

Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN)

Final Report on Self-Assessment of National Systems at Federal level

Report Number: ESSPIN 257

Lynton Gray

September, 2016



www.esspin.org

Report Distribution and Revision Sheet

Project Name: Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria

Code: 337662

Report No.: ESSPIN 257

Report Title: Report on Self-Assessment of National Systems at Federal Level – September, 2016

| Rev No | Date of issue | Originator | Checker | Approver | Scope of checking |
|--------|----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------------|
| 01 | September 2016 | Lynton Gray | Pius Elumeze | Kayode Sanni | Accuracy, completeness, formatting |

Scope of Checking

This report has been discussed with the originator and checked in the light of the requirements of the terms of reference. In addition the report has been checked to ensure editorial consistencies, accuracy of data, completeness of scope and responsiveness to client's requirements.

Distribution List

| Name | Position |
|---------------------|---|
| DFID | |
| Ben Mellor | Head of Office, DFID Nigeria |
| Nick Hamer | Deputy Head of Office, DFID Nigeria |
| Kemi Williams | Human Development Team Leader and ESSPIN Senior Responsible Owner, DFID |
| Karen McGeough | Human Development Deputy Team Leader, DFID |
| Esohe Eigbibe | Education Adviser, DFID |
| Laura Brannelly | Education Adviser, DFID |
| Olatunji Ogunbanwo | Deputy Programme Manager, DFID |
| Robert Watt | Head of DFID Northern Nigeria Office (Kano) |
| Margaret Fagboyo | Ag. Head of DFID Lagos Office |
| David Ukagwu | Designated Head of DFID Lagos Office |
| Olachi Chuks-Ronnie | Head of DFID Enugu Office |
| Kabura Zakama | DFID State Representative, Jigawa and Yobe |
| Ben Nicholson | DFID State Representative, Kaduna and Zamfara |
| Siaka Alhassan | DFID State Representative, Kano and Katsina |
| Muyiwa Babatola | Education Programme Officer, DFID |
| IMEP | |
| Gregor MacKinnon | Project Manager, IMEP |
| Emmanuel Adegbe | Deputy Project Manager, IMEP |
| ESSPIN | |
| Jake Ross | Project Director |
| Kayode Sanni | National Programme Manager |
| Laura McInerney | Deputy Programme Manager |

| Name | Position |
|----------------------------|---|
| Simeon Ogbonna | Assistant Programme Manager |
| Andy Campbell | Operations Manager |
| James Fadokun | State Team Leader, Kwara |
| Olalekan Saidi | State Team Leader, Kano |
| Tayo Odekunle | State Team Leader, Kaduna |
| Christabel Omolade | State Team Leader, Enugu |
| Hezekiah Odeyale | State Team Leader, Jigawa (Acting) |
| Oluwafunmilayo Olalusi | State Team Leader, Lagos |
| John Kay | Lead Specialist, Education Quality |
| Fatima Aboki | Lead Specialist, Community Engagement and Learner Participation |
| Sandra Graham | Task Team Leader, Voice and Accountability |
| Pius Elumeze | Lead Specialist, National Systems and Institutional Development |
| Bankole Ebisemiju | Communications and Knowledge Management Coordinator |
| Consortium partners | |
| Connie Price | Country Director, Nigeria, British Council |
| Louisa Waddingham | Director Programmes, Nigeria, British Council |
| Hans Meusen | Director, Education and Society, British Council |
| Stuart Cameron | Consultant, Education Portfolio, Oxford Policy Management |
| Ben Foot | Nigeria Country Director, Save the Children |
| Sue Phillips | Director, Social Development Direct |
| Federal partners | |
| Dr Sulleiman Dikko | Executive Secretary, Universal Basic Education Commission |
| Dr Folashade Yemi-Esan | Permanent Secretary, Federal Ministry of Education |
| Professor Oladele Akogun | Country Director, Edoren |
| State partners | Honourable Commissioners and SUBEB Chairs |
| Programme Partners | |
| Gboyega Ilusanya | National Programme Manager, DEEPEN |
| Nguyan Feese | National Programme Manager, TDP |

Disclaimer

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

Note on Documentary Series

A series of documents has been produced by Cambridge Education as leader of the ESSPIN consortium in support of their contract with the Department for International Development for the Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria. All ESSPIN reports are accessible from the ESSPIN website.

<http://www.esspin.org/resources/reports>

The documentary series is arranged as follows:

- ESSPIN 0-- Programme Reports and Documents
- ESSPIN 1-- Support for Federal Level Governance (Reports and Documents for Output 1)
- ESSPIN 2-- Support for State Level Governance (Reports and Documents for Output 2)
- ESSPIN 3-- Support for Schools and Education Quality Improvement (Reports and Documents for Output 3)
- ESSPIN 4-- Support for Communities (Reports and Documents for Output 4)
- ESSPIN 5-- Information Management Reports and Documents

Reports and Documents produced for individual ESSPIN focal states follow the same number sequence but are prefixed:

- JG Jigawa
- KD Kaduna
- KN Kano
- KW Kwara
- LG Lagos
- EN Enugu

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Context..... | 1 |
| The Organisational Framework..... | 1 |
| The Process for Conducting the Self-Assessment Workshops..... | 2 |
| Assessment, Analysis and Recommendations | 3 |
| Monitoring of Learning Achievement (MLA: 1.2.a) | 3 |
| Quality Assurance (QA: 1.2.b) | 5 |
| School-Based Management Committees (SBMCs: 1.2.c) | 7 |
| Conclusions | 9 |
| Annex 1: Sub-Output Indicators, Dimensions & Score sheet 2013 | 11 |
| Annex 2: Bands & Scores..... | 12 |
| Annex 3 – Performance criteria for each sub-output indicator and dimension | 13 |
| Annex 4: Suggested Evidence for each Group | 17 |
| Annex 5: Participants | 18 |

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | |
|-------------|--|
| ACEO | Assistant Chief Education Officer |
| AD | Assistant Director |
| Ag Director | Acting Director |
| CEO | Chief Education Officer |
| EPR & D | Education, Policy, Research and Development |
| EMIS | Education management information system |
| FEQAS | Federal Education Quality Assurance Service |
| FIS | Federal Inspectorate Service |
| FME | Federal Ministry of Education |
| GPE | Global Partnership for Education |
| HME | Honourable Minister of Education |
| IDPs | International Development Partners |
| JAMB | Joint Admissions & Matriculation Board |
| JCC | Joint Consultative Committee |
| M&E | Monitoring & evaluation |
| MDAs | Ministries, Departments and Agencies |
| MDG | Millennium Development Goals |
| MLA | Monitoring of Learning Achievement |
| MoE | Ministry of Education |
| MoU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MTSS | Medium term sector strategy |
| NCE | National Council on Education |
| NIEPA | National Institute for Educational Planning & Administration |
| NTI | National Teachers Institute |
| PSMO | Principal Social Mobilisation Officer |
| SBMC | School-based management committee |
| SEO | Senior Education Officer |
| SDG | Sustainable Development Goals |
| SMO | Social Mobilisation Officer |
| QA | Quality Assurance |
| UBEC | Universal Basic Education Commission |

Introduction

1. This report summarises the work done by selected Federal agencies on 2nd August 2016 in assessing progress against the indicators for three National Systems in ESSPIN's Logframe – Monitoring of Learning Achievement (MLA); Quality Assurance below Tertiary Education (QA); and School Based Management Committees (SBMC).
2. The Self-Assessment procedures have been designed to enable states and the Federal Government to conduct assessments of key aspects of performance in a participatory manner. ESSPIN has worked with selected federal agencies since 2008, under 'Output 1' of its workplan and logframe. For each Output Indicator including Output 1, there are Sub-Indicators, which are defined in terms of Dimensions (activities) and performance criteria against which current practice is assessed (see Annexes 1 & 3).
3. Assessment is undertaken by a group of participants from each Federal agency, facilitated by consultants and informed by evidence. The results of this self-assessment exercise should provide useful insights on the progress (or lack of) made since the last self-assessment exercise in July 2015. It should enable the agencies involved to identify priorities for future planning and implementation. For ESSPIN, it should serve as a useful marker to identify areas worth continuing to support in the next Extension Phase of the Programme and what areas might be better served by more intensive support from other programmes or IDPs.
4. The Federal agencies and the processes involved in conducting the self-assessment exercise are described below, followed by assessment and analysis and finally conclusions and recommendations which highlight progress (or not) over time. The Annexes provide details of the participants, the instruments used including the performance criteria, the evidence provided, the scoring system, and conversion of scores to Bands aligned to targets in the ESSPIN logframe. This is the final self-assessment exercise to be organised by ESSPIN: the Federal agencies will need to decide whether there is value in continuing the activities in 2017, in order to assess changes since August 2017.

Context

The Organisational Framework

5. The Federal agencies involved in each of the three areas of assessment are listed below

Table 1: List of National Systems under Sub-Output Indicator 1.2 and Agencies involved in them

| S/N | Sub-Indicator / National System | FME Dept./ Agencies represented |
|-----|--|---------------------------------|
| a | Policy on MLA established and preparations made towards implementation | FME EPR&D; FME TRCN |
| b | Revised policy and QA methods implemented | FEQAS; UBEC QA |
| c | National Support for SBMC implementation | UBEC SMO; FME |

6. ESSPIN has provided technical assistance to these agencies to varying degrees since inception in 2008. The method of working with Federal agencies has been less intensive and less holistic than at state level. As a state level programme, ESSPIN has concentrated resources at state and local level, given that states and local governments have direct responsibility for the delivery of basic

education.

7. Inputs at the Federal level have included short and specific assistance in areas such as high level strategic planning, functional reviews and development of technical documents. The focus on National Systems per se emerged out of the revision of the ESSPIN Logframe in 2011 where six sub-indicators were identified as equating to a National System and consideration was given to what could be achieved over the remaining lifespan of the ESSPIN programme, to 2014. Three of those sub-indicators are no longer supported by ESSPIN and have been omitted from this exercise and report.
8. In the ESSPIN logframe, Output 1 covers support to school improvement at the Federal level. The Output statement is:
“Federal Government systems that support states' implementation of school improvement strengthened and functioning”
9. Sub Indicator 1.1 is a quantitative indicator, concerning disbursement rates of funds to basic education and is reported elsewhere in direct percentage terms.
10. The areas covered by this self-assessment exercise fall under Sub-Output Indicator 1.2 which involves National systems established in the remaining three areas with which ESSPIN has been actively working. These are listed in Table 1.

The Process for Conducting the Self-Assessment Workshops

11. The process for undertaking the self-assessment involved the following steps:
 - i. The self-assessment instrument used in 2012, 2013 and 2014 was extensively revised for 2015. The instrument is based on the ESSPIN Logframe Indicator and Sub-Indicators, with the specified “Dimensions” (listed in Annex 1) to deliver each sub-indicator/National System. Targets were established for each of these Indicators to have achieved by 2014. When the ESSPIN Extension Phase from 2014- 2016 was approved, the logframe was revised and these sub-indicators and targets updated for 2015 and 2016. In October 2014, a workshop with representatives from each area was convened to review and upgrade the Dimensions and their performance criteria for the purpose of self-assessment in 2015 and 2016. This report is based upon the assessments of those revised Dimensions and their performance criteria.
 - ii. The instrument has a set of status statements or “performance criteria” that were developed for each Dimension. These are used to assess the extent to which the Federal government had made progress in each dimension area required to deliver on the entire sub-indicator/National System (see Annex 2).
 - iii. Federal agencies are asked to nominate participants with relevant expertise in each area to form the core team that undertakes the self-assessment exercise (see Annex 5).
 - iv. At the one day workshop held in Abuja on 2nd August 2016, the core team was divided into three sub-groups – one for each National System. Each sub-group discussed the work done to date and reviewed the evidence produced to demonstrate that work was either completed or in progress (Annex 3). Each Dimension was then scored with reference to the performance criteria, to determine whether the dimension was “Met”; “Partially met”; or “Not met”. Each group was supported by a facilitator. All the sub-groups then came

together to review and comment on the scores given and validate the findings of the sub-groups.

- v. The scoring system operates as follows – 2 points if the dimension is agreed as “met”; 1 point if it is “partially met”; and 0 points if “not met”. These scores are then converted in Bands according to the ESSPIN logframe (see Table 2 and Annex 2). In addition to the scoring, participants in their sub-groups were encouraged to comment in writing on each Dimension. These comments have influenced this draft report prepared by the lead facilitator of the workshop.
- vi. It is intended that this draft report will receive comments from participants so that a final report can be shared with senior leaders and decision makers in the Federal Agencies and Committees represented and can be used by them to identify priorities for initiatives by the Federal Government and IDPs following the completion of ESSPIN’s work in January 2017.

Assessment, Analysis and Recommendations

12. This section presents the scores that were received for each sub-indicator, provides some analysis on progress (or not) made in specific dimensions and highlights recommendations which emerged from the workshop.

Monitoring of Learning Achievement (MLA: 1.2.a)

13. Sub-output Indicator 1.2.a refers to the extent to which the Federal government is able to determine a policy on MLA that is accepted and then followed by the necessary steps towards implementation of a revised national MLA.
14. The scores for 2016, and comparisons with earlier scores (using rather different Dimensions and less challenging criteria before 2015) are as follows:

Table 2: MLA Ratings and Bands (Actual and Target), 2012 to 2016

| | Dimension | Old Dimensions & Criteria | | | New Criteria | |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| | | Score 2012 | Score 2013 | Score 2014 | Score 2015 | Score 2016 |
| 1.2.1.1/ 1.2.a.1 | Rationale, roles and responsibilities of Federal/state agencies involved in MLA clarified and documented | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1.2.a.2 | A management structure and operational arrangements agreed and established for national MLA | <i>Not included</i> | | | 1 | 1 |
| 1.2.1.2/ 1.2.a.3 | Funding for MLA identified | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1.2.1.3/ 1.2.a.5 | Revised MLA instruments developed, taking into account learning from previous exercises nationally and international best practice | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1.2.1.4/ 1.2.a.4 | Capacity development planned for and undertaken at relevant stages of the MLA process | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|------|-------------|
| Total/ Maximum possible score | 1/8 | 2/8 | 4/8 | 4/10 | 3/10 |
| Actual Band/ Target (Milestone) Band | D/D | D/C | C/B | C/B | D/B |

15. This sub-indicator was revised after the 2014 exercise for the ESSPIN Extension Phase, by the addition of an extra Dimension (1.2.a.5) and the upgrading of some performance criteria. As the Table above shows, the more challenging criteria mean that none of the Dimensions in either 2015 or 2016 were rated as 'met'. In 2016 three Dimensions were rated as 'partially met' with two as 'not met'.
16. Delays in the ratification of a national MLA policy document noted in 2014 and 2015 persist today. A draft National Policy and Policy Guideline dated May 2016 is now available, awaiting presentation to and ratification by the Joint Consultative Committee (JCC) and the National Council on Education (NCE). Until this is completed, the rationale, roles and responsibilities of Federal and State agencies involved in MLA (1.2.a.1) cannot be clarified, and this Dimension is rated as 'partially met'. In 2015 it was noted that the imperatives created by the adoption of new Global Sustainable Development Goals and a new Ministerial team would hopefully give more urgency to this long-standing Federal Government weakness. These hopes remain unfulfilled and the plans for the next national MLA survey in 2016 seem very unlikely to be achieved.
17. Dimension 1.2.a.2 (*"A management structure and operational arrangements agreed and established for national MLA"*) was introduced in 2015. The draft Policy document referred to above contains very broad proposals for an MLA management structure, and this (as last year) is rated as 'partially met', because the operational arrangements have not yet been agreed and established.
18. The 'partially met' rating for 1.2.a.3 demonstrates that the long-standing funding issues, falling between the FME and UBEC, still have not yet been resolved. The final line of the draft Policy states "establish annual budget line for FME and other collaborating agencies" and the responsibilities of the various agencies are specified. More concretely, one state (Kaduna) has sent a letter of support, following an April 2016 meeting. This is hardly a firm funding commitment but is enough to justify the 'partially met' rating.
19. The MLA dimension focusing on capacity building (1.2.a.4) is again rated in 2016 as 'not met'. No evidence could be produced to show that the necessary capacity-building has taken place or is in the process of taking place. The reason for this, as last year, is that the capacity building plan cannot be operational until ratification takes place, and in any event funding is not available. A process has been agreed for selecting individuals, but they have not been selected, hence no capacity-building.
20. The MLA Instruments (Dimension 1.2.a.5) are to be revised following ratification. But that was also reported in 2014, when FME agreed to engage UBEC to commence this revision of the policy document. The lack of progress here leads this Dimension to be rated as 'not met'. This must be a matter of some urgency, given impending ratification some time later in 2016. Consultants must be selected to develop the revised instruments; training must be provided to those who will administer the instruments; the sampling frame has to be decided; and data has to be collected. At least it is now agreed that JAMB will undertake the data analysis.

21. Overall, there has been disappointingly little progress across this Sub-Indicator over the past year and the total score of 3 points out of a possible 10 justifies only a D Band (see Annex 2 for the conversion tables). This is well short of the target B Band in the ESSPIN logframe and even worse than the 2015 result. The 2014 self-assessment report stated that “there is reluctance to move forward here without formal endorsement. In consequence, work has not progressed as anticipated”. Things have not changed over the past two years. Worse still, the results of the last MLA exercise in 2011 have not yet been processed and in the open forum there was discussion about whether or not it is still worthwhile completing the collation and analysis – the data was described as “littering the corridors of the Federal Ministry” without any decision as to what to do with it.
22. However, post-workshop feedback is more positive. The FME MLA team has been directed to draft the expenses for conducting MLA to be included and approved in the 2017 budget, and the Department has been mandated to conduct the planned MLA in 2017.

Quality Assurance (QA: 1.2.b)

23. Sub-output indicator 1.2.b on QA below Tertiary Level refers to the extent to which a revised QA policy is agreed and approved and new QA methods are implemented nationally. A new Dimension and a revised coding system was added in 2015 (1.2.b.5) and one Dimension (1.2.4.4) removed. The scores and comparisons with earlier scores (using rather different Dimensions and less challenging criteria) are shown in Table 3.
24. The overall score for this work area is 8 points out of a possible 10, compared with the 6 points in 2015. The methodology for QA nationally has now been developed and agreed (1.2.b.1), so this Dimension is rated as ‘met’. Collaboration between FEQAS in the Federal Ministry and UBEC along with effective support from ESSPIN have enabled the national QA Handbook and QA policy to be prepared, produced and disseminated (although only limited numbers of the Handbook are as yet available for funding reasons).

Table 3: QA Ratings and Bands (Actual and Target), 2012 to 2016

| | Dimension | Old Dimensions & Criteria | | | New Criteria | |
|---------------------|---|---------------------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------|
| | | Score 2012 | Score 2013 | Score 2014 | Score 2015 | Score 2016 |
| 1.2.4.1/ 1.2.b.1 | Methodology for QA developed and agreed | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 1.2.4.2/ 1.2.b.2 | Rationale, roles and responsibilities of Federal agencies involved in QA clarified and documented and being implemented | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1.2.4.3/ 1.2.b.3 | Funding for QA at federal level, to support and sustain QA processes at state level defined (budgeted) | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1.2.4.4 | Planned and sustained engagement to develop states capacity on Whole School QA (Capacity development) | 0 | 2 | 1 | <i>omitted</i> | |
| 1.2.4.5/ 1.2.b.4 | Mechanisms for producing and disseminating annual QA Reports established and operative | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|-----|-----|------|-------------|
| 1.2.b.5 | Linkages and coordination between FIS and UBEC on QA strengthened | <i>Not included</i> | | | 2 | 2 |
| Total/ Maximum possible score | | 1/8 | 2/8 | 4/8 | 6/10 | 8/10 |
| Actual Band/ Target (Milestone) Band | | C/C | B/B | B/A | C/B | B/A |

25. There has been some progress in clarifying the rationale, roles and responsibilities of Federal agencies involved in QA below tertiary level (1.2.b.2) but not enough to achieve a ‘fully met’ rating, so once again this is ‘partially met’. FIS has become FEQAS but the implementation guidelines for the national QA policy have not yet been finalised – it was stated that technical support is still needed to do this. Meetings are in hand between the relevant agencies – but this was the case last year, without any outcomes of note.
26. The third Dimension (1.2.b.3) has again been rated as ‘met’. The more rigorous criteria set in 2015 have been met, with training and mentoring in all 36 states, using UBEC’s Teacher Professional Development Fund. There are also reports from all states on effective school self-evaluation and a National Report in QA in Basic Education in November 2015. However, dependence on UBEC funding is problematic as there are no guarantees of sustainability, and FME funding is irregular at best. Late budget releases are as much of a problem as inadequate budget provision.
27. The mechanisms for producing annual national QA reports are examined in 1.2.b.4. This is now rated as ‘partially met’ – an improvement on last year’s ‘not met’ rating. UBEC has produced a 2012-2015 National QA Report (on UBEC’s website in draft) and FEQAS has produced a report in 2013 but not in 2014 or 2015. The expectations do not seem to have been fulfilled that the work in producing a draft national report in 2014 would be consolidated through the establishment of a task team to ensure this happens annually. An annual report at Federal level should demonstrate good quality, standardised reporting and model good practice to the states which they engage: this was recommended in previous years and still applies: and timeliness should be added to this list of exemplars.
28. Dimension 1.2.b.5 examines whether linkages and coordination between FIS and UBEC have been strengthened. It was added in 2015 and both last year and in 2016 has been rated as ‘met’. Evidence was produced to demonstrate that FEQAS and UBEC now work and schedule work together both at the national level and in the states, although funding problems mean that some planned joint school evaluation activities cannot be implemented. So the next step in this collaboration is to agree on ways of ensuring sufficient funding.
29. Overall the national system for quality assurance below tertiary level has progressed – but not enough to achieve the target A Band envisaged when ESSPIN’s logframe was revised for its Extension Phase: the 8 points out of a possible 10 justify only a B Band, falling just short of the target (seen Annex 2 for conversion tables). The Federal agencies are now working more closely together and their work in the states is better coordinated. However, the outputs from that collaboration are not sufficiently visible. The policy documents and reports on which work at state level should be based are either not yet being produced – or where they are produced they are not being sufficiently printed and disseminated. Nor are they sufficiently regular. ESSPIN involvement has been an integral part of the progress to date and both UBEC and FEQAS must consider whether they can continue to make the intended progress when this support is no

longer available.

School-Based Management Committees (SBMCs: 1.2.c)

30. This Sub-output indicator 1.2.c explores the extent to which national support is given to SBMC implementation to promote effective SBMCs across states. The coding system was updated and two new Dimensions added for 2015 (1.2.c.5 & 1.2.c.6), with one Dimension removed (1.2.6.4). The scores and comparisons with earlier scores (using rather different Dimensions and less challenging criteria before 2015) are as follows. The evidence indicates that the high standards reported in 2015 have not been maintained – or possibly the criteria were applied more rigorously this year. But the result is a score of only 6 points out of a possible 12 and a C Band rather than the target A Band for 2016.

Table 4: SBMC Ratings and Bands (Actual and Target), 2012 to 2016

| | Dimension | Old Dimensions & Criteria | | | New Criteria | |
|---|--|---------------------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------|
| | | Score 2012 | Score 2013 | Score 2014 | Score 2015 | Score 2016 |
| 1.2.6.1/ 1.2.c.1 | Documents to support the process of SBMC implementation developed | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1.2.6.2/ 1.2.c.2 | Funding for SBMC implementation secured | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 1.2.6.3/ 1.2.c.3 | Development of SBMC trainers across states | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1.2.6.4 | Domestication of SBMC guidelines across states | 1 | 2 | 2 | <i>omitted</i> | |
| 1.2.6.5/ 1.2.c.4 | Support capacity building of SBMC members across states, to support functional SBMCs | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 1.2.c.5 | Development of SBM monitoring systems using mentors across the states | <i>Not included</i> | | | 2 | 0 |
| 1.2.c.6 | National strategies developed to demonstrate best practices | <i>Not included</i> | | | 1 | 1 |
| Total/ Maximum possible score | | 5/10 | 7/10 | 10/10 | 10/12 | 6/12 |
| Actual Band/ Target (Milestone) Band | | C/D | B/C | A/A | A/B | C/A |

31. As in all previous years, the documentation required in 1.2.c.1 is sufficient to achieve a ‘met’ rating. It comprises the adoption, production, domestication and dissemination of the national monitoring and mentoring guide for SBMCs. This represents the final stage of a sequential process based on the SBMC national strategic plan 2011-2015, supported by UBEC with hypothecated national funding. The SBMC Guidebooks have been disseminated to all states and training has been provided through NIEPA. As a result, this Dimension is again rated as ‘met’.
32. Funding for SBMC implementation (1.2.c.2) is now the responsibility of state governments after the initial pump-priming with UBEC funds. In consequence, without the certainty of future funding for SBMC work from UBEC and FME funding monitoring activities, this Dimension is now rated as ‘partially met’. It was hoped in 2015 that the passing of a revised UBE or UBSE Act will

include formal creation of SBMCs as an organ of UBEC (along with SUBEBs and LGEAs) and this would support funding flows for SBMCs, but as yet these hopes have as yet come to nothing.

33. The development of SBMC trainers across states (1.2.c.3) is once more rated as 'met' because NIEPA is reported to have conducted training across all 36 states and the FCT. Training is completed for all states at the third level of this four-level system and training of master trainers on mentoring is continuing in all states at the 4th Level, as evidenced by the training reports at each level.
34. Dimension 1.2.c.4 examines the extent to which SBMC members in all states have been supported through relevant capacity-building to ensure fully functional SMBCs. The criterion for this to be rated as 'met' is that *"All 36 states & FCT have developed policies for regularly updating training for SBMC members in selected schools and LGEAs to deliver functional SBMCs"*. This was applied rigorously this year. UBEC has not yet received reports that these policies are being implemented by states, an apparent bone of contention between states and federal agencies. UBEC is refusing to disburse further funds until it gets reports on the use of funds to date. With only 12 state reports available, this falls short of the 'partially met' criterion of 18 states, so the Dimension is rated as 'not met'. In 2015 it was stated that policies had not yet been approved by the State Houses of Assembly, and for this reason, last year's 'met' rating was doubtful.
35. The creation of functioning SBMCs is only the start of a long development process. The mentoring phase of development focuses on the work of SBMCs in supporting the preparation and use of school development plans (SDPs). Mentoring needs to be accompanied by monitoring and Dimension 1.2.c.5 requires evidence that *"at least 30 states have mentoring and monitoring systems in place"* for a 'met' rating. As with the previous Dimension, the documentary evidence was unavailable in the workshop, so no evidence of the numbers of states involved has been produced. In consequence this Dimension has been rated as 'not met'.
36. A final Dimension (1.2.c.6), added in 2015, seeks evidence that best practices are disseminated through national annual reports and conferences. Although one conference took place in 2014, it was reported that FME was not involved and it was unclear at the workshop as to the relative contributions required of FME and UBEC. Nothing seems to have happened since, and the 'partially met' rating for this Dimension is rather generous. A national strategy is needed involving FME and UBEC in order to create both awareness and uniformity. The policy (strategy) will need endorsement from the NCE. This is a necessary further stage in consolidating the solid work undertaken in recent years in support of functional SBMCs across Nigeria, to which ESSPIN has contributed substantially. UBEC and FME will need to review the internal resources needed to maintain and build upon this progress.
37. NOTE: Shortly after the self-assessment exercise took place, the national strategy was endorsed by the NCE and is now established as a nationwide policy with committed resources. Had this taken place a little earlier (or the self-assessment taken place a little later) the ratings for these SBMC Dimensions would have been significantly more positive. With this endorsement, the progress made in supporting functional SBMCs across the country is now embedded into the Federal Government's action programme for basic education reform.

Conclusions

38. This section provides an overview of the progress made across the three sub-output indicators/National Systems while providing final comments to be considered by the incoming Government, other IDPs/ Programmes at this final stage in ESSPIN's work.
39. It was clear from the workshop and this draft report that there remains much to be done, even after eight years of limited ESSPIN involvement and support, at least in QA and SBMC work. The initiatives with SBMCs are now well embedded and much now depends upon sustainability by the states. Similarly in QA, the states will need to take forward the implementation of national policies. In MLA the issues are not so clear-cut but, as in the other national systems, the need for technical support to promote inter-agency cooperation and deliver specified objectives remains strong.
40. In 2016 the criteria (Annex 3) on which scores and Bands are based were applied rigorously and hearsay evidence that missing documentation could be made available was not accepted. In consequence the results, as Table 5 indicates, are that none of the targets were met and in two areas scores were lower than in 2015, applying the same criteria. The impending termination of ESSPIN support, and the news (announced on the day of the self-assessment workshop) that the heads of most Education parastatals had been replaced, created a climate of uncertainty that probably encouraged a more pessimistic approach to the self-assessment than in previous exercises. As noted above, Government actions affecting MLA and SBMC work since the self-assessment workshop have removed or minimised some of the concerns expressed at the workshop and reflected in the assessments.

Table 5: A comparative look at the Bands achieved against ESSPIN Logframe Milestones and Targets, 2012-2016

| S/ N | Sub-Indicator / National System | 2012 | | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | |
|-----------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| | | Mile- stone 1 Band | Band Achiev ed | Mile- stone 2 Band | Band Achiev ed | Target Band | Band Achiev ed | Mile- stone | Band Achieve d | Target Band | Band Achieve d |
| 1.2 .a | Policy on MLA established and preparations made towards implementation | D | D | C | D | B | C | B | C | B | D |
| 1.2 .b | Revised policy and QA methods implemented | C | C | B | B | A | B | B | C | A | B |
| 1.2 .c | National Support for SBMC implementation | D | C | C | B | A | A | B | B | A | C |

41. There is evidence that, with political will and technical support, funding barriers can be overcome and a major reform programme initiated. UBEC's concerted commitment to the development of SBMCs demonstrates this. However, in a period of economic uncertainty and reduced resources, full institutionalisation of the QA and SBMC reforms is dependent on the political determination of individual states.
42. The need for closer collaboration between the federal agencies involved in MLA, QA and SBM

development has been stressed in all the self-assessment reports, and it remains a high priority. The Ministerial Committees established in 2014 provided temporary mechanisms to facilitate this collaboration, but with a new Government and new leaders for the main parastatals, it is unclear as to whether current initiatives can be sustained. It remains important that the efforts and resources of multiple agencies do not constitute duplication and wasted resources, and do deliver value for Nigeria's children.

43. There are lessons in these findings for DFID and other IDPs as well as for the Federal agencies. MLA is the only key national system mentioned under the Systems component for the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) grant awarded to five Northern states, while Nigeria's response to the new Sustainable Development Goals is very likely to require evidence as to the current status of Nigeria's schools and their key development needs. The completion and return of state QA and SBMC reports and the long-planned completion of the next MLA exercise are all needed to provide that evidence.
44. The sustainability of the self-assessment process is itself doubtful. In marked contrast to the states that undertook this year's self-assessment exercises, the Federal partners showed little interest in or enthusiasm for continuing the self-assessment procedures after ESSPIN. This may be no more than a reflection of the circumstances, mentioned above, at the time of the workshop and later feedback from FME was more positive, stating that "we are positive that self-assessment will be continued ... as it is a necessity in knowing where we have been, where we are and where we are going". But if ESSPIN is to leave any legacy that supports further federal self-assessment, it would be helpful to bequeath a framework for further assessments.

Annex 1: Sub-Output Indicators, Dimensions & Score sheet 2013

| 1.2 National Systems Established | | | | |
|---|---|------------|--|----------|
| Output & Sub-output indicators | | Dimensions | | Score |
| 1.2 National Systems Established | | | | |
| 1.2.a | Policy on MLA established and preparations made towards implementation | 1.2.a.1 | Rationale, roles and responsibilities of Federal /State agencies involved in MLA clarified and documented | 1 |
| | | 1.2.a.2 | A management structure and operational arrangement agreed and established for national MLA | 1 |
| | | 1.2.a.3 | Funding mechanisms for MLA clarified | 1 |
| | | 1.2.a.4 | Capacity development planned for and undertaken at relevant stages of the MLA process | 0 |
| | | 1.2.a.5 | Revised MLA instruments developed, taking into account learning from previous MLA exercises nationally and international best practice | 1 |
| | | | | 4 |
| 1.2.b | Revised policy and QA methods implemented | 1.2.b.1 | Methodology for QA reviewed, published and disseminated | 1 |
| | | 1.2.b.2 | Rationale, roles and responsibilities of Federal agencies involved in QA clarified, documented (Policy) and being implemented | 1 |
| | | 1.2.b.3 | Funding for QA at federal level, to support and sustain QA processes at state level defined (budgeted) | 2 |
| | | 1.2.b.4 | Mechanisms for producing and disseminating annual QA Reports established and operative | 0 |
| | | 1.2.b.5 | Linkages and coordination between FIS and UBEC on QA strengthened | 2 |
| TOTAL | | | | 6 |
| 1.2.c | National Support for SBMC implementation | 1.2.c.1 | Documents to support the process of SBM implementation developed | 2 |
| | | 1.2.c.2 | Funding for SBM implementation institutionalised | 1 |
| | | 1.2.c.3 | Development of SBMC trainers across states | 2 |
| | | 1.2.c.4 | Support capacity building of SBMC members across states, to support functional SBMCs | 2 |
| | | 1.2.c.5 | Development of SBM monitoring systems using mentors across the states | 1 |
| | | 1.2.c.6 | National strategies developed to demonstrate best practices | 1 |
| TOTAL | | | | 9 |

Annex 2: Bands & Scores

| Sub-Indicator Band | With total score of 10 (a & b) | With total score of 12 (c) |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Band A | 9-10 | 10-12 |
| Band B | 7-8 | 7-9 |
| Band C | 4-6 | 4-6 |
| Band D | 0-3 | 0-3 |

Annex 3 – Performance criteria for each sub-output indicator and dimension

1.2 Quality of national systems established for:

- a. Monitoring learning achievement (MLA)
- b. Quality assurance (QA)
- c. SBMC implementation

MLA

| Output & Sub-output indicators | | Dimensions | |
|--------------------------------|--|------------|--|
| 1.2.a | National policy on MLA established and plans agreed towards implementation | 1.2.a.1 | Rationale, roles and responsibilities of Federal /State agencies involved in MLA clarified and documented |
| | | 1.2.a.2 | A management structure and operational arrangement agreed and established for national MLA |
| | | 1.2.a.3 | Funding mechanisms for MLA clarified |
| | | 1.2.a.4 | Capacity development planned for and undertaken at relevant stages of the MLA process |
| | | 1.2.a.5 | Revised MLA instruments developed, taking into account learning from previous MLA exercises nationally and international best practice |

Performance Criteria/ Status Statements

| 1.2.a.1 | Rationale, roles and responsibilities of Federal /State agencies involved in MLA clarified and documented | | |
|---------|---|--|--|
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | Clear policy including roles and responsibilities developed and ratified through NCE process | Ministerial Committee recommends delineation of roles and responsibilities for MLA; Policy under development | No clear policy recommendations on roles and responsibilities of Federal & state agencies on MLA |

| 1.2.a.2 | A management structure and operational arrangement agreed and established for national MLA | | |
|---------|--|--|---|
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | Management structure and operational arrangements for national MLA agreed and in place | Management structure and operational arrangements for national MLA agreed but not yet in place | Management structure and operational arrangements for national MLA not yet agreed |

| 1.2.a.3 | Funding mechanisms for MLA identified | | |
|---------|--|--|---|
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | Functional linkages & coordination exist between Federal & state agencies for effective implementation of the national MLA Framework | Functional linkages & coordination exist but are not operational | No linkages or coordination between relevant agencies |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|
| 1.2.a.4 | Capacity development planned for and undertaken at relevant stages of the MLA process | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | Capacity development undertaken or in progress, based on guidelines accompanying policy document. These include rationale and methodology for capacity development at federal and state level, including roles and responsibilities and funding | Capacity development planned for by relevant federal agency but not yet in operation before the next MLA exercise | Plans for capacity development not undertaken and no plans before the next MLA exercise |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| 1.2.a.5 | Revised MLA instruments developed, taking into account learning from previous MLA exercises nationally and international best practice | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | Revised MLA instruments agreed and operative. Policy document includes rationale for MLA and methodology Nigeria adopted to suit its own needs and requirements; includes a process for revision of instruments on a cyclical basis | Instruments for the next national MLA revised with some input from relevant stakeholders but implementation policy not yet agreed | MLA instruments remain similar to those used in previous exercises with no provision for periodic review |

Quality Assurance

| Sub-output indicators | | Dimensions | |
|------------------------------|--|-------------------|---|
| 1.2.b | Revised policy and QA methods implemented | 1.2.b.1 | Methodology for QA reviewed, published and disseminated |
| | | 1.2.b.2 | Rationale, roles and responsibilities of Federal agencies involved in QA clarified, documented (Policy) and being implemented |
| | | 1.2.b.3 | Funding for QA at federal level, to support and sustain QA processes at state level defined (budgeted) |
| | | 1.2.b.4 | Mechanisms for producing and disseminating annual QA Reports established and operative |
| | | 1.2.b.5 | Linkages and coordination between FIS and UBEC on QA strengthened |

Performance Criteria/ Status Statements

| | | | |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| 1.2.b.1 | Methodology for QA reviewed, published and disseminated | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | Handbook and Instrument on National QA documents reviewed, published and disseminated | Review of QA documents with QA methodology ongoing but not yet published | National QA documents not yet reviewed |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| 1.2.b.2 | Rationale, roles and responsibilities of Federal agencies involved in QA clarified, documented (Policy) and being implemented | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | National QA policy approved by NCE and guidelines & instruments produced and implemented | National QA policy approved but not yet implemented. Guidelines not prepared | Policy not yet approved |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| 1.2.b.3 | Funding for QA at federal level, to support and sustain QA processes at state level defined (budgeted) | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | Support for capacity building of QAEs by states and mentoring of state QA officers on WSE process in at least 25 states and FCT | Support for capacity building of QAEs by states and mentoring of state QA officers on WSE process in at least 18 states and FCT | Support for capacity building of QAEs by states and mentoring of state QA officers on WSE process in less than 25 states |

| | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| 1.2.b.4 | Mechanisms for producing and disseminating annual QA Reports established and operative | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | Task team on annual national QA Report constituted, guidelines developed and implemented production of annual national QA Report and at least one report published | Task team on annual national QA Report constituted, guidelines developed but no annual national QA Reports published yet | Task team on annual national QA Report not yet constituted, or (if constituted) guidelines not yet developed for production of annual national QA Report |

| | | | |
|----------------|--|---|--|
| 1.2.b.5 | Linkages and coordination between FIS and UBEC on QA strengthened | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | FIS & UBEC routinely work & schedule work together at federal level and work collaboratively in states | FIS & UBEC are informed of each other's activities and make efforts not to overlaps activities at state level | FIS & UBEC do not share information on planned activities, leading to overlap in some states |

SBMC Implementation

| Sub-output indicators | | Dimensions | |
|-----------------------|---|------------|--|
| 1.2.c | SBM implementation supported at National level | 1.2.c.1 | Documents to support the process of SBM implementation developed |
| | | 1.2.c.2 | Funding for SBM implementation institutionalised |
| | | 1.2.c.3 | Development of SBMC trainers across states |
| | | 1.2.c.4 | Support capacity building of SBMC members across states, to support functional SBMCs |
| | | 1.2.c.5 | Development of SBM monitoring systems using mentors across the states |
| | | 1.2.c.6 | National strategies developed to demonstrate best practices |

Performance Criteria/ Status Statements

| | | | |
|----------------|--|--|---|
| 1.2.c.1 | Documents to support the process of SBMC implementation developed | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | Monitoring & mentoring guide for SBMCs adopted and produced, domesticated and disseminated | Monitoring & mentoring guide for SBMCs adopted and produced but not domesticated or disseminated | Monitoring & mentoring guide for SBMCs adopted but not yet produced |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|----------------------|----------------|
| 1.2.c.2 | Funding for SBMC implementation secured | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |

Federal Self-Assessment Report: National Systems

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| National agency provides continuing funding for SBMC implementation in states | National funding for SBMC implementation based on annual funding decisions | No national funding for SBMC implementation |
|---|--|---|

| | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|
| 1.2.c.3 | Development of SBMC trainers across states | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | Capacity development for Master Trainers in all states; Capacity development of Trainers completed in all 36 states & FCT | Capacity development of Master Trainers and of Trainers completed in at least 18 states | Capacity development of Master Trainers and Trainers completed in less than 18 states |

| | | | |
|----------------|--|--|---|
| 1.2.c.4 | Capacity building of SBMC members across states, to support functional SBMCs | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | All 36 states & FCT have developed policies for regularly updating training for SBMC members in selected schools and LGEAs to deliver functional SBMCs | At least 18 states have developed policies for regularly updating the capacity of SBMC members in selected schools and LGEAs to deliver functional SBMCs | Less than 18 states have developed policies for regularly updating the capacity of SBMC members in selected schools and LGEAs to deliver functional SBMCs |

| | | | |
|----------------|--|--|---|
| 1.2.c.5 | Development of SBM monitoring systems using mentors across the states | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | At least 30 states & FCT have monitoring and mentoring systems in place for 'Level 4' SBMC support | At least 15 states have monitoring and mentoring systems in place for 'Level 4' SBMC support | Less than 15 states have monitoring and mentoring systems in place for 'Level 4' SBMC support |

| | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| 1.2.c.6 | National strategies developed to demonstrate best practices | | |
| | MET | PARTIALLY MET | NOT MET |
| | At least 2 national annual reports on SBM best practices produced and disseminated along with at least one national conference | At least 1 national annual report on SBM best practices produced and disseminated OR one national conference | Neither national annual report nor national conference delivered |

Annex 4: Suggested Evidence for each Group

| S/N | Indicator | Suggested Evidence (Minutes of meetings, reports, letters...) |
|-------|--|---|
| 1.2.a | Policy on MLA established and preparations made towards implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of 1 year strategy with the sections relating to MLA • Report of the 4 year strategy with the sections relating to MLA • Evidence of budgetary allocation to MLA activities at Federal level (FME and parastatals) • Copies of MLA instruments used • Documents showing capacity development and administrative plans to support the MLA exercise • Draft policy or planning documents to take MLA forward • Reports showing itemised recommendations to improve MLA processes • ToR of Ministerial Committee under 4 year strategy • Report of Ministerial Committee with key recommendations |
| 1.2.b | Revised policy and QA methods implemented | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of national QA methods • Evidence of national QA policy • Evidence of collaboration across federal agencies to support QA • Evidence of funding/budgetary planned for and released to support QA work at the Federal level • Evidence of collaboration between Federal and states to support QA / Evidence of federal support to states to promote QA • Evidence of number of states practicing Whole School QA • Report of 1 year strategy on QA • Report of 4 year strategy on QA • ToR of Ministerial Committee under 4 year strategy • Reports of Ministerial Committee and key recommendations |
| 1.2.c | National Support for SBMC implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence showing partnerships and collaborations on SBMCs • Evidence of published documents resulting from such partnerships • Evidence of capacity building conducted at federal and at state level • Evidence of funds allocated to support SBMCs in states/nationwide • Evidence of funds disbursed to support SBMCs in states/nationwide • Evidence of states (number of states) domesticating SBMC guidelines • Evidence of states training SBMCs members in schools in states • Reports of accomplishments re. National SBMC roll out including funding commitments |

Annex 5: Participants

| S/N | NAMES | Organisation | EMAIL ADDRESS |
|-----|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Jake Jiya | UBEC/SMO | Jaker_jiya@yahoo.com |
| 2 | Tolulope Faokunla | UBEC/SMO | Femisank1@yahoo.co.uk |
| 3 | Patricia Oche | UBEC/PSMO | Silverspoon2006@yahoo.com |
| 4 | Masi Danie. T | FME/EPR & D | mtekwata@yahoo.com |
| 5 | Mrs. Juliana Ekwem | FME/EPR & D | juliekwen@yahoo.com |
| 6 | Arowolo R.O | FEM/EPR & D | arochie@yahoo.com |
| 7 | Pius Elumeze | ESSPIN | Pius.elumeze@esspin.com |
| 8 | Agbenu Onazi | ESSPIN | Agbenu.onazi@esspin.org |
| 9 | Mrs H. Lawal | FME/MLA-AD | Leena319@yahoo.com |
| 10 | Mrs.Glory Usoro | FME/MLA-ACEO | gloryusoro@gmail.com |
| 11 | Mr. Afolayan T.M | FME/MLA- SEO | proffinishe@gmail.com |
| 12 | Olarewaju Yemisi | FME/MLA Sign language interpreter | Abike_olani@yahoo.com |
| 13 | Egwuzoro Vincent | UBEC/QA | Vinurch787@yahoo.com |
| 14 | Ada V. Ogwuche | UBEC/QA | ogwucheda@gmail.com |
| 15 | Deborah Dajep | UBEC/QA | ddajep@yahoo.com |
| 16 | Amina Usman | FME/QA | ronkesuleiman@yahoo.com |
| 18 | Dr.Essien | FEQAS | oguessien@yahoo.com |
| 19 | Stephen O. Yusuf | FEQAS/Ag Director | Stephenyusuf2004@yahoo.com |
| 21 | Kingsley Ogbonna | ESSPIN | Kingsley.ogbonna@mottmac.com |
| 22 | Lynton Gray | ESSPIN | gray4@which.net |