at (2.5) but it was (3.5) for supervisors</p> <p>The general satisfaction degree was (3.0) (law) and it ranged between low in North Mazar at (2.5) to high in Madaba at (3.5)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis The general satisfaction degree was (3.1) (low)</p> <p>The degree of the general satisfaction ranged from low in North Mazar at (2.9) to high in Madaba at (3.2)</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 5 “The Ministry follows up the directorate in carrying out the financial analysis of the disbursement of the grant in schools and directorates and follows up the disbursement ” which reached to (3.3) whereas the least degree was</p>	<p>reached at (3.7) but it was (1.7) for supervisors</p> <p>The general satisfaction degree was (2.7) (law) and it ranged between low in Ein Al-Basha and Al-Qaser at (2.5) to high in Ramtha at (3.0)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis The general satisfaction degree was (2.5) (low)</p> <p>The degree of the general satisfaction ranged from low in Al-Qasr at (2.3) to high in Ramtha at (2.7)</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 1 “Support provided by the Ministry to ensure the optimal use and improvement of the common needs database of schools ” which reached to (2.8) whereas the least degree was on paragraph 3 “Feedback provided by the</p>	<p>reached at (3.7) but it was (2.2) for supervisors</p> <p>The general satisfaction degree was (2.9) (law) and it ranged between low in Petra at (2.0) to high in Ajlun and Salt at (3.5)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis The general satisfaction degree was (2.7) (low)</p> <p>The degree of the general satisfaction ranged from low in Tafela at (2.1) to high in Ajlun at (3.3)</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 5 “The Ministry follows up the directorate in carrying out the financial analysis of the disbursement of the grant in schools and directorates and follows up the disbursement ” which reached to (3.0) whereas the least degree was</p>	<p>reached at (1.6) but it was (2.8) for supervisors</p> <p>The general satisfaction degree was (2.2) (law) and it ranged between low in Qasabit Amman, Qasabit Irbid and Shobak at (2.0) to high in Zarqa Qasabat and Ma'an Qasabat and Salt at (2.5)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis The general satisfaction degree was (2.1) (low)</p> <p>The degree of the general satisfaction ranged from low in Amman Qasabat at (1.8) to high in Irbid Qasabat at (2.6)</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 1 “Support provided by the Ministry to ensure the optimal use and improvement of the common needs database of schools” which reached to (2.3) whereas the least degree was on paragraph 2 “Support</p>	<p>reached at (2.8) but it was (2.5) for supervisors</p> <p>The general satisfaction degree was (2.6) (law) and it ranged between low in Jerash and Qasabit Mafraq at (1.5) to high in Al-Giza, Madaba, Ajlun and Salt at (3.5)</p> <p>Questionnaire Analysis The general satisfaction degree was (2.5) (low)</p> <p>The degree of the general satisfaction ranged from low in Qasabit Amman at (1.8) to high in Ajlun at (3.3)</p> <p>The highest degree of satisfaction was on paragraph 5 “The Ministry follows up the directorate in carrying out the financial analysis of the disbursement of the grant in schools and directorates and follows up the disbursement ” which reached to (2.7) whereas least degree was</p>	<p>• Monitoring and evaluation provided by the Managing Directorate of Planning and Educational Research at the Ministry’s center to the SDDP</p> <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 • The extended length of the training programs provided and choosing inappropriate time to carry out training in the field. • The degradation of the specialized supervisory work • Lack of clear and specified professional accountability mechanism <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
--	---	--	--	---	---	--	---	---	---	--

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2014 Group 1	June 2014 Group 2	June 2014 Group 3	June 2014 Group 4	June 2014 Group 5	June, 2013 All Groups	Notices
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						Implementation degree average was (5.0/5.0)	<p>required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry’s center should integrate development programs that have similar objectives. • 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. <p>Accomplishment achieved up to date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The communication strategy was approved in the second half of the year 2012. • Holding awareness sessions on the strategy to the Head of divisions of Information and Communal Communication in the field directorates. • Holding discussion meetings with the elements of the educational matrix and social activities to build partnerships between the educational institutions and local community. • Preparation of training manuals which were experimented on a sample of directors in the Ministry's center within special training manual of the senior management • Training of (16) employees out of the Ministry's staff on the training guide from divisions of Information and Communal Communication, 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 as

										<p>well as technical and administrative director and head of divisions of information in the field directorates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launching journalistic campaign to introduce the SDDP program and disseminating success stories • Establishment of group for social communication regarding the strategy. <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formation of knowledgeable and experienced communication team which consists of the directors of the communal communication, Head of division of public relations and information, Head of division of SDD, M&E coordinator at the DCU • The presence of trained and qualified heads of divisions of information who are ready to work in the field directorates • Positive relations with mass media and local press representatives. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of sufficient enthusiasm regarding the communal communication strategy by some of relevant managing directorates • Weak institutionalization and structuralization of communication in Ministry of Education. • Lack of abilities and motivation in the concerned managing directorates regarding communication • In sufficient financial allocations • Duties are poorly introduced in the employees' job description cards within the concerned divisions.
1.8 Qualitatively; The degree of satisfaction of MoE staff with inter-departmental communications at the Ministry's Center with Field Directorates and Schools and with communication with local community in		N/A	High level of satisfaction (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics							Satisfaction degree was not measured

relation to SDDP										
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	<p><u>For plans of group ONE:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Priorities defined based on school needs as shown by the self-review data – Results aligned with school's priorities – Indicators aligned with desired results – Procedure/activities aligned with results – Responsibilities assigned for each procedure/activity intended to implement – Realistic implementation timeframe – Endorsed by the education council of schools cluster <p>For directorates' plans of groups TWO + THREE + FOUR and FIVE</p> <ul 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 	N/A	90% of school plans meet minimum standards (4.0 Score) as per the rubrics	Overall average score was (3.7). The lowest district was Mafraq at (3.5) and the highest was South Ghors at (4.3).	Overall average score was (4.2). The lowest district was North Mazar at (3.8) and the highest was Madaba at (4.6).	Overall average score was (4.0). The lowest district was Ramtha at (3.7) and the highest was Al-Qaser at (4.5).	Overall average score was (4.1). The lowest district was Qwaismeh at (3.7) and the highest was Ajlun & Salt at (4.3).	Overall average score was (4.2). The lowest district was Amman Qasabat at (4.0) and the highest was Zarqa Qasabat at (4.6).	For directorates' plans of groups TWO, THREE + FOUR and FIVE Overall average score was (4.1). The lowest district was North Mazar, Quwaismeh and Ramtha at (3.7) and the highest was Madaba Qasabat and Zarqa Qasabat at (4.6).	<p>GROUP ONE:</p> <p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures (activities) are linked to the results of the majority of the plans. • Many plans were endorsed by the educational council of schools cluster. • Priorities defined according to school's needs as shown by the self-review data in many of the plans • Results are aligned with the school's priorities in many plans • Indicators are aligned with the desired results intended to be implement. • Many schools re-built their plans based on result-oriented management methodology <p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeframe of implementation in many plans is not realistic • Responsibilities were not defined regarding procedures (activities) intended to be implemented for most of the plans • Many plans lack plan criteria based on results and they need re-build them comprehensively • Activities in most plans do not elevate to development activities level • Considerable accord in the development and procedural plans among some schools in one cluster <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Concerned staff in the directorates of

<p>correctly written – Indicators are aligned with outcomes – Activities, outcomes and results are logically aligned – Responsibilities of activities intended to be carried out are defined – Realistic implementation timeframe – Endorsed by educational development council of schools cluster</p>			<p>school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (56%)</p>	<p>percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (81%)</p>	<p>percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (58%)</p>	<p>percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (64%)</p>	<p>percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (78%)</p>	<p>percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (70%) (for groups TWO, THREE + FOUR and FIVE)</p>	<p>education should follow up the processes of preparing and implementing plans in school closely</p> <p><u>GROUPS TWO, THREE, FOUR & FIVE:</u></p> <p><u>Strengths:</u></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 • Output are correctly written in most plans • Indicators are linked with outputs in most plans • Procedures (activities) are logically linked with results in most of the plans. • Responsibilities were identified for the indented action (activities) to be implemented in most of the plans. • Most plans were approved by the educational councils of the school clusters. • Timeframe of implementation is realistic in most plans <p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are some plans need to be re-designed wholly and others need to be re-checked to meet the standards • Activities in many of the plans don't elevate to developmental activities levels • There is considerable accord in the developmental and procedural plans among some schools in one cluster <p><u>Recommendations:</u></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.
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Indicators	Standards	Baseline 2009	Target 2015	June 2014 Group 1	June 2014 Group 2	June 2014 Group 3	June 2014 Group 4	June 2014 Group 5	June, 2013 All Groups	Notices
										<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 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><u>Weaknesses:</u></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><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 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. • Concerned staff in the directorates of education should follow up the processes of preparing and implementing plans in school closely

<p>1.1.2 Quantitatively; Percentage of field directorate improvement plans that meet minimum quality standards</p>	<p>For directorates' plans of group ONE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School common needs and directorate needs inform priorities as shown by self-review data Results aligned with priorities Indicators aligned with results intended to be implemented Procedure/activity aligned with results Appropriate responsibilities identified for each activity Realistic implementation timeframe Endorsed by educational development council of schools cluster Plans observe the different needs between males and females (gender) <p>For directorates' plans of groups TWO + THREE + FOUR + FIVE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School common needs and directorate needs inform priorities as shown in self-review data. Results aligned 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>90% of school plans meet minimum standards (4.0/0.5 Score) as per the rubrics</p>	<p>Overall average score was (3.9). The lowest district was Mafraq Qasabat at (3.1) and the highest was South Ghors at (5.0).</p> <p>The lowest sub-indicator was "Plans observe gender sensitivity" [NO] and the highest was "Results aligned with priorities" at (5.0).</p> <p>Standards aligned with (1) plan out of (4) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (25%)</p>	<p>Overall average score was (3.5). The lowest district was North Mazar at (4.1) and the highest was Madaba at (4.9).</p> <p>The lowest sub-indicator was "Realistic implementation timeframe" [NO] and the highest was "Endorsed by educational development council of schools cluster" at (5.0).</p> <p>Standards aligned with (1) plan out of (2) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was</p>	<p>Overall average score was (4.4). The lowest district was Ramtha at (3.9) and the highest was Al-Qaser at (5.0).</p> <p>The lowest sub-indicator was "Realistic implementation timeframe" [NO] and the highest was "Priorities were defined", "Results were linked with priorities", "Results are correctly written", "Outputs were correctly written" "Endorsed by educational development council of schools cluster" at (5.0).</p> <p>Standards aligned with (2) plans out of (3) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (67%)</p>	<p>Overall average score was (4.2). The lowest district was Taybeh and Wasateya at (3.3) and the highest was Tafela at (5.0).</p> <p>The lowest sub-indicator was "Plans observe gender sensitivity" [NO] and the highest standard was "Endorsed by educational development council of schools cluster" [YES]</p> <p>Standards aligned with (4) plans out of (6) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (67%)</p>	<p>Overall average score was (4.6). The lowest district was Irbid Qasabat, Ma'an Qasabat and Shobak at (4.5) and the highest was Zarqa Qasabat at (4.9).</p> <p>The lowest sub-indicator was "Plans observe gender sensitivity" (3.6) [NO] and the highest was "Outputs were correctly written", "Responsibilities are defined" and "Endorsed by educational development council of schools cluster" at (5.0).</p> <p>Standards aligned with (5) plans out of (5) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was (100%)</p>	<p>For directorates' plans of groups TWO + THREE + FOUR + FIVE Overall average score was (4.2). The lowest district was North Mazar at (2.1) and the highest was Al-Qaser and Tafela at (5.0).</p> <p>The lowest sub-indicator was "Plans observe gender sensitivity" (2.6) [NO] and the highest standard was "Endorsed by educational development council of schools cluster" at (5.0).</p> <p>Standards aligned with (12) plans out of (16) which were evaluated. Therefore; the percentage of school development plans' alignment with quality standards was</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"> 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>GROUPS: TWO & FOUR: 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 of
--	---	------------	--	--	---	---	---	---	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – with priorities – Results are clearly written – Indicators aligned with desired results – Outcomes are correctly written – Indicators are aligned with outcomes – Activities, outcomes and results are logically aligned – Responsibilities of activities intended to be carried out are defined – Realistic implementation timeframe – Endorsed by educational development council of schools cluster • Plans observe the different needs between males and females (gender) 				(50%)				(75%)	<p>schools in most plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation timeframe is not realistic in many plans • 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"> • The directorates of education and the concerned staff in Ministry's center should build the capacity of those who are involved in the schools and directorates of education in the area of results-oriented management • 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								This indicator is not measure
1.1.4 Quantitatively; Number of communication initiatives related to SDDP as per the communication strategy		N/A	All initiatives in the Communications Strategy						N/A	The establishment of special website of the SDDP has started.
1.1.5 Quantitatively; Number of School	All schools throughout the Kingdom		N/A	(854) schools and (7) directorates of education	(256) schools and (4) directorates of education	(529) schools and (6) directorates of education	(517) schools and (6) directorates of education	(569) schools and (5) directorates of education	(2725) schools and (28) directorates of	<u>Group One:</u> Jerash, North-Eastern Badia, North-Western Badia, Mafraq District, Al-Mowqar and Al-Giza.

Improvement plans are developed according to the approved form for SDDP									education	<p>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 Group Five: Amman Qasabat, Irbid Qasabat, Zarqa Qasabat, Ma'an Qasabat, Shobak</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	<p>The degree of effectiveness according principals' and school developments teams' estimations were (3.9) The standard <i>"Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils"</i> scored the lowest degree of effectiveness at (3.0) whereas the standard <i>"Establishment of school development team and self-review"</i> achieved the highest score at (4.5)</p> <p>Girls' schools scored higher degree at (4.2) than Boys' schools at (3.6).</p>	<p>The degree of effectiveness according principals' and school developments teams' estimations were (3.9) The standard <i>"Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils"</i> scored the lowest degree of effectiveness at (3.2) whereas the standard <i>"Establishment of school development team"</i> achieved the highest score at (4.4)</p> <p>Girls' schools scored higher degree at (3.7) than Boys' schools at (4.1).</p>	<p>The degree of effectiveness according principals' and school developments teams' estimations were (4.5) The standard <i>"Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils"</i> scored the lowest degree of effectiveness at (3.8) whereas the standard <i>"The school conducted a comprehensive self-review"</i> achieved the highest score at (4.9)</p> <p>Girls' schools scored higher degree at (4.7) than Boys' schools at (4.3).</p>	<p>The degree of effectiveness according principals' and school developments teams' estimations were (3.8) The standard <i>"Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils"</i> scored the lowest degree of effectiveness at (3.8) whereas the standard <i>"Establishment of school development team"</i> achieved the highest score at (4.7)</p> <p>Girls' schools scored higher degree at (4.7) than Boys' schools at (4.0).</p>	<p>The degree of effectiveness according principals' and school developments teams' estimations were (4.2) The standard <i>"Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils"</i> scored the lowest degree of effectiveness at (3.2) whereas the standard <i>"Establishment of school development team"</i> achieved the highest score at (4.7)</p> <p>Girls' schools scored higher degree at (4.5) than Boys' schools at (3.9).</p>	<p>The degree of effectiveness according principals' and school developments teams' estimations were (4.2) The standard <i>"Sharing of schools development plans with the educational councils"</i> scored the lowest degree of effectiveness at (3.4) whereas the standard <i>"Establishment of school development team"</i> achieved the highest score at (4.6)</p> <p>Girls' schools scored higher degree at (4.5) than Boys' schools at (4.0).</p>	<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 clusters 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 <p>Development recommendations resulted in the processes of reviewing (SDDP):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General review of the program methodology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Effective school indicator were reviewed and indicators were reduced from (39) to (20) indicators along with better concentration on students' learning as well as the development of data collection tools which became (3) tools only – Directorate program was reviewed in

										terms of tools and indicators – Training guides were reviewed and updated 2. Establishment of the accountability system A team was formed which consists of a director of one of the managing directorates, director of one of the directorates of education, a supervisor in the field, a principal, a director from the Ministry's center in addition to deputy manager of the SDDP and an international expert 3. Enhancement of decentralization: – Accomplishment and dissemination of the regulatory instructions of the work of the educational councils and educational development councils – Fulfillment of instructions that facilitate the processes of receiving denotations from the local community and institutions.
1.1.1 Output 1.1.1: SDDP Communications Strategy was developed										
1.1.1.1	Quantitatively; There is an SDDP Communications Strategy	N/A	SDDP communications Strategy exists in August , 2012							Communication strategy was approved in the second half of the year 2012.
1.1.2 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										
1.1.2.1	Quantitatively; Number of members of MoE Communication Team, Field Directorates Media staff and Education Council Members trained									
	TOTAL									
	A) Number of		565							

Communication team members in MoE center 1. Males 2. females TOTAL B) Number of communication staff in the directorates of education 1. Males 2. Females TOTAL C) Number of Educational Councils' members 1- Females 2- Males TOTAL			5							
Output 1.1.3: Field Directorates and school staff trained on preparing and implementing RBM-based and gender sensitive School Improvement Plans with community participation										
1.1.3.1 Quantitatively; Number of those who were trained on leadership skills TOTAL: Males Females		N/A	All of principals, principal assistants and supervisors in the Kingdom TOTAL :1167 Males: 617 Females: 550			TOTAL: 4102 Males: 1766 Females: 2336		TOTAL: 5296 Males: 2383 Females: 2886		
1.1.3.2 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, Principals' Assistants, Councilors and supervisors TOTAL : 657			TOTAL: 7425		TOTAL: 8472		

TOTAL:				Males: 267 Females: 390		Males: 2874 Females: 4551		Males: 3531 Females: 4941	
Males									
Females									
Output 1.1.4: MoE Field Directorate staff trained to develop and implement results-based gender sensitive Field Directorate Improvement Plans with community participation									
1.1.4.1 Number of those who were trained on SDDP		N/A	All directors of the directorates of Education , their assistants, heads of divisions and educational supervisors throughout the kingdom						
TOTAL:				TOTAL :147		TOTAL: 1041		TOTAL: 1188	
Males				Males: 132		Males: 770		Males: 902	
Females				Females: 15		Females: 271		Females: 286	
Output 1.1.5: Process for reviewing and revising the SDDP implemented based on a participatory approach									
1.1.5.1 Quantitatively; Number of reviews conducted		N/A	2					1	
1.1.5.2 Quantitatively; Number of education stakeholders involved in the SDDP review process		N/A	10 minimum, in addition to MoE, such as MoPIC, MoHE, universities, MoF, NCHRD, Private Sector, CSOs, community members and others					5	Concerned parties participating in the review process: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SDI program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through inviting the international expert (Kebron Harison) • Formation of a joint technical team with the concerned staff in the Ministry of Education to implement the recommendations 2. Learning, Environment Technical Support Program (LETS). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arbitration of the amended tools and revision of the paragraph by the international expert (Kris) and local experts 3. Education Reform Support Program (ERSP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiring an expert to help develop the new role of the educational supervisor 4. NCHRD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carrying out a study on the effectiveness of the SDDP 5. The Ministry of Education

										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the implementation of the M&E reports issued by the Division of M&E in the Managing Directorate of Planning & Educational Research Delivery of the feedback from the field directorates and schools 	
Output 1.1.6: MoE staff trained on integrating Gender analysis into daily work to support school improvement											
1.1.6.1 Quantitatively ; Number of education stakeholders involved in the SDDP review process		0/according to SDIP	All MoE Center staff, Field Directors, FD Assistants, supervisors, School Principals and SP Assistants in the kingdom	TOTAL: 599 Males: 327 Females: 272						TOTAL: 4292 Males: 1983 Females: 2309	TOTAL: 4894 Males: 2310 Females: 2581
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											
2.1 Quantitatively; Percentage of policies and procedures which observe gender-sensitivity and support the school-based development system. and recommendations that have been implemented		N/A	100% of policies developed								Documents of the general framework of the educational policy were reviewed and recommendations were prepared in July 2012. After the adoption of the general framework of educational policy, 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	A standardized tool designed to be used by all school throughout the Kingdom								The tool is revised, amended and developed in 2014
2.5 Qualitatively; Degree of satisfaction of	N/A	High degree of satisfaction									Satisfaction degree hasn't been measured yet

stakeholders with extent to which central MoE uses SDDP information to inform national policies, strategic planning, annual priorities and resource allocation		(5.0/4.0 score as per the rubrics)								
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 evaluation reports	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 cover the period until the end of June 2014. Satisfaction degree will be studied after the issuance of the third report
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 third 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:		N/A	– M&E Division staff – M&E Coordinators in MoE	Staff trained: M&E Division staff : 7 (M: 6 F:1) 22 M&E	(38) senior M&E coordinators in directorates of education (Groups: TWO & THREE, FOUR, FIVE, & SIX). Males: (31) Females: (7)				(45) M&E coordinators in directorates of education	

1. Males 2. females B. Directorates: 1. Males 2. females C. Schools: 1. Males 2. females			center, directorates of education & schools	Coordinators in SDDP Field Directorates in Groups 1	Schools and directorates' center TOTAL: (4080) Males: (1931) Females: (2149)				Males: (37) Females: (8) Schools and directorates' center Total: (4080) Males: (1931) Females: (2149)	
2.1.1.2 Quantitatively; Number of SDDP M&E Reports produced		N/A	4 reports starting 2012						Number (3)	The third monitoring report of SDDP will cover period until the end of June 2014.
Output 2.1.2: MoE SDDP related policies to institutionalize coherent planning at school, Field Directorate and MoE central levels were 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							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	The percentages of Improvement Plans activities for schools arrived to (49%)	The percentages of Improvement Plans activities for schools arrived to (60%)				The percentages of Improvement Plans activities for schools arrived to (54%)	<u>STRENGTHS:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of the financial grant on time. • The grant contributed to carrying out many activities in the development plans. <u>WEAKNESSES:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The grant was not distributed according to the number of students • The provided grant was insufficient • Disbursement items were limited <u>Recommendations:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the amount of the grant and not to limit the aspects of disbursement • Developing definite criteria in the distribution of grants over schools and directorates of education equally and efficiently.

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 in its annual budget for each school and directorate							(JD 200000) in the Ministry's budget for the fiscal year 2014 for group THREE and FOUR only
2.2.3 Quantitatively; Number of schools and directorates which received grant from MoE's budget		N/A	All directorates of education & schools	(854) schools and (7) directorates of education in 2013	(256) schools and (4) directorates of education in 2014	(529) schools and (6) directorates of education in 2014			(1639) schools and (17) directorates of education	<p>Group One: Jerash, North-Eastern Badia, North-Western Badia, Mafrq District, Al-Mowqar and Al-Giza.</p> <p>Group Two: North Mazar, Bain Obied and South Mazar.</p> <p>Group Three: Marka, Ramtha, Ein Al-Basha, South Badia, Al-Qsar and Russaifah.</p>
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; There are instructions procedures and guidelines which specify the allocated amounts disbursement principles.		N/A	There are instructions, 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.