

## Ministry of Education

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

Groups 2 and 3 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 School Improvement 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	School development team members: An average score of <b>4.3/5.0</b> which equals <b>86%</b> of implementation of plan. Girls/mixed schools scored higher ( <b>4.75</b> ) than boys schools ( <b>3.62</b> ). Supervisors: Average score of ( <b>3.5/5.0</b> ) particularly low in Al-Qaser ( <b>1.0</b> )	<p><b>Enabling factors:</b> strong community involvement, team work, support from supervisors, financial support (block grants), planning process leads to building applicable and realistic needs based plans</p> <p><b>Hindering factors:</b> lack of clarity re: new role of supervisors, financial regulations make it difficult to fundraise, burden of extra work, lack of stability of supervisors and teachers, lack of awareness on SDDP of local communities, transportation not always available</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b> Train all members of the school development team on SDP, delegate additional responsibilities to school leadership, provide financial support, institutionalize the new role of supervisors</p>
1.2 Degree to which Field Directorates are implementing their Improvement Plans	Percentage of activities implemented as per Field Directorate Improvement Plan	Field Directorates Improvement Plans as per SDDP model did not exist	All Field directorates implement their Improvement Plans per schedule to a high degree	Average score from self-assessment was <b>4.56/5.0</b> . Scores varied from a low of <b>4.0</b> to a high of <b>5.0</b> .	<p><b>Enabling factors:</b> financial assistance from SDIP, objectivity of needs based planning</p> <p><b>Hindering factors:</b> process of decision making is highly centralized. Inconsistencies between the MOE financial regulations and the SDDP</p>

Indicators	Criteria	Baseline	Targets	June 2012	Comments
			(4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics		<b>Recommendations:</b> MOE provides grants to Field Directorates, decentralize authority to enable directorates to implement plans

**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 3.89 with the lowest in Ramtha (2.7) and the highest in Amman 4 (4.8). Of the sub-indicators, meeting membership requirements and holding three meetings per year scored the highest.	<b>Enabling factors:</b> Decisions being taken with community input, discussion and follow-up, membership standards for educational councils were followed.  <b>Hindering factors:</b> lack of gender balance, lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities, not enough involvement with field directorate to solve problems, complicated procedures for gifts and contribution to schools, educational councils not recognized as official entities  <b>Recommendations:</b> more awareness of role of educational council roles within MOE and local communities, improve representation of children and parents, more gender balance, recognize as official entities, modify regulations to facilitate fundraising, improve capacity of members in documentation
1.4 Degree to which Education Development Councils at the level of Field Directorates	1- Membership 2- Roles and responsibilities 3- Meetings held (3 per school year)	0	All Field Directorates' Education Development Councils are	The operational Education Development councils rated themselves lower than the	<b>Enabling factors:</b> involvement of parents and communities, experience of members <b>Hindering factors:</b> onlack of official status for councils, lack of gender balance, not enough communication with field directorate, lack of clarity

are operational	4- Decisions made 5- Decisions implemented		operational to a high degree (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics	directorate development teams <b>(4.28 and 3.5 respectively)</b>	of roles insufficient implementation of decisions and insufficient communication among members <b>Recommendations:</b> improve capacity in documentation, amend regulations related to fundraising, institutionalize the committee
-----------------	---	--	---	--	---

**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 degree of satisfaction with the support they receive from the field directorate (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	Principals' satisfaction in all Field Directorates average score was 4.00 on this indicator, "acceptable" with the exception of <b>South Mazar</b> which scored <b>3.0</b> "marginal"	<b>Enabling factors:</b> field directorates have increased understanding of the problems of the school and can provide assistance that is based on needs and an improved climate for cooperation  <b>Hindering factors:</b> school leaders don't participate in the development of the improvement plans of their field directorates, administrative demands placed on schools from field directorate, not enough support from field directorate on school plans, insufficient learning resources at school  <b>Recommendations:</b> Organize exchange visits with schools and districts that are more experienced in SDDP
1.6 Degree of satisfaction of Field Directorate staff with support from MoE central to implement Field Directorate Improvement Plans	1- Professional development opportunities 2- Mentor coaching 3- Feedback on reports 4- Other support	N/A	High level of satisfaction with support received from central MoE (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	The scores varied from a low of <b>1.4 (South Mazar)</b> to a high of <b>4.5 in (Amman 4)</b> . The average score was <b>3.69</b> . Respondents were the most satisfied with professional	<b>Enabling factors:</b> the development of the new role of supervisors has helped develop the schools.  <b>Hindering factors:</b> refusal of the MOE to allow Filed Directorate staff to conduct training without MOE approval.  <b>Recommendations:</b> mechanism to provide feedback from the MoE on their reports in a timely manner,

				development opportunities.	better coordination among development programs to avoid replication, a mechanism to ensure that plans and reports reach the correct department, increase effectiveness of electronic communications between Ministry and field directorate
1.7 Degree to which SDDP Communication Strategy is implemented		N/A	High level of implementation (4.0/5.0) as per the rubrics	Not yet been implemented	Communication Strategy prepared. Not yet been implemented
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	No SIPs as per SDDP model existed	90% of school plans meet minimum standards(4.	Average score overall was <b>4.2</b> . The lowest district was Madaba and South Badia ( <b>3.9</b> ) for both, and the	<b>Observations:</b>  -Good connections between needs, priorities and results -Responsibilities not assigned appropriately

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
	<p>aligned with results</p> <p>4- Procedure aligned with results</p> <p>5- Suitable responsibilities assigned for each procedure</p> <p>6-Realistic timeframe</p> <p>7-Endorsed by the education council</p>		0/5.0) Score as per the rubrics	<p>highest was Russaifah <b>(4.7)</b>. The highest sub-indicator was “results aligned with priorities” <b>(4.5)</b> and the lowest was “responsibilities identified for each procedure <b>(3.8)</b>. No significant difference between boys and girls/mixed schools.</p>	<p>-Implementation time not always realistically allocated</p> <p>-Lots of indicators, but not enough balance between qualitative and quantitative</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p>-School development teams could benefit from RBM training</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> <p>6- Realistic timeframe</p> <p>7- Endorsed by Educational Development Council</p>	No FDIPs as per SDDP model existed	90% of directorate improvement plans meet minimum standards (4.0/5.0) Score as per the rubrics	<p>Average score of <b>4.2</b>. Highest in Ain El Basha <b>(4.5)</b> and lowest in Irbid 2 <b>(3.8)</b>. Gender integration was the lowest criteria <b>(2.2)</b>.</p>	<p>Observations:</p> <p>Strong link between needs (directorate and school common needs), priorities and results</p> <p>-In some plans gender sensitive language is used, but in general, data is not disaggregated.</p> <p>-The responsibilities section is weak</p> <p>-Lack of balance between qualitative and quantitative indicators</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p>-RBM training</p> <p>-Need to use gender disaggregated data</p>

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
	8-Integration of gender				
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		
1.1.4 Number of communication initiatives related to SDDP as per the communication strategy		0	All initiatives in the Communications Strategy	N/A	Communication Strategy prepared but not yet implemented.
1.1.5 Number of School Improvement plans developed		0	All Schools	<b>732</b> Schools in the 9 SDDP Field Directorates (Groups 2&3) have School Improvement Plans	All schools in Groups 2&3 Field Directorates 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 and school development teams both rated the effectiveness of the SDDP process as <b>4.2</b> . "Sharing the SIP with educational councils" was the lowest rated criteria according to both groups. School principals rated self-review slightly below average.	<b>Enabling factors:</b> -They have a computerized system for analyzing data - Have built capacity of identifying needs which leads to realistic plans - State of readiness training programs were strong - In cases where the ed. council is strong, it can be very useful  <b>Recommendations:</b> - Roles of stakeholders have to be clarified - Need more time to develop school Improvement plans - Developed a mechanism to review and revise School Improvement plans

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appoint qualified and enthusiastic individuals to school development committees</li> <li>- Increase time for state of readiness training</li> <li>- Educational councils are weak and need to be strengthened with active involvement of school members</li> <li>- Enhance student participation</li> <li>- More RBM training is needed</li> <li>- Questionnaires need to be simplified and avoid repetition and increase opportunities for analysis.</li> <li>- Include school development team members in state of readiness program</li> </ul>
1.1.7 Number of Field Directorate plans developed			All Field Directorates	SDDP Groups 2&3 <b>Nine</b> Field Directorates have Improvement Plans	All 9 Field Directorates in Groups 2 and 3 have Improvement Plans
1.1.8 Degree of effectiveness of the process for developing Field Directorate Improvement Plans (Perceptions of FD staff)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- State of readiness</li> <li>2- Identify school common needs</li> <li>3- Identify field directorate needs</li> <li>4- Needs prioritization</li> <li>5- Develop field directorate plan</li> <li>6- Sharing FD Improvement Plan with education development councils</li> </ul>	N/A	High degree of effectiveness (4.0/5.0) score as per the rubrics	Supervisors rated the process significantly lower than Field Directorate development teams ( <b>3.4</b> compared to <b>4.3</b> ), probably because they do not participate in the process.	<p><b>Enabling factors:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plans based on needs and priorities</li> <li>- Strong involvement of the local community</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The questionnaires need to be reviewed to better address the target group (get input from directorate staff)</li> <li>- Decentralize authority to field directorate level so they can implement plans</li> <li>- Need awareness raising for local communities on the role of the field directorate</li> <li>- Improve cooperation between the various departments of the field directorate</li> <li>- Improve differentiation between the needs of girls and boys schools</li> </ul>

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Involve educational development councils more in the development of the filed directorate plans</li> <li>- Should hold readiness program in summer</li> <li>- Involve the educational councils in developing the directorate plans</li> <li>- Train all supervisors on the SDDP and don't transfer them as often</li> <li>- Ensure that all supervisors know about the field directorate improvement plan.</li> <li>- Consider differences in needs between boys and girls schools when developing responses to plan</li> <li>- Improve coordination among the various professional development programs offered at field directorate level</li> </ul>
1.1.9 Percentage of review process recommendations implemented			90% of recommendations implemented		Review process hasn't 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 communications 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 Education 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	<b>G2&amp;3</b> 1667 735 male/ 932 Female	<b>G4</b> 0	Newly appointed in Groups 2 and 3 92 (44 Male / 48 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	<b>G2&amp;3</b> 1497 808 Male / 689 Female	<b>G4</b> 152 98 Male/ 54 Female	Newly appointed in Groups 2 and 3 92 (44 Male / 48 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	<b>G2&amp;3</b> 2559 993 Male / 1566 Female	<b>G4</b> 151 71 Male/ 80 Female	Newly appointed in Groups 2 and 3 254 (100 Male / 154 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	<b>G2&amp;3</b> 502 363 Male / 139 Female	<b>G4</b> 0	Newly appointed in Groups 2 and 3 122 (72 Male / 48 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 in the SDDP review process			10 minimum, in addition to MoE, such as MoPIC, MoHE,		Review is not yet due.

Indicator	Criteria	Baseline	Target	June 2012	Comments
			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 trained on SDDP Gender analysis training program	All MoE Center staff, Field Directors, FD Assistants, supervisors, School Principals and SP Assistants	<b>G2&amp;3</b> 1497 808 M/ 689 F	<b>G4</b> 152 98 M/ 54 F	Newly appointed in Groups 2 and 3 104 (54 Male /50 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	Not yet been implemented	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	
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&amp;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	First SDDP Report is being prepared	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 (4.0/5.0) 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 (4.0/5.0) 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 first report is being 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	732 schools received SDIP/CIDA Block Grants  9 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) score as 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		