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Introduction

1. This report presents a qualitative review of the Education Sector Strategy Programme in Nigeria’s (ESSPIN) support to 90 nomadic schools in Jigawa State.

2. ESSPIN is nearing the end of a six-year programme of increasing quality, access and accountability in basic education, in six states of Nigeria. A major element of ESSPIN focuses on improving access to education for the most vulnerable children. In Jigawa, ESSPIN’s team used ESSPIN’s Challenge Fund to upgrade a series of nomadic community primary schools, responding to requests for support from Jigawa’s state Agency for Nomadic Education (ANE).

3. The first phase of the programme ran from 2011 to 2013, during which 40 schools were upgraded in partnership with the ANE. ESSPIN’s Impact Assessment of the Challenge Fund (Fawson, 2013), showed very positive results from this support, particularly in terms of increased enrolment of nomadic children. The programme was thus extended to a further 50 schools from January to July 2014. Documented enrolment rates continued to rise, and anecdotal evidence from partners indicated that nomadic schools which had received Challenge Fund support were extremely popular.

4. This review was commissioned to document the full programme of Challenge Fund support to nomadic schools in Jigawa; to assess whether the model of support was successful and sustainable; and to provide recommendations for ESSPIN in deciding the scope of any future support to nomadic schools in Jigawa State from 2014-2016, during ESSPIN’s extension phase.

Project overview

5. The programme has been running three years, since 2011. Previously, ANE’s model for schools set up by communities was more along the lines of temporary schools, which were staffed by unpaid volunteer local teachers, who would not turn up often, and were abandoned when communities migrated. Little funding was given to these schools, 270 which are monitored by ANE, under its responsibility to deliver nomadic education in Jigawa State.

6. The ESSPIN approach was to persuade communities to establish more permanent schools and leave the women and children behind with their farmland and some cattle so the children could stay at school. Attempts to introduce an adapted curriculum were rejected by Jigawa’s governor, who is nomadic, and who felt it was important to give nomadic children the full primary curriculum, so that their learning
levels and range would be the same as other children. Therefore the volunteer teacher training is based on the IQTE ESSPIN approach (and delivered by ESSPIN’s SSIT), but the curriculum is the full primary curriculum of English, Hausa, maths, science, social science, and art. Most schools have around 4 teachers, some of which are paid, and many of which are unpaid.

7. The intervention started with community engagement through ANE and MACBAN; then with setting up and orienting SSCs to engage the community and develop understanding of the schools’ needs. Schools were only selected on the basis of either strong community commitment to existing schools, or strong ANE investment in certain existing schools.

8. Then the programme of infrastructure support started in response to common needs. Schools received support for shelter roofs from ESSPIN. After that teachers in Phase 1 schools were given stipends so that they would come every day, and teachers were trained. ANE linked up with SUBEB to provide new teaching and learning materials, most of which were funded by ESSPIN. ANE also provided new uniforms, shoes and bags for boys, while ESSPIN provided uniforms, shoes and bags for girls, and the SSCs mobilised community resources.

9. Schools have gradually added new grades as children progress, and several have now added grade five, making a full primary curriculum.

10. 75% of the 40 Phase 1 schools have already been mainstreamed by ANE, with ANE posting teachers to them, taking responsibility for textbooks and monitoring, and planning to bring nomadic volunteer teachers onto the payroll. Several of the 50 Phase 2 schools, which received the same support except for teacher salaries, are also receiving teacher postings from ANE.

11. The first phase of the project cost ESSPIN £164,820 GBP. The average cost of each new enrolment for the first phase was £51 (Fawson, 2013). ESSPIN’s input leveraged an estimated N24,250,000 from government (over £93,000 GBP), N550,000/£2,000 from MACBAN, and N2,250,000/£8,500 from communities. The second phase cost ESSPIN N57,000,000/£219,000, and leveraged N1,500,000/£5,800 from government and N1,500,000/£5,800 from communities. Government contributions focused on teacher salaries, classroom construction and repair, water and sanitation, and textbooks, while communities often donated land, teacher support, building work and materials.

Review approach

12. The key research questions for the review were:

- Is ESSPIN’s model of support to nomadic schools working as well as indicated in the Challenge Fund Impact Assessment?
- If so, what are the factors in the success of the model?
- What are the prospects for the future of ESSPIN’s support to nomadic schools in Jigawa?
13. The review took place over two weeks in June 2014, during which time seven nomadic schools were visited and project documents were reviewed by an international consultant from Save the Children, a key partner in ESSPIN. Teacher training materials were also reviewed. Schools were selected to provide a representative range of locations, community characteristics and learning environments.

14. Structured observation and focus group discussions with several groups of stakeholders were undertaken in each school. Children were interviewed, in groups of at least two girls and at least two boys. Teachers were interviewed, and a group of School Support Committee members (including the head teacher) and parents were interviewed. Discussions were translated into English from Hausa or Fulfulde (the language of the Fulani ethnic group, which is the majority ethnic group in Jigawa and which is spoken by nomadic and cattle herding communities). School materials, lesson plans, attendance records and other documentation were reviewed.

15. Focus group discussions were also held with key staff from the Agency for Nomadic Education, with state level members of Jigawa’s Nomadic Cattle Breeders Association (MACBAN), and with ESSPIN staff involved in developing and managing the project.

16. During observation and group discussions, schools were assessed against the following questions and criteria:

- Was the school offering a comparable level of education with a government primary school, in terms of teaching approach, curriculum offered, and learning environment? The consultant and project team’s knowledge of standard primary school environments in Jigawa were used to make judgements against this question.

- Was the school offering a good level of basic education, according to Save the Children’s criteria for quality basic education? These criteria are:
  - Relevant (to children’s lives, educational needs and interests),
  - Appropriate (for the age and development of children),
  - Participatory (for children and the school community, including women and girls, disabled people and minorities)
  - Flexible (fitting in with children’s life and work patterns, capable of changing to meet children’s needs)
  - Inclusive (all children are welcomed and supported to learn and participate)
  - Protective (children are kept safe and their rights and welfare are not compromised).

- Was the school being managed and offering services in a way which was appropriate to the needs of the surrounding community, and valued by them?
• Is there demand among stakeholders for sustaining and replicating ESSPIN’s model of upgrading schools?

• To what extent were schools capable of sustaining quality services from this point?

• To what extent are government and school communities currently capable of expanding and sustaining ESSPIN’s model of nomadic school improvement after ESSPIN closes?

• Was there any unexpected impact or unmet demands from school communities involved in the programme of support?

Information observed to make an assessment of school performance against success criteria:

**Observable in school environment**
- i. Toilet accessible to children (inc disabled)
- ii. clean water supply accessible to children
- iii. teachers do not carry sticks in school
- iv. children’s work displayed in school/in class
- v. structures safe and clean, with sufficient light
- vi. language of textbooks – any in 1st language?
- vii. content of textbooks in terms of nomadic culture and life
- viii. availability of reading materials in 1st and 2nd language
- ix. content of reading materials in terms of nomadic culture and life

**Observable from lesson observation**
- i. extent to which active and differentiated learning methods in use
- ii. extent to which teachers use children’s 1st language
- iii. extent to which teachers use clear, simple language if 2nd language
- iv. extent to which teachers engage all the class, esp girls and any disabled children
- v. level of attendance (check against expected numbers.)

**Reported teacher behaviour**
- i. teachers not beating children / not being cruel to children
- ii. teachers attend on time and do not miss days
- iii. teachers willing to work with girls
- iv. teachers willing to work with disabled children

**Reported school management**
- i. timing of school hours in relation to expressed community needs
- ii. eating or drinking while at school
- iii. engagement with parents and SSC from HT and teachers
Reported SSC behaviour

i. monitoring teachers
ii. supporting attendance of most excluded
iii. raising external support needs
iv. mobilising community resources for school improvement
v. seeking children’s views
vi. seeking women’s views

Other support given to school

i. monitoring visits – by whom
ii. where textbooks and literacy materials sourced from and how developed
iii. where infrastructure inputs to schools sourced from and how developed
iv. How school/community information is used to leverage external resources.

Limitations

17. In most cases schools only operated in the morning, meaning that only one school could be visited per day. Travel times to remote schools meant that only 1.5 – 2 hours could be spent at each school.

18. It was not possible to capture children’s learning levels, although efforts were made to review Grade 3 children’s exercise books where time allowed, and to discuss learning issues with children.

19. The changing security situation resulted in a reduction in the number of schools which could be visited during the available time. This reduced the sample from 10% of each type of school (Phase 1 and Phase 2) to 7.5-8% of each type of school. Nevertheless, the sample of schools from each phase was sufficiently varied in terms of location, level of teaching and aspects of community engagement that it was possible to see a useful range of learning environments, and to draw out common features.

Findings

Overview

20. Is ESSPIN’s model of support to nomadic schools working as well as indicated in the Challenge Fund Impact Assessment?

21. Yes. ESSPIN’s model of upgrading schools is well designed and is working well in most cases. All 7 schools visited were found to be operating at a good basic standard comparable to a government primary school outside ESSPIN’s programme. This was reported by all stakeholders to be significantly better than the situation of schools
before intervention. Schools had different strengths and weaknesses, but all were successful and viable compared to before ESSPIN’s intervention. Three schools met a good standard of teaching and learning more comparable with a school which had received quality improvement. (See Appendix 1 for more details.)

22. Levels of teaching and learning, while varied, were broadly similar between Phase 1 and 2 schools, as was evidence of leveraged investment in infrastructure: all Phase 1 and 2 schools visited had been provided with one or more inputs of water, toilets or classroom blocks from government agencies, after the school’s expansion due to ESSPIN’s inputs had been noted.

23. Schooling was stable: communities were already fully or partly settled, and had agreed to keep their children mostly in the community rather than travelling with herds, in exchange for ESSPIN’s upgrade support. There was great enthusiasm from all stakeholders for more improvements to expand the upgrade approach. The intervention had also sparked widespread emerging demand for preschool classes and adult literacy. Community commitment in the form of substantial land donations had been recorded in several schools across the programme.

24. What are the factors in the success of the model?

25. Closeness to children’s homes; strong community commitment to formal education. Upgrading and revitalising schools’ infrastructure and quality of teaching has increased enrolment and leveraged investment from other agencies. In addition having local teachers able to use children’s language, the prospect of sustainable funding for teacher salaries from government, and the prospect of expansion of school capacity leveraging available government resources have been important factors in the success of the approach.

26. What are the prospects for the future of ESSPIN’s support to nomadic schools in Jigawa?

27. Replicating this model under government management could offer a rapid and cost-effective way to absorb many more children into education. As well as strengthening the model itself, which can be done with relatively little investment, ESSPIN should decide whether it can offer the capacity building support necessary to government to enable it to plan for, resource and monitor the expansion of quality education to all nomadic schools. The main request from school communities for investment was funding and support for more teachers - both to get existing volunteer teachers on the payroll, and to bring in new teachers to meet the rapidly expanding enrolment and ensure quality learning. Communities and teachers were also keen to expand infrastructure to meet the demands of new enrolment.
Access to school for marginalised nomadic children

28. Both project databases and individual school attendance records showed that enrolment had increased since ESSPIN’s intervention in all schools, ranging from increases of 50 to increases of 300. Enrolment in project schools had more than doubled to 6185 children by 2013, 48% girls. Regular attendance as at May 2013 was 3700, with 49% girls. As at May, 2014, a total of 6036 children (3178 boys and 2858 girls) pupils have been reached and supported under phase 2 of the rollout.

29. There was high demand for a school in 6 out of 7 communities visited, with attendance ranging from 60% to 90% of the roll. Enrolment was highest, and had increased most strongly, in settings where there had been strong community demand and organisation of schooling in the years before the intervention. In one school enrolment was stuck at 70, despite ANE investing 1 million Naira in a large school building. While the chair of the SSC was enthusiastic, it seemed that the surrounding community did not value education.

30. School support committees and community members were mostly happy with the standard of education provided, although they were keen for more trained teachers in schools which did not have fully qualified teachers. Community members interviewed were consistently keen for their children to go to secondary school and get professional jobs, such as teachers and health workers, as well as achieving political representation for cattle herding communities.

31. Community members consistently reported the importance of having a school close to home, as walking too far was not possible for younger children; also for having water in the school given the severe heat. In one school, teaching had been changed to the afternoon to fit in with volunteer teachers’ need to pursue other work, and to fit in with community fishing work.
Gender

32. Enrolment of girls and boys was roughly equal in all schools visited, with good attendance from both girls and boys, except for gaps of a few days at a time caused by livestock rearing. Girls in most schools were seated at the side of the class or in mixed groups for younger children, but in a significant minority of schools – including those with more effective teachers – they were seated at the back and clearly disengaged. One or two teachers were seen only talking to a few boys at the front of the class, but most teachers made consistent attempts to engage the whole of the class, and to engage with individual students from the whole class, including girls. Brief review of Grade 3 textbooks in some schools suggested that girls’ performance was in general lower than boys’.

33. Early marriage came up as a reason for girls dropping out in two Phase 2 communities, but most said they were happy for their daughters to progress all the way to secondary school. JSSs tended to be within 3-5km of the community, suggesting that travel to secondary school would not be an insurmountable obstacle for older children.

34. Women SSC members said that girls generally had more domestic responsibilities than boys, cutting into their time for school and study.

35. Women’s participation in school management and development was mostly low, despite SSC rules requiring two women members; except for two schools where women were more engaged and had more views on improving education. Efforts to include women in SSCs had led to some small improvements: full SBMC training and support to women’s committees would help to boost women’s participation significantly. The model of one or two women members taking part freely in committee meetings may be problematic, as one community said this was not appropriate for their culture. It was clear that women and men were uncomfortable...
with one or two women sitting with the men. Having a separate women’s committee
to discuss ideas, and then to meet as a committee with the men, could well
overcome this difficulty, with the right training.

Disability
36. Two schools were found to be supportive of children with disabilities, with one
school in particular taking a fully inclusive approach, both assisting children to learn
and working to stop teasing and bullying. Conversely, one of the schools with a high
standard of general teaching was not admitting disabled children, on the basis that
the children they had identified (having hearing impairments) could not learn. This
was despite Hausa sign language being freely used in the community.

Teaching approach and quality
37. Communities appeared to value having local teachers – schools with local teachers
were noticeably oversubscribed. There was a mix of local teachers, who had
started off as volunteers, and some of whom were now being paid by ANE.
Some volunteer teachers were not paid anything, while some were paid by
communities. Many volunteer teachers either had teaching qualifications or were
studying for them.

38. Teaching in all schools visited was active and efforts were made to engage a range of
children, although girls were sometimes left out (see above). Teachers moved
around the classroom confidently and had a pleasant demeanour. Corporal
punishment was clearly still in evidence, although at one Phase 1 school, children
said they would tell their head teacher if a teacher beat them. In all the other
schools, children said they would put up with being beaten; suggesting that corporal
punishment is an accepted part of school life.

39. All schools were following curriculum topics, although the level of complexity of
teaching points varied significantly. There was not the expected difference in quality
between Phase 1 and 2 schools, even though Phase 2 schools had had only half the
ESSPIN teacher training of Phase 1 schools. On the other hand, Phase 1 schools had had their training some time ago.

40. In schools with large class numbers and teachers with less experience, there was reliance on repeating phrases from the board and then asking individual students to read the same phrases. This was partly due to the lack of teachers in some schools, with head teachers having to move constantly around classes to help students or community members, who were delivering the actual teaching. Allocation of teaching posts to schools by ANE was apparently not linked to enrolment numbers.

41. The three schools with more confident teachers displayed much more use of open questions, more advanced teaching points, a wider range of topics and subjects being taught, and occasional use of group work. Flipcharts using ideas from the IQTE training were in evidence, and some homemade teaching and learning materials were in use.

42. Several schools showed strong documentation and accountability, displaying timetables, enrolment information and teaching materials on the walls. This was the case even where teaching was less advanced.

43. Teaching was noticeably better where teachers were already qualified and had good English, whether or not they had completed the ESSPIN teacher training. This may be because the IQTE training was delivered in English. Also, teachers in the Phase 1 schools may well have forgotten much of their training, as training was only delivered once, to one teacher in each school, with no opportunity to practice and then review. Trained teachers said they had passed learning along to other teachers, but only through discussion and not through conducting training themselves.

44. However, teachers consistently said that the ESSPIN training was very useful to them, even though most of them had some form of teaching qualification. Teachers said ESSPIN’s training provided useful knowledge on engaging children; making lessons active; and including all children in learning. Lesson plans from teachers who had undergone ESSPIN training had clearer learning objectives and focused on students’ skills more than other lesson plans.

45. When asked about inconsistencies in teaching approaches, project staff tended to feel that better qualified teachers were better teachers. But the ESSPIN IQTE teaching modules are intended to substantially improve the teaching practice of unqualified teachers. It should not be necessary for teachers to have qualifications in order to implement the IQTE training.
46. Children described preferring Fulani language to be used, especially instead of English. Teachers said that children could work well in Hausa, but several children interviewed clearly had trouble understanding Hausa and were much more comfortable when Fulfulde was used. Most teachers could speak Fulfulde, and some described using it for teaching, but a substantial minority of teachers – generally those posted by ANE to the schools - had very little Fulfulde.

47. It is recommended that ANE only post teachers who speak Fulfulde well, especially to the more remote areas; and that teachers are encouraged to teach in Fulfulde to the greatest extent possible, given the more isolated language setting of nomadic communities. The IQTE training curriculum used by ESSPIN to train nomadic school teachers deals with second and third language teaching, but while teachers were consistent that children learn better in their mother tongue, not all were clear on how to boost children’s first, second and third languages. Extended training on this would be helpful.

48. The ESSPIN model of training nomadic teachers needs some adjusting in its delivery, to ensure a more consistent standard of teaching and learning. It is recommended that the IQTE modules are delivered again to at least two Phase 1 teachers per school, this time in Hausa. The structure of delivery of the rest of the modules for Phase 2 teachers should be changed so that teachers can practice, return and review each module before passing on to the next one; and ideally for more teachers per school to be included. It would also be a good idea to give unqualified nomadic teachers opportunities to see good practice in teaching and what it looks like – visits could be organised to ESSPIN supported government schools.

Preschool

49. The ESSPIN model needs a small amount of design change to respond to unexpected new demand created by intervening in nomadic schools. In Phase 1 schools and most of the Phase 2 schools, there were large classes of young children, ranging from 2 to 5 years old. Some of these were supervised, mostly by older students with direction from the headteacher. Some had no supervision. Generally these children had the poorest quality shelter. They were receiving instruction in letter and number recognition, or in Koranic education. When teachers were asked about these classes, they responded that many parents had been bringing their younger children now
that the school had improved, partly for childcare and partly to help them get used to primary school.

**Access to text**

50. Children in nomadic schools had extremely poor access to text, which threatens their capacity to become fully literate. It was clear from several children’s exercise books – although by no means all – that children were copying text from the board without having coherent understanding of text as representing sound or meaning. This appeared to be more prevalent among girls than boys, suggesting that girls’ learning levels were in general lower than boys. It would be useful to investigate this further with a proper learning assessment.

51. ESSPIN had only been able to supply a few textbooks to each school, and those supplied to Phase 1 schools had already reduced in number due to getting worn/out lost; they had not been replaced or supplemented by ANE.

52. There was no awareness among parents or teachers about the need for children to have free reading materials. There was very little availability of text in nomadic/cattle-rearing communities, but children and parents described sometimes buying English or Hausa textbooks, notably the Teach Yourself line. When SBMC training is delivered to SSCs, as planned by ESSPIN, it is suggested that SBMCs are asked to recommend to parents to buy children free reading books. It would also help to provide nomadic teachers with an extra module on creating text in the local environment, and to share readers being developed by ESSPIN’s Output 3 with nomadic schools.

**Leveraging wider benefits**

53. The model has worked well through ESSPIN’s partnership to ANE to leverage other investment support to strengthen learning environments, e.g. RWASA, SUBEB and the MDG Fund.
Most, but not all, schools visited had received some form of government support. Therefore ESSPIN should not need to invest further in major infrastructure strengthening, if sufficient government capacity to sustain support to all schools can be put in place.

54. The model, in invigorating and upgrading nomadic schools, offers an opportunity for schools to offer wider services to the community, particularly to women. ANE – in the form of a zonal coordinator who ran adult literacy classes previously - has already been making links with the Agency for Mass Education to bring in a women’s literacy teacher to use the school out of hours. Another school SC said it wanted adult literacy classes. When mentioned to other schools, this idea was popular. Many young people in these communities and women were previously denied the chance of education, so upgraded nomadic schools could offer useful sites for helping these people catch up with basic education. MACBAN members suggested that schools should provide agricultural extension advice in cattle rearing to improve community skills in this area.

School support and investment

55. ESSPIN had trained ANE’s zonal coordinators, who regularly visit 7 or 8 schools twice per term, and who are based in the LGEA. Coordinators reported having a better idea of how to identify good quality, child centred teaching and advise teachers on this, due to the training. Coordinators and head teachers mentioned that coordinators advise teachers not to beat children.

56. Government investment in nomadic schools has been leveraged well by ESSPIN’s intervention, with all schools visited receiving state inputs. However, the management of this support has been opportunistic rather than strategic. Infrastructure funding which had been leveraged was not coming on a consistent basis; there was no overall plan or clear targeting regime for getting new classrooms, water supplies or toilets into upgraded nomadic schools.

57. Although ANE had posted over 20 teachers to schools supported by ESSPIN as part of the upgrade programme, teachers had not been provided by ANE on a needs basis.
One school had been waiting for a funded teaching post from ANE for three years, and had nearly 400 children on its roll, with only one full time volunteer teacher and three part time volunteers. Another had two funded teaching posts from ANE (and one volunteer), and had only 70 children.

58. All school support committees said that 200-300 children in the local area were still out of school. This suggests that, where schools are already popular, there is good potential for them to absorb large numbers of new children. Given that ANE was already positioned to provide more teachers, supervise schools and coordinate provision of infrastructure, it seemed like schools could be expanded in capacity terms with relatively little effort. However, the major challenge was ANE’s extremely low annual capital budget of 70m Naira, with very limited access to other funds.

59. The 90 schools in the programme were included in the Annual School Census for this year, suggesting that, were more schools to be upgraded along the same lines, they could then be included in the ASC, which should mean inclusion in investment plans for sustaining and improving school infrastructure and teaching. However, it was unclear whether this would lead to clear funding lines from SUBEB, or whether ANE would be expected to find funding for sustaining upgraded schools separately. Because a law was created in 2009 to set up ANE as a separate agency for nomadic schools, this was considered by ESSPIN staff to potentially cut ANE off from UBEC funding for basic education. The national Commission for Nomadic Education, which is linked to ANE, has some funding, but it is not currently clear whether it would be enough to run effectively a large school system, or whether this would be appropriate, as nomadic education departments were originally set up to provide travelling education for fully pastoralist communities.

60. ANE had appropriate departments and structure to monitor and supervise the 270 schools on its books. However, it emerged that most of these schools were either fully community run, or were supported by MACBAN, because there was little budget to properly fund infrastructure or teachers. ANE’S capacity to monitor and manage schools had clearly been helped by ESSPIN training on teaching quality and by ESSPIN support to develop monitoring spreadsheets for school enrolment and infrastructure.

61. ESSPIN staff felt it would be possible to provide more capacity support to ANE to help its team develop clear projections of the resources needed to fully upgrade and run nomadic schools to provide expanded enrolment and quality education. Consideration was given to two steps in this process: one, to develop a plan and seek funding for upgrading the remaining 180 nomadic schools under ANE, and, two, to develop plans and seek funding for managing upgraded schools on a long term basis.

62. MACBAN were very keen for government to take more responsibility in managing and improving nomadic schools, stating that government had not fulfilled its responsibilities so far. Although MACBAN had mobilised communities to start schools, it had only been able to provide some monitoring rather than any substantial inputs, and felt that more expert support was needed. MACBAN staff expressed strong gratitude for ESSPIN’s intervention, and concern that without
support, government would not be able to step up to managing nomadic schools adequately.

**Sustaining schools in nomadic cattle-rearing communities: recommendations for ESSPIN**

**Strengthening teaching practice**

- **Adequate teacher supply**
  - Urgently work with ANE to rationalise existing teacher allocation to schools on the basis of enrolment size.

- **Ensuring training is implemented**
  - It is recommended that the IQTE modules are delivered again to at least two Phase 1 teachers per school, this time in Hausa. Emphasise strategies on child protection and language.
  - The structure of delivery of the rest of the modules for Phase 2 teachers should be changed so that teachers can practice, return and review each module before passing on to the next one; and ideally for more teachers per school to be included.
  - It would also be a good idea to give unqualified nomadic teachers opportunities to see good practice in teaching and what it looks like – visits could be organised to ESSPIN supported government schools.

- **Creating a sustainable teacher development system**
  - Work with ANE to adopt ESSPIN’s IQTE teacher training model and materials into agency policies and plans as part of a phased process of upgrading nomadic schools.

- **Ensuring learning outcomes are being delivered**
  - Conduct a learning assessment as soon as possible of a sample of Grade 3 and 4 children in ESSPIN-supported nomadic schools, with controls of both unsupported nomadic schools and government mainstream schools in the same LGEAs. Use to take action to strengthen teacher training and materials provision where necessary.
  - Conduct follow up assessment in two years for the Grade 3 children, who will then be in Grade 5. Use this to inform advice and support to ANE on how to develop a sustainable training programme for volunteer teachers.

**Girls and women’s participation in education**

- **Girls’ participation in learning**
In refresher teacher training and planned headteacher leadership training, reiterate the requirement for girls not to be seated at the back, and for teachers to give girls special support for learning, to build confidence and counteract extra demands on girls’ time.

- Girls’ retention in school
  - As part of SBMC training, ensure that early marriage and access to secondary school are given focus.

- Women’s participation in School Support Committees
  - Implement planned full SBMC training for SSCs, followed by quickly setting up Women’s Committees (as covered in ESSPIN’s SBMC training and mentoring model).
  - It is recommended that Women’s Committees meet as a whole with the rest of the SSC, to overcome participation imbalances and possible cultural problems involved with just one or two women at SSC meetings.

**Including children with disabilities**

- Access
  - As part of planned leadership and school management training for head teachers, reiterate that schools must accept and encourage enrolment from children with disabilities. Using training materials and messages from ESSPIN’s SBMC work on inclusive education may help with this.
  - ANE should be asked to give strong recognition and encouragement to schools which already include disabled children.

- Teaching support
  - Refresher and/or extended training for nomadic school teachers should include practical strategies on how teachers can support the learning and participation needs of children with disabilities. As a start, strategies which schools already use should be shared in training. As ESSPIN develops more training on disability-specific teaching and school management, this should be offered to nomadic schools also.

**Meeting the needs of nomadic communities**

- Management of schools
  - Work with ANE to build flexible school management policies into continued government oversight of nomadic schools. This should include options for communities to set alternative hours and/or terms for teaching, where school time throws up major conflicts with communities’ working patterns.
• Language of instruction
  o Engage with ANE to ensure that teachers posted to nomadic schools are prioritised on the basis of coming from the school location or nearby; and on the basis of speaking Fulfulde.
  o Emphasise in ESSPIN teacher training and in further teacher training approaches that using Fulfulde as language of instruction is key to children’s learning in isolated communities.

• Access to text
  o Include early reading materials in preschool boxes (see below)
  o Engage with ANE and the Agency for Mass Literacy on possibilities for promoting a sustainable supply of text to nomadic communities.
  o Develop a teacher training module on creating text within schools and communities (HP to follow up)
  o Share readers being developed by ESSPIN’s Output 3 with nomadic schools.

Responding to community demand

• Rising preschool enrolment
  o Use funds from ESSPIN’s Challenge Fund learning materials budget line to provide early learning materials boxes for schools with preschool classes (see Appendix 2)
  o Conduct a process of selecting community volunteers to supervise preschool/early learning groups (see Appendix 2)
  o Liaise with SUBEB and ANE to provide basic training and advice for community preschool volunteers (see Appendix 2)

• Rapidly growing primary enrolment
  o Help ANE develop a plan of projected teacher number needs for the next two years for all nomadic schools, on the basis of recent enrolment patterns in upgraded schools.
  o Support ANE to seek either direct or indirect (via SUBEB) resources for funding teacher increases on the basis of increased enrolment as schools are upgraded.
  o Support ANE to develop a plan of projected classroom and water and sanitation needs for the 270 nomadic schools under ANE’s purview, on the basis of a strategic plan to progressively upgrade nomadic schools.

Building government capacity to sustainably upgrade and manage nomadic schools

• Provide more capacity support to ANE to help its team develop clear, evidence based projections of the resources needed to fully upgrade and run nomadic schools to provide expanded enrolment and quality education.
• Develop two steps in this process: one, to develop a plan and seek funding for upgrading the remaining 180 nomadic schools under ANE, and, two, to develop plans and seek funding for managing upgraded schools on a long term basis.
• Support state agencies to work with the state commission for nomadic education and UBEC to attempt to access the UBEC intervention fund, and other donor funds, for the costs of upgrading nomadic schools which cannot be covered by the state.
• Adapt ESSPIN IQTE teacher training modules for ANE to roll out to all volunteer teachers;
- Develop a clear sliding scale and plan for absorbing volunteer teachers based on different levels of payment for different levels of teaching experience.
- Conduct high level political engagement to get ANE a significantly expanded recurrent budget based on funding large numbers of new teaching posts, and on managing the upgrade and monitoring of all nomadic (community set up) schools in the state, rolling out the ESSPIN model to do so. The upcoming out of school survey results should offer a good opportunity to start this, as upgrading and expanding nomadic school enrolment should offer a relatively easy and cost effective way to dramatically expand access to primary education in Jigawa state.
- Extend SBMC development training to SSCs, including women’s and children’s committees
- Continue with delivering SBMC and head teacher leadership training as planned.
References

## Annex 1: Table of school observations and ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School &amp; LGEA</th>
<th>Roll</th>
<th>Approx. present</th>
<th>No. classrooms*</th>
<th>Toilets &amp; water</th>
<th>Furniture</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Teaching behaviours (underline = negative)</th>
<th>Needs identified*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kullumi Community Nomadic School, Birnin Kudu LGEA</td>
<td>435, 240 regular</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2 in SUBEB block, 1 in ESSPIN block, 1 in ESSPIN shelter, 1 in thatched shelter</td>
<td>Pit latrine built by community (not seen)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Floor mats, exercise books, uniforms, sandals, bags, football, few textbooks, exercise books, attendance registers. HT had written enrolment and attendance summary.</td>
<td>1 ESSPIN-trained HT present, plus 1 Koranic teacher. 3 absent (studying diplomas). 1 SCC member, 1 student running classes. None paid by government</td>
<td>Different levels of learning for different grades. Reciting English letters and phrases from board; children encouraged to come to front and read them. Correcting mistakes, applause. Chanting and songs. Hausa used to interact and translate. Encouraging attention and ‘coming up’ from all sections of class. Girls seated on one side, boys on the other in higher classes, mixed in lower. Young students teaching pre-schoolers. Teachers carried canes.</td>
<td>Teacher training*, more ‘competent teachers’, more classrooms*, toilet*, more materials*, become JSS school in future.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gidan Maje Community Nomadic School, Ringim LGEA</td>
<td>2 in MDG block, 2 in ESSPIN block, 1 under trees</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Benches, desks and bookcases in MDG block</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Floor mats, exercise books, uniforms, sandals, bags, few textbooks, exercise books, attendance registers. Stored in bookcase in MDG classroom.</td>
<td>1 ESSPIN-trained HT, 1 Koranic teacher, 2 other teachers present. HT has diploma, others doing diplomas, 1 completing NCE. Koranic teacher paid</td>
<td>Different levels of learning for different grades; more advanced content taught (e.g. addition involving carrying sums for G4). Asking open questions, prompting for answers, correcting mistakes, applause. Chanting and songs in lower grades. Girls often at back of class, disengaged. Teachers sometimes carried canes. English used first in upper grades (e.g. to teach maths), then Hausa.</td>
<td>Teacher training*, more teachers, more classrooms, toilet, more materials, more furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualitative Review of ESSPIN’s support to Nomadic Schools in Jigawa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School &amp; LGEA</th>
<th>Roll</th>
<th>Approx. present</th>
<th>No. classrooms*</th>
<th>Toilets &amp; water</th>
<th>Furniture</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Teaching behaviours (underline = negative)</th>
<th>Needs identified*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Daba</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dabaza Community Nomadic School, Kazaure LGA&lt;br&gt;Rank C for teaching and learning; B for learning environment, due to strong community support&lt;br&gt;Phase 2</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>2 in ESSPIN block, 2 in ESSPIN shelter (?)</td>
<td>Latrines built by community. Women from community had brought water for children every day for 2 years. Pump by (ESSPIN)</td>
<td>Benches built by community</td>
<td>Floor mats, exercise books, uniforms, football, sandals, bags, few textbooks, exercise books, attendance registers. Stored in hut built by community.</td>
<td>1 HT, 1 ESSPIN-trained teacher, 1 Koranic teacher, 1 other teachers? Present. None paid by government.</td>
<td>Different levels of learning for different grades. Reciting English letters and phrases from board; children encouraged to come to front and read them. Correcting mistakes, applause. Chanting and songs. Hausa used to interact and translate. Encouraging attention and ‘coming up’ from all sections of class. 3 disabled children included and supported. Teachers carried canes and bunches of leafy twigs; one was seen lightly hitting a child to get him to sit down.</td>
<td>More ‘competent teachers’, more classrooms, more materials, teacher training*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Gallan Kyau</strong>&lt;br&gt;Community Nomadic School, Gwiwa LGA&lt;br&gt;Rank C</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2 in wicker rooms; 2 in large ESSPIN classroom block</td>
<td>No toilets; water pump nearby</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Floor mats, exercise books, uniforms, football, sandals, bags, few textbooks, exercise books, attendance registers. Store</td>
<td>1 ESSPIN-trained HT, 2 Koranic teachers paid by government.</td>
<td>Different levels of learning for different grades. Reciting English and Arabic letters from board; children encouraged to come to front and read them. Correcting mistakes, applause. Chanting and songs. Hausa and Fulfulde used to interact and translate. Encouraging attention and ‘coming up’ from all sections of class.</td>
<td>More teachers, more classrooms, toilet, furniture, more materials, teacher training*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualitative Review of ESSPIN’s support to Nomadic Schools in Jigawa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School &amp; LGEA</th>
<th>Roll</th>
<th>Approx. present</th>
<th>No. classrooms*</th>
<th>Toilets &amp; water</th>
<th>Furniture</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Teaching behaviours (underline = negative)</th>
<th>Needs identified*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gidan Wanzamai Community Nomadic School, Dutse LGA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>220+</td>
<td>2 in large MDG classroom block, 1 in ESSPIN block, 1 in ESSPIN shelter</td>
<td>2 high quality toilet blocks built by RWASA</td>
<td>Benches, desks and bookcases in SUBEB classrooms. Central store/office space with bookcases.</td>
<td>Floor mats, exercise books, uniforms, football, sandals, bags, few textbooks, exercise books, attendance registers. Stored in office/store room. HT had put enrolment summary, teacher information and timetable on walls of outer office.</td>
<td>1 ESSPIN-trained HT (with NCE); 1 Koranic teacher; 2 volunteer teachers. HT and Arabic teacher paid by government (?) Reported getting older students to teach.</td>
<td>Different levels of learning for different grades. More advanced content taught. Asking open questions; some group work; Ts moving freely around class; confident explanation and clarification by Ts. Correcting mistakes, applause. Hausa used to interact and translate. Encouraging attention and engagement from all sections of class. Girls and boys mixed. Some children able to communicate simply in English. Ts did not appear to be carrying canes. Large preschool group unsupervised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank A.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Manda Community Nomadic Schools in Gagarawa LGEA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1 large classroom block provided by ANE from MDG fund (1m Naira); unfinished and damaged by the woman SSC member provides water every day from her home.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>Floor mats, exercise books, uniforms, sandals, bags, few textbooks, football, exercise books, homemade</td>
<td>3; 2 paid by ANE, with NCE; one volunteer, unpaid.</td>
<td>Different levels of learning for different grades. Reciting English and Arabic phrases from board; children encouraged to come to front and read them. Correcting mistakes, applause. Chanting and songs. Hausa and Fulfulde used to interact and translate. Simple addition being taught. Encouraging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Approximation of present number of classrooms and teachers.
* Needs identified related to the teaching environment and resources.
* Funding and support details provided for each phase and school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School &amp; LGEA</th>
<th>Roll</th>
<th>Approx. present</th>
<th>No. classrooms*</th>
<th>Toilets &amp; water</th>
<th>Furniture</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Teaching behaviours (underline = negative)</th>
<th>Needs identified*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>learning materials, attendance registers. Stored in office. HT had teacher information, lesson plans and timetable in office.</td>
<td>2 Ts carried canes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Maikubori Community Nomadic School in Sule Tankarkar LGEA Rank A. Phase 2.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1 ESSPIN, 1 community shelter = 2 rooms (built with support from ESSPIN, 2 classes under trees. Shelter too hot for use except in early morning.</td>
<td>No toilets but two boreholes – due to poor coodination from gov agencies</td>
<td>Benches being made by community from ESSPIN grant.</td>
<td>Floor mats, exercise books, uniforms, sandals, bags, few textbooks, football, exercise books, attendance registers. Stored in office/store room. HT had put teacher information, teaching flipcharts and timetable on walls of community shelter.</td>
<td>4; all paid by ANE (inc one Arabic teacher); 3 have NCE and one has a diploma.</td>
<td>Different levels of learning for different grades. More advanced content taught and wide range of engaging topics. Asking open questions; Ts moving freely around class; confident explanation and clarification by Ts; songs for younger children; correcting mistakes, applause. Hausa used to interact and translate, with some Fulfulde but teachers mostly not from this area. Encouraging attention and engagement from all sections of class. Girls and boys mixed or sitting on separate sides. Several children able to communicate simply in English. Ts were not carrying canes; HT had a very small twig. Supporting several disabled children and reported teaching children not to tease or bully.</td>
<td>More teachers; toilet; more furniture; more textbooks and learning materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Suggestions for ESSPIN support to preschool classes in nomadic schools

Aim

Promote children’s linguistic, social and physical development, help develop children’s pre-literacy and pre-numeracy skills

1. **Provide an early learning materials box for 90 schools.**

Based on observed class sizes of 40-50 children aged 2-5, the following box contents are recommended, depending on budget and availability:

- 8 big story books with large pictures and some large text - Hausa.
- 4 x 8 small picture books for toddlers - Hausa
- 2 x 10 small counting books or larger counting boards with pictures for young children (e.g. a pineapple plus a pineapple = two pineapples (with the numbers below)
- 10 dolls (fabric, no attached buttons, eyes or other parts which could come loose)
- 10 sets building blocks
- 20 pads of drawing paper and 10 sets coloured pencils (suggest ANE is encouraged to commit to renewing this)
- Pencil sharpener
- Hard surfaces for drawing and writing on (or 30 slates and chalk if paper pads not possible)
- Sheets of traditional song words for the teacher – produced by ESSPIN
- Exercise books and pens for teacher to record community stories in, for telling to the children.

2. **Work with SSCs in 90 schools to identify and select volunteer preschool teachers from communities.**

Plan for high turnover (meaning regular re-trainings) as work is expected to be unpaid.

**Roles of volunteer preschool teacher:**

- Supervise preschool classes with direction from head teacher.
- Encourage individual, pair and small group play with the toy box items – equally, boys and girls
- Encourage non-violent discipline and sharing among children
- Look out for any children who seem sick or unable to participate, and notify head teacher
- Tell stories to the group using the big book – encouraging picture interpretation and letter recognition – and using oral stories – encouraging language development and memory
- Conducting counting games and songs
- Encourage children to tell stories/give descriptions to each other using toys and books
- Encouraging children to draw freely and possibly to shape letters and numbers – either on paper or in the dirt
- Ask children simple questions about what they have drawn – ‘who’s that? what’s this? what’s he doing?’
- Conduct active games and songs involving movement outside the shelter (under a tree, for example)
• Giving children time to interact freely with toys, books and drawing materials, while changing activities regularly. Giving a few structured activities such as learning a song or practising letters and numbers.

**What qualities should a community preschool teacher have?**

- Likes children, wants role, has time available, able to work unpaid
- Speaks children’s mother tongue
- Children feel comfortable around them
- Can be calm, can be lively
- Completed primary education ideally, but at least to P3 level
- Can read short stories in Hausa and can tell them to children in Fulfulde first and then Hausa
- Have some time to spare – can be a larger number of people offering a few hours a week each
- Understands the need to be safe and non-violent around children; willing to learn child-friendly ways of managing a class
- Able to move about and have fun with the children
- Able to spot when children are upset, starting a fight, excluded – and intervene to improve the situation
- Able to help children with toileting and make sure they are comfortable
- Able to notice when children may be at risk of hurting themselves and to intervene (experience of childcare with own children or siblings therefore useful)

3. **Work with SUBEB to develop a basic training package for volunteer preschool teachers, to be given to at least 1 preschool teacher per school.**

**What could teachers be trained in?**

- Expectations for young children’s learning (learning through play and interaction; variety; only short and small focus on academic content)
- Why children need stimulation, play and exposure to language
- Diversity among young children
- Why children need to become familiar with handling books, and the idea of text as having meaning
- Value of repetition in children’s early learning
- Telling stories to help pre-literacy – using dolls and body language to liven it up
- Telling stories in two languages (Fulfulde and Hausa)
- Asking questions to help speech development (e.g. asking for description)
- Nonviolent ECCD class management
- Counting and number activities
- Songs and games to teach, how to adapt traditional songs and games

**What should the teacher be aiming to see more of?**

- Children learning to move their bodies in a coordinated way – e.g. in songs and games
- Children using their hands to touch, draw, manipulate and build
- Children talking with each other in ‘baby speech’ and later in their mother tongue
- Children smiling, laughing
- Children cooperating in sharing toys and in using toys, books etc.
- Children memorising some of the tunes and words of songs and stories
- Children freely doing ‘pre-writing’ – scribbling etc.
- Children drawing
• Children able to answer questions about what they have drawn
• Children becoming familiar with handling books, knowing which way up to hold them, which way to follow the text, how to turn pages etc.
• Children who do not speak start to speak, children who do speak start to use more words

4. Work with zonal inspectors and SUBEB to monitor, document and revise the process; work to hand final package of preschool development and teacher training over to ANE.

Discussion about potential funding for longer-term preschool teacher posts should be included.
Annex 3: Sample questions asked in focus group discussions

A. Interview with Director and Monitoring & Evaluation Department of the Jigawa State Agency for Nomadic Education

1. What is ANE’s mandate and remit?
2. How did you manage nomadic schools before you started work with ESSPIN?
3. What has been done differently since the partnership with ESSPIN?
4. Has your organisation’s capacity changed in any way as a result of working with ESSPIN?
5. How is enrolment and attendance monitored?
6. What do you think the key reason for increased enrolment is/are?
7. Do you think these nomadic schools are more popular than mainstream schools? Why?
8. Any differences in your work? – manded director
9. What other changes and achievements have been noted?
10. How can you tell?
11. Why have these successes been achieved?
12. What curriculum is children’s learning based on?
13. What languages do teachers use for teaching?
14. What languages do children use for reading? How much access do children have to reading materials?
15. What characteristics and skills do teachers have once they have been trained?
16. What challenges have been solved?
17. What challenges remain?
18. What have been the costs, and what is your expected budget for next year?
19. Will there be certification of learning for children at the end?
20. Are there plans to test children’s literacy, numeracy etc. each year?
21. How do children progress after primary?
22. How do you see nomadic schools working after ESSPIN ends? Can you see this programme expanding to cover all nomadic children in Jigawa? How many children and schools would we be talking about?

23. How would that need to happen? What key features would need to be retained in any scale up/replication?

24. Do you think the state could find the money for this type of replication from its own/UBEC’s resources?

25. What do you think the future for the nomadic teaching force should be?

26. What is the capacity of ANE to fully manage an active programme of nomadic schools for the future?

27. What support would they need to meet this demand? from ESSPIN

28. How has your experience of working with MACBAN been?

29. What would you like to see happen for nomadic schools in Jigawa over 5-10 years?

30. Challenges – areas for improvement?

31. Communities happy with level of learning, progress?

32. Any other points?

B. Interview with children in nomadic schools

1. What do you like about this school?

2. What do you like about your teachers?

3. What is your favourite subject? Why?

4. What subject do you find most difficult? Why?

5. Do you have books that you read at home?

6. What improvements would you like to see to this school?

7. Do you know any children who cannot come to school? How many? Why?

8. Are there any children with disabilities who cannot come to school?

9. What would you do if a teacher came who was cruel and beat children? Would you tell anyone?

10. What would you like to do after you complete primary school?
C. Interview with School Support Committees and parents in nomadic schools (including women members, head teacher and Committee chair)

1. What is the history of this school?
2. What is the enrolment?
3. What would parents in this community like their children to learn?
4. Would you like your children to go to secondary school? What about the girls?
5. How often does the SSC meet, and what do you discuss?
6. What action has the SSC taken?
7. What training did the SSC have?
8. Do any women come to the SSC? What contributions do they make?
9. How satisfied are you with the teachers? Is there anything you would like to improve about teaching?
10. What improvements would you like to see to this school?
11. Do some children have any problems coming to school? Why?
12. How many children are out of school completely in this area?
13. Are there any children with disabilities who cannot come to school?
14. Do children have books that they read at home?