

# Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN)

## 2016 Review of ESSPIN's Support to Nomadic Schools in Jigawa State

Report Number: ESSPIN – JG 406

**Helen Pinnock**

**July 2016**



[www.esspin.org](http://www.esspin.org)

## Report Distribution and Revision Sheet

**Project Name:** Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria

**Code:** 337662

**Report No.:** ESSPIN – JG 406

**Report Title:** 2016 Review of ESSPIN's support to Normadic Schools in Jigawa State

| Rev No | Date of issue | Originator    | Checker      | Approver     | Scope of checking                  |
|--------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------------|
| 01     | July 2016     | Helen Pinnock | Fatima Aboki | 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  |
|---------------------|---|
| <b>DFID</b>         |   |
| 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 Eigbiki       | 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                                       |
| <b>IMEP</b>         |   |
| Gregor MacKinnon    | Project Manager, IMEP   |
| Emmanuel Adegbe     | Deputy Project Manager, IMEP  |
| <b>ESSPIN</b>       |   |
| Jake Ross           | Project Director  |
| Kayode Sanni        | National Programme Manager  |
| Laura McInerney     | Deputy Programme Manager  |
| 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)                                      |

| <b>Name</b>                | <b>Position</b>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| 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             |
| <b>Consortium partners</b> |   |
| 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                             |
| <b>Federal partners</b>    |   |
| 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  |
| <b>State partners</b>      | Honourable Commissioners and SUBEB Chairs                       |
| <b>Programme Partners</b>  |   |
| 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

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Acronyms and Abbreviations .....   | 1  |
| Acknowledgements.....  | 1  |
| Executive Summary.....   | 2  |
| Introduction .....   | 6  |
| Project overview .....   | 6  |
| Review methodology .....   | 8  |
| Findings .....   | 9  |
| Status of 2014 review recommendations for ESSPIN, by end July 2016 .....   | 16 |
| SANE task list, nomadic education follow-ups, August 2016 .....  | 20 |
| ESSPIN nomadic/remote community education upgrade model : outline of package of interventions for future scale-up..... | 23 |
| References .....   | 30 |
| Annex 1: Messages for nomadic teachers in Jigawa who speak Fulani language .....                                       | 31 |
| Annex 2: Sample questions asked in focus group discussions .....   | 32 |
| Annex 3: School visit assessment criteria .....  | 33 |

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| ANE    | Agency for Nomadic Education (Jigawa)         |
| ASC    | Annual School Census                          |
| CBO    | Community-based organisation                  |
| CNS    | Community Nomadic School                      |
| CSO    | Civil society organisation                    |
| ESSPIN | Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria |
| GBP    | British Pounds                                |
| GPE    | Global Partnership for Education              |
| JSS    | Junior Secondary School                       |
| IQTE   | Integrated Quranic & Tsangiya Education       |
| LGA    | Local Government Authority                    |
| LGEA   | Local Government Education Authority          |
| MACBAN | Jigawa Cattle Breeders' Association           |
| SBMC   | School-based Management Committee             |
| SIP    | School Improvement Programme                  |
| SSC    | School Support Committee                      |
| SSIT   | State School Improvement Team                 |
| SSO    | School Support Officer                        |
| SUBEB  | State Universal Basic Education Board         |
| UBEC   | Universal Basic Education Commission          |

## Acknowledgements

This report was written by Helen Pinnock of Save the Children, based on a field review conducted in Jigawa during July 2016. Additional support and input were provided by Abubakar Nashabaru, Fatima Aboki and Laura McInerney.

## Executive Summary

### **Gidan Maje school, Ringim LGEA**

*This school started in 2009 with an enrolment of 33 pupils (18 boys and 15 girls) and currently has a n enrolment of 273 children in all grades, with broadly equal male and female numbers.*

1. ESSPIN (the Education Sector Strategy Programme in Nigeria) is at 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 and partners used ESSPIN's Challenge Fund to upgrade 90 nomadic community primary schools, responding to requests for support from Jigawa's state Agency for Nomadic Education (ANE).
2. This work has been effective and popular with stakeholders. Over 16,000 additional children (48% girls) have been reached with primary education since 2011<sup>1</sup>. Sustained partnership, ownership and collaboration is evident, as 75% of the first phase of supported schools have already been taken over by ANE, which is posting teachers to schools, taking responsibility for textbooks and monitoring, and planning to bring nomadic volunteer teachers onto the payroll. The cost of ESSPIN support per newly enrolled child was £51 GBP (Fawson, 2013).
3. Based on learning from two programme reviews, ESSPIN should now strengthen its model of support to nomadic education, developing an approach which is relevant to the major challenges faced in expanding access to quality basic education in remote areas of Northern Nigeria.

### **The 2016 review**

4. A follow-up visit was undertaken in July 2016 to review the status of nomadic education improvements supported by ESSPIN, and to scope out the prospects for consolidation and extension of ESSPIN's model of upgrading nomadic community schools as ESSPIN closes.

### **Main achievements**

5. The 2016 review visit found that the quality of educational experience on offer had been maintained since the 2014 review. The prospects for integrating the existing 90 target schools into the public education system are good; integration is almost complete on a number of levels.
6. Some improvements for sustainability had been made since 2014, such as increased numbers of teachers supported by government, distribution of textbooks and other materials by government, institution of preschool classes, and inclusion of nomadic schools in training for teachers and community committees. School records showed that access to secondary school was increasing, particularly for boys but also for

<sup>1</sup> SUBEB data reported in ESSPIN Inclusive Education Review, 2016

some girls. Stakeholders reported this was a result of the scheme's improvements to primary schools.

7. From the Phase 1 and 2 schools, 522 children (299 boys and 223 girls) sat for 2016 State Common Entrance Examination into JSS and 295 (182 boys and 113 girls) passed and were admitted into JSS across the state. Stakeholders reported that these numbers were much higher than seen previously in these schools.

### Recent progress on quality and sustainability

- 30 out of 40 pilot Phase 1 Community Nomadic Schools achieved takeover by Jigawa State Agency for Nomadic Education.
- 80 nomadic schools have been included in the state School Improvement Programme (SIP) so far (meaning that SSO visits are in place, teacher training is in operation and that SBMC development for SSCs is planned). 50 SSCs have begun SBMC development.
- The State Agency for Nomadic Education and SUBEB have posted about 50 teachers to Nomadic Schools in Phases 1 and 2. Most nomadic schools in the ESSPIN programme have received between two and four fully funded teaching posts, for a mixture of Islamic and Western teaching roles. (However, often these are new teachers rather than transferring existing volunteer teachers to government payroll. This sets up a risk of demotivating local teachers who speak the local language children need to learn well, and have built the trust of the community.)
- ANE has committed to take over volunteer teaching allowances for teachers in 40 schools supported by ESSPIN.
- Capacity of 40 preschool Community Teachers enhanced to effective utilisation of SUBEB's Early Childhood Care, Development and Education (ECCDE) curriculum.
- 40 Community Teachers, 5 LGA Coordinators and 9 Zone Coordinators of Nomadic Schools were trained on effective management of 40 ECCDE centres.
- N46,400,000.00 was leveraged from state, MDG Office and communities: N24,300,000.00 (state), N18,000,000.00 (MDG Office) N8,100,000.00 (communities) for additional teaching materials, provision of classroom shelter, water points, drugs and first aid kits, repairs of furniture and purchase of land for school expansion.
- MACBAN, the nomadic cattle-breeders' association sensitised and mobilised communities, providing teaching and learning materials worth N350, 000.00.

### Upcoming government support plans for nomadic schools

- Under GPE, 199 schools will receive grants and support to offer ECCD: 14 of these are planned to be nomadic schools.
- Approx. 9 nomadic schools are scheduled to receive school grants under GPE.
- SANE has prepared a budget request for construction of 10 new nomadic schools in 2017.
- 8,000 uniform and sandals sets are scheduled to be distributed by ANE to nomadic schools in 2016, with a further 10,000 planned for 2017.



- In service training of teachers in nomadic schools is planned at the rate of 300 teachers per year.
- ANE is preparing enrolment drives in several nomadic communities for 2016 and 2017.
- SUBEB plans to deliver 10-20 classrooms to nomadic schools per year, with associated renovation, furniture, teaching materials and training.

### Challenges

8. Areas of significant improvement are still needed. The management of schools was not targeted to children with significant livestock responsibilities, and School Support Committees had not mobilised all the children they could to attend school. Schools' physical capacities in terms of land, classrooms and teacher numbers was constrained. As a result, significant numbers of children in the surrounding community were estimated to be still out of school.
9. Girls' inclusion and access to primary and secondary school were still markedly weaker than boys'. Children speaking Fulani language at home (Fulfulde) appeared to have weaker levels of Hausa and English than Hausa-speaking children, and appeared less confident, despite the ability of most teachers to speak Fulfulde. Children with mobility challenges were being included, but children with other disabilities were not apparently being supported, apparently due to lack of teacher motivation and training. Communities needed support and advice to mobilise transport to secondary school, particularly for girls, who in many cases would not be able to go to secondary school without transport.

### Recommended next steps

10. Further external intervention will be required to make a large-scale change in access to education for children in nomadic areas of Jigawa State. ANE does not have strong advocacy or planning capacity, and resources for strengthening access to education are very limited in Jigawa. Only substantial reordering of Jigawa's GPE plan would lead to large-scale rapid expansion of access to education in remote areas.
11. There is potential for the model of upgrading nomadic schools to be extended more widely in Jigawa states and in other states with dispersed rural populations. An updated draft package of interventions is outlined below.
12. Replicating this model under government management could offer a rapid and cost-effective way to absorb many more children into education. The model itself is relevant to any remote area where communities are running active informal schools, whether nomadic or not.
13. As well as strengthening the model itself, which can be done with relatively little investment, ESSPIN should offer the model to donors and government agencies as a way to rapidly and cost-effectively expand of quality preschool and primary education to remote areas.
14. ESSPIN should develop an enhanced package of interventions to expand the upgrading of community schools in nomadic and/or remote areas. The approach can

be shared with donors and potential collaborators such as the National Commission for Nomadic Education. This model includes flexible class timings and basic bilingual teaching approaches to cater for more marginalised children, enabling the approach to better fit ESSPIN's Theory of Change outcome of more children from marginalised backgrounds accessing basic education. The draft enhanced model is outlined in Section 5 of this report.

## Introduction

15. This report presents a brief programmatic review of the Education Sector Strategy Programme in Nigeria's (ESSPIN) support to 90 nomadic schools in Jigawa State.
16. ESSPIN is at 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 90 nomadic community primary schools, responding to requests for support from Jigawa's state Agency for Nomadic Education (ANE).
17. A qualitative review was commissioned in 2014 to document the full programme of ESSPIN's 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.
18. In 2014 it was found that nomadic schools reviewed were operating at a good level comparable to a formal primary school. This was reported by all stakeholders to be significantly better than the situation of schools before intervention. 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.
19. In the two years following the qualitative review, several of its recommendations were implemented. A follow-up visit was undertaken in July 2016 to review the status of nomadic education improvements supported by ESSPIN, and to scope out the prospects for consolidation and extension of ESSPIN's model of upgrading nomadic community schools as ESSPIN closes.
20. This report contains the findings and recommendations from the 2016 review visit. Section 2 discusses findings from the review, while Section 3 identified which recommendations from ESSPIN's 2014 nomadic education review in Jigawa have been implemented. Section 4 details the progress of ANE's work to institutionalise improvements to nomadic education supported by ESSPIN. Section 5 offers a detailed description of a programme model which could be developed for nomadic and remote education in Nigeria, based on experience and learning from the past five years of ESSPIN's support to nomadic schools in Jigawa.

## Project overview

21. Before 2011, 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 were monitored by ANE, under its responsibility to deliver nomadic education in Jigawa State.

22. ESSPIN offered support to upgrade nomadic schools so that enrolment and quality of education increased, using a budget allocated for innovation entitled the Challenge Fund. 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.
23. The programme was thus extended to a further 50 schools from July 2014, with ESSPIN support ending in November, 2016. Documented enrolment rates continued to rise, and anecdotal evidence from partners indicated that nomadic schools which had received ESSPIN support were extremely popular with communities and civil society, showing strong increases in enrolment and retention (Fawson, 2013; Pinnock, 2014).
24. The intervention process started with community engagement through ANE and MACBAN; then with setting up and orienting School Support Committees, made up of seven community members, 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.
25. Then the programme of infrastructure support started in response to common needs. Schools received support for 78 shelters with roofs and 19 hand pumps from ESSPIN. The State Government, through the State Agency for Nomadic Education, SUBEB and Jigawa MDG Office, has provided 18 classrooms, and 6 toilets with 4 cubicles each. The NCNE constructed a block of 2 classrooms, a hand pump and 2 toilets in one school.
26. After that teachers were given stipends so that they would come every day, and teachers were trained using ESSPIN materials, based on learner-centred IQTE teacher training. 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.
27. ESSPIN provided funds for teacher allowances, low-cost classroom and shelter construction, teaching and learning materials, initial teacher training and school support committee setup and orientation. 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. The cost of ESSPIN support per newly enrolled child was £51 GBP (Fawson, 2013).

28. Schools have gradually added new grades as children progress, and all 90 now offer a full primary curriculum. 40 Phase 1 schools have established a preschool grade.
29. 30 out of 40 Phase 1 schools have now been mainstreamed by ANE, with ANE posting teachers to them, taking responsibility for textbooks and monitoring, and allocating full government payroll to some or all teaching positions.
30. Over 16,000 additional children (48% girls) have been reached with primary education since 2011<sup>2</sup>. Sustained partnership, ownership and collaboration is evident, as 75% of the supported Phase 1 schools have already been taken over by ANE, which is posting teachers to schools, taking responsibility for textbooks and monitoring, and planning to bring nomadic volunteer teachers onto the payroll.

### Review methodology

31. The key **review questions** were:

- Are standards of education in nomadic schools involved in the ESSPIN-supported upgrade still acceptable?
- To what extent have improvement recommendations been delivered?
- To what extent have sustainability recommendations been delivered?
- What are the prospects for sustaining and expanding improvements to nomadic education in Jigawa?
- What actions need to be taken by ESSPIN and others to maximise the chance of these prospects being delivered?

### Review Process

32. The review took place over three days in July 2016. Two nomadic schools were visited and project documents were reviewed by an international consultant from Save the Children, a key partner in ESSPIN. One school which had been visited in 2014 was visited, to allow some comparison of changes; another school which had not been visited by the reviewer was also chosen.
33. 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.

### Planning and review meetings

34. A workshop was held the following day with key staff from a range of government and CSO partners involved in supporting education in nomadic communities.

---

<sup>2</sup> SUBEB data reported in ESSPIN Inclusive Education Review, 2016

Findings from ESSPIN Jigawa experts and the previous days' visits were shared, and participants were asked to generate ideas for improving and scaling up support to nomadic schools. These ideas were fed into a revised model for supporting nomadic schools.

35. The workshop was followed up by a detailed planning meeting with SANE, the Ministry of Education, and MACBAN, to plan concrete next steps for taking forward these plans.

### Limitations

36. 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 hours could be spent at each school.
37. 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.
38. As only two schools could be visited, the review was only able to gain an impressionistic view of the state of teaching and learning in nomadic schools supported by ESSPIN.

### Findings

#### School visits

39. Overall it was apparent from school visits that the quality of educational experience on offer had been maintained since the 2014 review, with some improvements in terms of teacher numbers supported by government, distribution of textbooks and other materials by government, and institution of preschool classes.
40. Preschool classes were now active, marking a major improvement from 2014's review, when young children were unsupervised and unstimulated.
41. School records and local education officials' testimony showed that access to secondary school was increasing, particularly for boys but also for some girls. Stakeholders consistently reported that this was a result of the scheme's improvements to primary schools. However, communities needed support and advice to mobilise transport to secondary school, particularly for girls, who would in many cases not be able to travel long distances as they did not have access to bikes. Communities visited did not have access to vehicles or funds needed to provide transport directly.
42. Areas of significant improvement were still needed, along the lines of the 2014 review recommendations (Pinnock, 2014). Schooling was not targeted to children with significant livestock responsibilities, and SSCs had not mobilised all the children they could to attend school, neither offering flexible classes to herding children nor organising substantial continued enrolment and retention drives. Schools' physical

capacities in terms of land, classrooms and teacher numbers were also very constrained, limiting numbers.

43. As a result, significant numbers of children in the surrounding community were still out of school: SSC members in both communities estimated that the same number of children were out of school as were attending. This has significant implications for ANE, SUBEB, and other State bodies dealing with basic education, as it underlines recent Out of School Survey findings in Jigawa that the planning and delivery of the basic education system is far below actual need, especially in remote areas (SUBEB, 2014).
44. Stakeholders confirmed that the high temperatures in Jigawa meant that walking far from home to a large government school was not appropriate, particularly for younger children starting primary education. Community members preferred the idea of a larger number of smaller schools closer to home.
45. Girls' inclusion and access to primary and secondary school were still markedly weaker than boys', as indicated by patchier attendance records for girls, less participation for girls in one of the schools visited, and much lower numbers of girls than boys moving on to lower secondary school. Nevertheless, enrolment in Phase 1 and 2 programme schools was close to 50% and stakeholders felt that girls' inclusion had gone up significantly since the ESSPIN support had begun.
46. It is worth noting that the SSCs visited had not yet received ESSPIN's SBMC training package, which has a strong gender and girls' education focus. Although SSCs reported going to families' houses to encourage children to attend school, they did not seem to be doing further activities to promote girls' education that trained SBMCs would usually have reported (such as involving local leaders, campaigning events, and having a women's committee).
47. Children speaking Fulani language at home (Fulfulde) appeared to have weaker levels of Hausa and English than Hausa-speaking children, and appeared less confident, despite the ability of most teachers to speak Fulfulde. Children with mobility challenges were being included in the two schools visited, but children with other disabilities were not apparently being supported. Teachers and children would mention mobility-impaired children who were in school, but would also highlight children with other disabilities who were out of school. Teachers had not had training or orientation on how to best support children who had various impairments.

#### **Gidan Maje school, Ringim LGEA**

48. This school started in 2009 with an enrolment of 33 pupils (18 boys and 15 girls) and currently has an enrolment of 273 children in all grades, with broadly equal male and female numbers. However, girls' attendance was noticeably poorer than boys'. When asked about this, SSC members (of whom only one was female, and who did not meet the reviewer at the same time or place as the men) stated that there was more expectation that boys would go on to secondary school, so boys got more

support for education. Girls were expected to marry after completing primary education.

49. The school had a two-room classroom block provided by SUBEB, and a borehole, but no toilets/latrines. When asked whether this was a problem for girls, SSC members said that it was not an issue, as girls would be married by the time they started menstruating (14/15), and would then not be in school. The difference in attitude toward early marriage and girls' education between this SSC and a typical SBMC (as encountered in previous SBMC reviews) was stark.
50. Similarly, the SSC had not been as active in mobilising enrolment as an SBMC would have done, or resolving the problem of very limited community land available for the school site. The SSC estimated that at least another 300 children were out of school in the community. They said that a significant proportion of these had to look after livestock full time, both at home in the rainy season, and moving with the cattle in the dry season. They explained that families would normally choose which of their children could go to school, and which had to rear livestock. In the past, the school had offered evening education along Islamic lines, but the community had wanted a full primary curriculum.
51. Teaching was generally engaging and dynamic, and teachers made an effort to include most children. Teaching took place mostly in Hausa with some English. There were not enough teachers to supervise all classes all the time. This was because only two posts were government funded. The head teacher was a volunteer, and was reliant on a low stipend from the community. Most parents were only able to afford N10 per child per week, although those that could not pay were still encouraged to send their children. The other volunteer teacher was not able to come full-time.
52. 16 children had qualified to go to JSS, three of whom were girls. This was the first time a significant number of children from the school had qualified for JSS. However, two older boys from the community who had gone to JSS and were now in senior secondary school, joined the discussion. They said they had not had trouble adjusting from the level of education provided in their primary school to formal secondary school, and that they were happy with the teaching in this school.
53. Children said they did not have books at home. Some children were able to speak basic English. The school was not able to offer art from the full primary curriculum, and did not have the teacher skills to teach more than very basic science. A School Support Officer had visited twice in the term.

#### **Gidan Wanzamai school, Dutse LGEA**

54. This school had scored well in the 2014 nomadic education review, and teaching was observed to be at a consistent level with the 2014 visit. Four government teaching posts had been provided, to fully qualified teachers. Only one teacher was a volunteer. Teaching was more varied and advanced than in Gidan Wanje.



55. Similar amounts of materials and equipment were in evidence. Like Gidan Wanje, several classes were in the open air, with little space for play. The preschool class was in a corrugated iron shelter. Children said they needed more play space and equipment. Latrines and a borehole had been provided.
56. The school had an initial enrolment of 86 pupils (48 boys and 38 girls). At the time of the 2016 visit, 310 children were enrolled (163 girls) with generally good attendance. Girls' attendance was broadly equal to boys. It was expected that all Grade 6 children (approx. 25) would qualify to go on to secondary school. Many of the children, and most of the SSC, were ethnically Hausa. One Fulani boy took part in discussion, and said that he had struggled to understand when he joined school, because Hausa and English was used for teaching. He said that he understood well now, but had markedly lower English skills than the other boys interviewed.
57. The SSC had not planned what to do about getting girls to JSS, as they could not ride bikes to school like boys could, and the community had no vehicle. Again, the SSC was clearly not used to problem-solving in the same way as an SBMC would be.
58. A School Support Officer had visited four times in the term. The difference between this and Gidan Wanje's SSO visits suggests that more remote schools may not be receiving such good support from SSOs.
59. More children were able to speak English confidently, perhaps reflecting the more confident and qualified teaching. Girls reported that several of them had to miss school to go to market once a week. The SSC felt this was a problem only for a few girls, and were not able to suggest any solutions.
60. During the 2014 visit, the head teacher had been encouraged to enrol a hearing impaired boy who could not speak but could use local sign language. On following up, it emerged that the school had not made any efforts to include him. (This is in contrast to another school reviewed in 2014 which had supported a hearing impaired child.) Teacher training on working with children who have disabilities had not been provided, and inclusion of disabled children appeared still to depend on the individual attitudes of teachers and/or headteachers.

## Summary of programme achievements

### Access achievements

| Data Base as at June 2015       |             |             |              |             |             |              |                 |                       |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Category of Schools             | Enrolment   |             |              | Attendance  |             |              | % of Attendance | Remarks               |
|                                 | M           | F           | T            | M           | F           | T            |                 |                       |
| Phase 1 (40 schools)            | 3291        | 3098        | 6389         | 1878        | 1868        | 3746         | 58.63           |                       |
| Phase 2 (50 schools)            | 3178        | 2858        | 6036         | 2120        | 1948        | 4068         | 67.4            |                       |
| <b>Total</b>                    | <b>6469</b> | <b>5956</b> | <b>12425</b> | <b>3998</b> | <b>3816</b> | <b>7814</b>  | <b>62.89</b>    |                       |
| Data Base as at May, 2016       |             |             |              |             |             |              |                 |                       |
| Component                       | Enrolment   |             |              | Attendance  |             |              | % of Attendance | Remarks               |
|                                 | M           | F           | T            | M           | F           | T            |                 |                       |
| ECCDE                           | 1081        | 1027        | 2108         | 871         | 775         | 1646         | 78.08           | phase 1 and 2 schools |
| Primary 1 -6                    | 7478        | 6646        | 14124        | 5151        | 4463        | 9614         | 68.76           | phase 1 and 2 schools |
| <b>Total</b>                    | <b>8559</b> | <b>7673</b> | <b>16232</b> | <b>6022</b> | <b>5238</b> | <b>11260</b> | <b>69.98</b>    |                       |
| Increase in enrolment from June |             |             |              |             |             |              |                 |                       |

Table 1: Enrolment and attendance recorded in Phase 1 and 2 schools, June 2015

61. From the Phase 1 and 2 schools, 522 children (299 boys and 223 girls) sat for 2016 State Common Entrance Examination into JSS and 295 (182 boys and 113 girls) passed and were admitted into JSS across the state. Stakeholders reported that these numbers were much higher than seen previously in these schools.

### Recent progress on quality and sustainability

- 30 out of 40 pilot Phase 1 Community Nomadic Schools achieved takeover by Jigawa State Agency for Nomadic Education.
- 80 nomadic schools have been included in the state School Improvement Programme (SIP) so far (meaning that SSO visits are in place, teacher training is in operation and that SBMC development for SSCs is planned). 50 SSCs have begun SBMC development.
- The State Agency for Nomadic Education and SUBEB have posted about 50 teachers to Nomadic Schools in Phases 1 and 2. Most nomadic schools in the ESSPIN programme have received between two and four fully funded teaching posts, for a mixture of Islamic and Western teaching roles. (Only 11 schools have not, with 8 of them scheduled to receive posts.) However, often these are new teachers rather than transferring existing volunteer teachers to government payroll. This sets up a risk of demotivating local teachers who speak the local language that children need to understand and learn, and have built the trust of the community.
- ANE has committed to take over volunteer teaching allowances for teachers in 40 schools supported by ESSPIN.

- Capacity of 40 preschool Community Teachers enhanced to effective utilisation of SUBEB's Early Childhood Care, Development and Education (ECCDE) curriculum.
- 40 Community Teachers, 5 LGA Coordinators and 9 Zone Coordinators of Nomadic Schools were trained on effective management of 40 ECCDE centres.
- N46,400,000.00 leveraged from state, MDG Office and communities: N24,300,000.00 (state), N18,000,000.00 (MDG Office) N8,100,000.00 (communities) for additional teaching materials, provision of classroom shelters, water points, drugs and first aid kits, repairs of furniture and purchase of land for school expansion.
- MACBAN sensitised and mobilised communities, providing teaching and learning materials worth N350, 000.00.

### Answers to review questions

62. Are standards of education in nomadic schools involved in the ESSPIN-supported upgrade still acceptable?

63. Standards are still variable, but indications are that many schools are operating at a good basic level – good attendance, active engagement of teachers, use of basic child-centred methods and availability of teaching , learning and play materials.

64. There are concerns that not all teachers are working at the standard required to support effective learning for poor and marginalised children in remote communities, particularly girls, children who do not speak Hausa at home, and children with disabilities.

To what extent have improvement recommendations been delivered?

65. Several recommendations to improve sustainability of support to the schools involved in the ESSPIN programme have been implemented.

66. Most recommendations to intensify and upgrade teacher training have not been delivered. However, many of the 90 targeted schools are now involved in SIP and are receiving regular visits from SSOs. There were indications that more remote schools are receiving less frequent visits, and that SSOs are not addressing basic challenges of inclusion. (For example, in Gidan Wanje school, which is more remote, girls seated at the back of classes without teachers apparently having been challenged or supported by the SSO to change this).

67. In addition, ECCD (or rather, preschool) training using UBEC guidelines has been delivered to 55 of the 90 schools, along with ECCD play/learning material kits. These were in active use in the schools visited, with teachers conducting child-friendly early learning and play activities. Young children were not accommodated by classrooms, however, with preschool classes still occupying very cramped space in the open or under basic shelter roofs.

To what extent have sustainability recommendations been delivered?

68. There has been substantial engagement by ESSPIN to encourage SUBEB and ANE to increase funding for teaching posts and school support in 2016 and 2017. However, these improvements are small given the scale of need. ESSPIN does not appear to have been able to deliver significant skills upgrades to ANE staff in terms of planning, budgeting and advocacy capacity, but has conducted ongoing influencing to encourage ANE to be more proactive in promoting the support needs of nomadic schools.

***Upcoming government support plans for nomadic schools***

- Under GPE, 199 schools will receive grants and support to offer ECCD: 14 of these are planned to be nomadic schools.
- Approx. 9 nomadic schools are scheduled to receive school grants under GPE.
- SANE has prepared a budget request for construction of 10 new nomadic schools in 2017.
- 8,000 uniform and sandals sets are scheduled to be distributed by ANE to nomadic schools in 2016, with a further 10,000 planned for 2017.
- In service training of teachers in nomadic schools is planned at the rate of 300 teachers per year.
- ANE is preparing enrolment drives in several nomadic communities for 2016 and 2017.
- SUBEB plans to deliver 10-20 classrooms to nomadic schools per year, with associated renovation, furniture, teaching materials and training.

(Note: 2017 budgets are not yet confirmed.)

What are the prospects for sustaining and expanding improvements to nomadic education in Jigawa?

69. The prospects for integrating the existing 90 target schools into the public education system are very good; integration is almost complete on a number of levels.
70. Further external intervention will be required to make a large-scale change in access to education for children in nomadic areas of Jigawa State. ANE does not have strong advocacy or planning capacity, and resources for strengthening access to education are very limited in Jigawa. Only substantial reordering of Jigawa's GPE plan would lead to large-scale rapid expansion of access to education in remote areas.
71. There is potential for the model of upgrading nomadic schools to be extended more widely in Jigawa states and in other states with dispersed rural populations. An updated draft package of interventions is outlined below.
72. Replicating this model under government management could offer a rapid and cost-effective way to absorb many more children into education.

73. As well as strengthening the model itself, which can be done with relatively little investment, ESSPIN should offer the model to donors and government agencies as a way to rapidly and cost-effectively expand of quality preschool and primary education to remote areas.

74. The model itself is relevant to any remote area where communities are running active informal schools, whether nomadic or not.

What actions need to be taken by ESSPIN and others to maximise the chance of these prospects being delivered?

75. Between August and December 2016, ESSPIN should work with ANE to ensure that the follow-up plan agreed during the review is delivered.

76. In August and September 2016, ESSPIN should promote a proposed package of interventions to expand the upgrading of community schools in nomadic and/or remote areas (see draft below in Section 5). This can be shared with potential donors (such as Educate A Child, the World Bank/GPE, DFID) and potential collaborators such as the National Commission for Nomadic Education.

### Status of 2014 review recommendations for ESSPIN, by end July 2016

(Red/R = Not implemented; Amber/A = partly implemented; Green/G = implemented/in progress)

#### Strengthening teaching practice

| Category   | Recommendation   | RAG    |
|--|--|--------|
| 1. Adequate teacher supply                           | Urgently work with ANE to rationalise existing teacher allocation to schools on the basis of enrolment size. (partly implemented)  | Yellow |
| 2. 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.  | Red    |
|  | 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. | Red    |
|  | 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.  | Red    |
| 3. 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. (partly implemented)  | Yellow |
| 4. Ensuring learning outcomes are being              | Conduct a learning assessment as soon as possible of a sample of Grade 3 and 4 children in ESSPIN-supported nomadic  | Red    |

|           |  |  |
|-----------|--|--|
| delivered | 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

| Category  | Recommendation   | RAG |
|---|--|-----|
| 1. 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.   |     |
| 2. Girls' retention in school                         | As part of SBMC training, ensure that early marriage and access to secondary school are given focus (in progress for mainstreamed schools as part of SBMC rollout).  |     |
| 3. 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); (in progress for mainstreamed schools as part of SBMC rollout).   |     |
|   | 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; (in progress for mainstreamed schools as part of SBMC rollout). |     |

### Including children with disabilities

| Category            | Recommendation   | RAG |
|---------------------|--|-----|
| 1. 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. (in progress) |     |
|                     | ANE should be asked to give strong recognition and encouragement to schools which already include disabled children.   |     |
| 2. 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

| Category                 | Recommendation   | RAG |
|--------------------------|--|-----|
| 1. 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. |     |
| 2. Language of teaching  | 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.  |     |
|                          | 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.  |     |
| 3. Access to text        | Include early reading materials in preschool boxes   |     |
|                          | Engage with ANE and the Agency for Mass Literacy on possibilities for promoting a sustainable supply of text to nomadic communities.   |     |
|                          | Develop a teacher training module on creating text within schools and communities  |     |
|                          | Share readers being developed by ESSPIN's Output 3 with nomadic schools.   |     |

### Responding to community demand

| Category                                    | Recommendation  | RAG |
|---|---|-----|
| 1. Rising preschool enrolment               | Use funds from ESSPIN's Challenge Fund learning materials budget line to provide early learning materials boxes for schools with preschool classes  |     |
|   | Conduct a process of selecting community volunteers to supervise preschool/early learning groups (partly implemented; existing volunteer teachers selected to offer preschool activities) |     |
|   | Liaise with SUBEB and ANE to provide basic training and advice for community preschool volunteers   |     |
| 2. Rapidly growing primary enrolment/demand | 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.                  |     |
|   | 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. (partly                    |     |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | implemented)  |  |
|  | 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.     |  |
|  | 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

| Category                       | Recommendation  | RAG |
|--------------------------------|---|-----|
| 1. ANE capacity                | 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. (partly implemented – through ongoing engagement and 2016 review visit; no dedicated training provided)   |     |
| 2. Planning                    | 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.   |     |
| 3. Resource mobilisation       | 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.  |     |
|                                | 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. (partly implemented) |     |
| 4. Teacher management system   | 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.   |     |
| 5. Community management system | Extend SBMC development training to SSCs, including women's and children's committees (in progress).  |     |
|                                | Continue with delivering SBMC and head teacher leadership training as planned (in progress).  |     |



**SANE task list, nomadic education follow-ups, August 2016**

|    | <b>Aim</b>  | <b>Challenges</b>  | <b>Action</b>  | <b>Who</b>  | <b>When</b> | <b>Date done</b> |
|----|---|--|--|---|-------------|------------------|
| A. | Coordinate with other agencies to ensure all 90 ESSPIN-supported nomadic schools (and as many others as possible) receive support to strengthen access and quality – minimising gaps and duplication with other agencies. | Harmonised budgeting, planning and delivery of basic education for nomadic communities has not been happening since SUBEB Chair changed.<br><br>SANE doesn't know which nomadic schools are scheduled for support from SUBEB and GPE, in order to monitor and advocate for delivery of this support. | 1. Meet Director SUBEB PRS to discuss SANE and SUBEB plans and budgets 2017. Are all nomadic schools included in SIP (teacher training and SBMC development?) How many teaching posts of SUBEB's 4,500 new roles can be allocated to nomadic schools? Are construction plans harmonised? Which trainings etc. should SANE be invited to monitor?<br><br>2. Get all local government nomadic education coordinators to complete intervention matrix. Ensure this is updated termly, and follow up on any problems.<br><br>3. Meet Director SUBEB PRS to check matrix against GPE target lists: should more nomadic schools be included in grants, cash transfers, scholarships? | Director PRS<br>SANE (involve Director Schools)<br><br>Director Schools, SANE<br><br>Director PRS<br>SANE(with Dir Schools) | 2017        |                  |
| B. | Promote the ESSPIN/SANE model of upgrading remote nomadic community schools, to increase chances of future funding for more schools   | SANE is not on GPE Access Technical Working Group, so is missing opportunity to promote the nomadic schools upgrade model as a cost-effective way to increase access.<br><br>Donor agencies are not aware of the success and potential of the nomadic schools upgrade model                          | 1. Talk to the chairman of GPE technical working groups to decide who in SANE should be on the Access group.<br><br>2. Ask that person to share documents and information (e.g. ESSPIN report) with the working group<br><br>3. Take up discussion with SUBEB GPE leads on whether there is any chance to increase funding for reaching more nomadic schools before the 2017 GPE workplan is finalised.<br><br>+   | Executive Sec<br>SANE<br><br>Executive Sec<br>SANE<br><br>Director PRS<br>SANE,<br>Executive Sec<br>SANE                    | 2017        |                  |

|    | <b>Aim</b>  | <b>Challenges</b>   | <b>Action</b>  | <b>Who</b>  | <b>When</b>    | <b>Date done</b> |
|----|---|---|--|---|----------------|------------------|
|    |   | +<br>National Committee on Nomadic Education is not being sufficiently mobilised  | 4. Arrange to meet NCNE, share documents (e.g. ESSPIN report) and request direct help as well as help to promote nomadic education in Jigawa to donors/IDPs.   | Executive Secretary SANE  |                |                  |
| C. | Prepare data so that scaleup can happen quickly if funds arise  | SANE doesn't know how many more nomadic schools are viable to receive support   | 1. If ESSPIN support is available, collaborate with ESSPIN to produce nomadic school viability survey: identify active schools in remote areas needing support.  | DPRS SANE, Dir Schools, SANE, ESSPIN  | 2017           |                  |
| D. | Deploy nomadic youth graduating from secondary school to inspire students, and develop the nomadic teaching force | Many nomadic secondary school leavers are unemployed, discouraging younger students. Teachers are badly needed. Offer them teaching assistant experience and facilitate their entry to formal teacher training. | 1. Compile list of secondary school graduates willing to become teachers: gender, location and credits gained.<br><br>2. Develop strategies to set up voluntary teaching assistants and give them local training (using ESSPIN materials?), plus access to formal teacher training. (5 credits; NCE; 3 credits; PTP*?) | MACBAN VC; give to DPRS + Dir Schools<br><br>Dir Schools, Exec Sec, MACBAN VC | 2017           |                  |
| E  | Seek more State support for volunteer teaching allowances: at least 170 teachers urgently need support.           | A memo was submitted to the Ministry for the previous Commissioner but no action was taken  | Update memo requesting State allowances of N10,000 for (how many?) nomadic volunteer teachers, and resubmit for the new Commissioner to consider (as well as sharing ESSPIN report with Commissioner)  | Exec Sec SANE, with advice from Ministry                                      | 2017           |                  |
| F  | Maximise support from ESSPIN before closure in December 2016.   |   | Fortnightly meetings to track progress and problem-solve.  | SANE (all available staff); ESSPIN (Abubakar Nashabaru)                       | Until Dec 2016 |                  |

**\*PTTP: Pivotal Teacher Training Programme delivered by local NTI training institutions**

### 5. ESSPIN nomadic/remote community education upgrade model : outline of package of interventions for future scale-up

| Intervention (in chronological order)   | Cost element  | Intended results  |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Baseline survey</b> to identify community schools far from formal school where communities are actively supporting teaching and learning. Record enrolment by gender, mother tongue and disability. Record rate of transition to JSS, m and f. Record teacher gender, qualifications, skills (including languages spoken) and current remuneration from community. Record infrastructure types (structures, water, sanitation) and quality (floor; roof; proportion of children educated outside; access to toilet/latrine; access to safe play space). Record teaching and learning materials available in school. Conduct baseline learning assessments of children in representative sample of schools, against primary ed. benchmarks.   | State to develop cost   | Communities prioritised to receive support; programme baseline set.   |
| <b>Year 1 begins: Community orientation.</b> Conduct sensitisation and negotiate programme entry with high-priority communities. Arrange enrolment campaign. Revise budget to take account of actual travel costs for monitoring, training and mentoring to selected communities. Agree curriculum and timetables.  | State to develop cost   | Enrolment expands (c.200 ch/ school Yr 1; 50/50 m/f)  |
| <b>Begin flexible education pilot.</b> Negotiate for a minority of schools to offer additional flexible education for primary school age children who are required to undertake livestock rearing full-time. Evening classes should be offered (minimum of 2.5 hours, minimum 4 days a week.) The curriculum and teaching/learning materials should be condensed by an accelerated education expert (Save the Children can source experts), who should produce an additional teacher training scheme and materials. Curriculum should include practical skills. SSCs should support children's attendance (inc. using a rota to see them home safe at night if necessary). Qualification criteria: family has already put 2 (or 70%) of their school age children into the formal school programme. For single caregivers, 1 or 50% of children are already in the formal programme. Baseline learning assessment to be given and assessed against according to the revised curriculum. | Volunteer teacher allowance (2 teachers part-time)/sch:<br>Expert condensing of curriculum: c.3000 GPB<br>T training and materials:<br>Teaching and learning materials: | 30-60? working children in x schools access a minimal level of accelerated education: they will be monitored and supported to take up full time learning opportunities. |
| Institute <b>volunteer teacher allowances</b> for all teachers able to guarantee full-time attendance (minimum four per school). Sliding scale of payment depending on level of education and qualifications. To qualify for allowances, teachers should demonstrate full-time attendance and implementation of training (to be monitored by zonal coordinators.)   | State to develop cost   | Teachers attend and teach full-time. Teacher/pupil ratio: minimum 1/50.   |
| <b>Revise and expand teacher training package.</b> To ensure consistent quality of teaching, the ESSPIN nomadic teacher training package will need to be updated and expanded. Teachers should receive training once per month for the first year (unless they already have NCE, in which case three-monthly training should be sufficient.) After the first year, two years' quarterly training after the first year should be provided. After that, integration into SIP should have taken place (see below). Proposed additional topics for initial and ongoing nomadic teacher training:  | State to develop cost   | Teachers are quickly able to deliver quality, inclusive teaching, tailored to nomadic/remote community needs.   |

| Intervention (in chronological order)   | Cost element  | Intended results   |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (If not already in ESSPIN package) Leadership and reporting for headteachers</li> <li>• (if not already in ESSPIN package) Multigrade and multi-class teaching and supervision</li> <li>• Developing children's mother tongue to maximise understanding and capacity for second language (including multiple mother tongues in one class) – will require regular and ongoing training</li> <li>• Supporting children's literacy and numeracy in nomadic communities</li> <li>• Delivering complementary, child-friendly Islamic and Western education</li> <li>• Gender-sensitive, protective and girl-friendly teaching in nomadic communities</li> <li>• How to support children with visual, hearing and learning impairments</li> </ul>  |   | <p><i>(NB: given low levels of parental literacy in remote communities, intensive inputs to teaching are essential to ensure that children achieve.)</i></p> |
| <p><b>Teacher orientation and training.</b> Begin a one-year programme of training teachers already working in schools, through monthly teacher training sessions in LGA centres. Base the training on upgraded version of the ESSPIN nomadic teacher training package (see below). Deliver training in the local language of trainees, not English. All teachers in each school must attend training, even if this requires offering duplicate trainings at different times. Ensure teachers have detailed teaching guides to take away with them from each session.</p> <p>NB: All volunteer teachers working full-time at schools should receive all training inputs, whether or not they are being paid by the programme/government.</p>  | <p>X teachers covered per local training (c.4-6 per school).<br/> Venue &amp; facilitation cost per centre:<br/> Materials:<br/> Transport &amp; subsistence:<br/> x 12 (months):</p>   | <p>As above.</p>   |
| <p>Distribute initial package of <b>teaching and learning materials</b> (using existing ESSPIN/SUBEB package), and arrange ongoing distribution of more materials through ANE and SUBEB. This should include preschool/ECCD materials and toys, and a box of free reading materials in Fulfulde, Hausa and English.</p> <p>Reading materials should be used to form a school library, to be supplemented by future SSC/SBMC resource mobilisation. It may be necessary to work with SUBEB and publishers to develop new reading materials in Fulfulde and Hausa. At a minimum, books should be translated into Fulfulde and Hausa from English/Hausa. Adaptation of texts and images to local culture and norms will be necessary, rather than straight translation only. Working with local Fulani and Hausa cultural organisations to record stories/folktales etc. appropriate for children in print is recommended.</p> | <p>Set of school T/L materials (textbooks, chalk, posters, exercise books, planners and record books, pens/pencils):<br/> Set of school play/free learning materials (balls etc):<br/> Reading material devt/translation:<br/> Print &amp; production</p> | <p>Teachers are supported with relevant teaching and learning materials straight away.</p>   |

| Intervention (in chronological order)   | Cost element  | Intended results  |
|---|---|---|
|   | reading materials:<br>Set of ECCD/preschool materials:<br>Distribution:   |   |
| <b>School Support Committee setup.</b> Organise selection/election of committee members (at least 5 women), and deliver local orientation based on ESSPIN Nomadic School Support Committee materials. Zonal coordinators to attend and mentor SSC meetings.   | Initial orientation cost:<br>Zonal coordinator travel costs:  | Communities promote attendance and school resourcing.                         |
| <b>Select, train and mentor zonal and local nomadic education coordinators</b> (using ESSPIN training package?) Ensure they complete, update and send intervention matrix of planned support to schools at least termly. Ensure local coordinators follow up on any challenges/gaps at local level, and flag problems to be dealt with at State level with ANE/SUBEB. Train coordinators to report changes in enrolment, disaggregated by gender and disability, and to report against key baseline indicators. | Orientation per local centre:<br>Monitoring visit costs per local area:<br>Materials:                             | Progress is monitored and challenges are rapidly addressed.                   |
| <b>Classroom / shelter construction</b> takes place. Costs should be shared between the programme and relevant government agencies. Community contributions to materials and labour to be coordinated by SSCs and zonal coordinators.   | N300,000-400,000 per classroom. Minimum 4 per school: N1,600,000.   | Teaching quality, safety and retention are boosted.                           |
| <b>Furniture distribution</b> takes place. Costs should be shared between the programme and relevant government agencies. Community contributions to materials and labour to be coordinated by SSCs and zonal coordinators.   | Set of seating mats:<br><br>Set of desks and chairs:<br><br>First aid kit:<br><br>Water equipment (kettles etc.): | Teaching quality, safety and retention are boosted.                           |
| <b>Water/sanitation construction</b> takes place. Budget to be shared between programme and relevant State agencies. Community contributions to materials and labour to be coordinated by SSCs and zonal coordinators.  | Set of gender-segregated, accessible latrines per school:<br>Borehole per school:                                 | Children (especially girls) use toilets and water safely, boosting retention. |
| <b>Uniform distribution</b> Coordinate with SUBEB, ES's and other providers to ensure uniform and sandal distribution to schools, based on SSCs' estimates of need, and prioritising girls.   | x (100?) sets uniform & sandals / school:   | Retention of poorest ch. & girls boosted.                                     |
| <b>End Year 1: conduct learning assessment against baseline.</b> Redesign programme to address learning   | Assessment (sample or   | Learning is   |

| Intervention (in chronological order)   | Cost element  | Intended results   |
|---|---|--|
| gaps/challenges. Assessment method should be appropriate for international standards.   | all schools?):  | comparable with standard schools.  |
| <b>Year 2: Finalise scheduling of schools for inclusion in Annual School Census and SIP.</b> Ensure that planned dates of SSO visits, SSIT training for teachers and SBMC development trainings and visits are entered on local intervention matrix.  | No programme cost: advocacy will be needed to ensure that costs of expanding SIP to these schools are budgeted annually by ANE and SUBEB (including contracting of local CSOs for CGP).   | SSCs become SBMCs, boosting enrolment and resource mobilisation. Teachers get full capacity support from State teacher dev. system.  |
| <p><b>Review teacher numbers and add to teaching force.</b></p> <p>Volunteer teachers with NCE will need to be transitioned onto the government payroll. (advocacy and planning/budgeting for this will need to have begun at the start of the programme, so that salaries are in place by the beginning of Year 2.)</p> <p>Nomadic headteachers with diplomas who have completed Year 1 training should be prioritised for state payroll status. If NCE is required, headteachers should receive programme support to complete NCE to qualify.</p> <p>An additional volunteer teaching post allowance should be paid by the programme for all schools where enrolment and attendance are at 200 or more children.</p> <p>Interested secondary school graduates from nomadic communities should be deployed as junior teaching assistants (not paid from programme initially). An adapted monthly training programme should be delivered for them. CSOs and other agencies should work to help them access teacher training qualifications.</p> | <p>Cost of 1 full payroll teaching post per school (SUBEB):</p> <p>Cost of 1 NCE transition process for each volunteer headteacher with diploma:</p> <p>Cost of 1 additional volunteer teacher allowance per school:</p> <p>Cost of trainings for junior teaching assistants:</p> | <p>Retention of volunteer teachers is boosted by transferring to government payroll.</p> <p>Additional volunteer teaching posts reduce pupil/t ratio to 1:40 and expand number of classes with a single teacher.</p> |
| <b>Deliver additional teacher training and mentoring</b> sessions specifically for nomadic schools: every three months, for a further two years. This should include repeats of the initial teacher training sessions at regular intervals for new teachers (including qualified, government-posted teachers).  | X teachers covered per local training.<br>Venue & facilitation cost per centre:   | Teaching capacity is consolidated and upgraded.  |

| Intervention (in chronological order)   | Cost element  | Intended results   |
|---|---|--|
|   | Materials:<br>Transport &<br>subsistence:<br><br>x 2 x 4 (quarterly):   |  |
| <p><b>Programme monitoring and advocacy.</b> Frequent engagement with all government and civil society agencies to promote collaboration, cost sharing, forward-planning and budgeting will be needed. Capacity development for monitoring, data analysis, problem-solving, planning and resource projection will be essential.</p> | minimum 3 capacity development workshops, 20 people, x 3 years:<br><br>Data analysis and research to produce minimum 2 review and learning reports per year, x 3 years:<br><br>School monitoring visits and official meeting costs: |  |
| <p><b>Repeat annual cycle for one further year, before handing schools over fully to government.</b></p>  |   | c. 300 children x ? schools now accessing quality preschool and primary education within State system. |



## **Features of the proposed model**

### **Rapid, low-cost infrastructure expansion to absorb enrolment**

77. It costs N4.5 million to build a two-classroom block in a nomadic community school according to standard SUBEB approaches. It makes sense for nomadic and remote community schools to be scheduled for such support as state resources become available. But it is unlikely that such resources will be available in time to educate thousands of children before they grow past primary school age. Based on ESSPIN's experience so far, it is likely that many nomadic community schools at present are only able to offer wattle and daub or corrugated iron shelters which create too much heat and offer too little light for quality learning.
78. Given that even 4 four low-cost classrooms are only likely to absorb about half of the available school-aged population in the average target community, there is no risk of duplication of resources if low-cost classrooms based on the ESSPIN shelter model were to be set up rapidly to absorb a large amount of children initially, with additional 'full formal' classrooms were then provided over a longer time period to provide upper grade classrooms as children progress.

### **Rapid expansion of teacher numbers from part-time to full-time in remote communities**

### **Rapid and effective upgrading of teaching capacity and materials to deliver a standard of preschool and primary education comparable to formal schools**

### **Expands education access and quality through building on strong community demand and ownership**

79. Closeness to children's homes in areas of strong community commitment to formal education are key to the approach. 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, are important factors in the success of the approach.

### **Strong sustainability and scalability**

80. Upgrading and revitalising schools' infrastructure and quality of teaching has been shown to increase enrolment and leverage investment from other agencies.
81. Schools will be on the Annual School Census from the beginning of Year 2, ensuring they are recognised as part of the basic education system.
82. Once the initial three-year intensive period of upgrading is complete, targeted schools can be expanded and integrated into ongoing government structures and budgets to further extend enrolment and strengthen learning quality. However, by the end of the first three years all schools should be meeting standards of education provision comparable to a good rural primary school.

**Additional pilot features to ensure that education is flexible and acceptable to the needs of nomadic communities and children**

## References

Fawson, J. (2013) Impact Assessment of Challenge Fund in Six States, Abuja: ESSPIN

Pinnock, H. (2014) Qualitative Review of ESSPIN's Support to Nomadic Schools in Jigawa State. Abuja: ESSPIN

SUBEB (2014) Survey Report For Out-Of-School Children In Jigawa State, Nigeria. Abuja: ESSPIN/SUBEB

## **Annex 1: Messages for nomadic teachers in Jigawa who speak Fulani language**

For the whole of preschool and primary education, it is important to teach mostly in children's mother tongue (for Fulani children, Fulfulde language; for Hausa children, Hausa language).

This is because evidence from all over the globe says that if you speak your mother tongue well, you will have a much better chance of learning other languages. Your mother tongue (the language a child speak most often with their parents from birth) is usually the language in which you think. Educating children mostly in this language is important, so that they can understand as easily as possible.

How can a teacher do this, when some children in a nomadic school speak Fulfulde and some speak Hausa as their mother tongue?

1. When speaking to an individual child, always use their mother tongue. This will make sure they understand you quickly and easily without getting confused.
2. Never use Hausa or English that is new, without introducing the meaning of what you are going to say in Fulfulde.
3. This means that as a teacher you will need to be aware of what language you have already introduced to children, and what language you haven't.
4. You could write lists of vocabulary in each of the three languages that you will introduce each week. English words should be very few at first, to allow children time to develop their most familiar languages well. There will be plenty of time to increase English vocabulary later.
5. New ideas and words should be introduced using the children's mother tongue – both Fulfulde and Hausa, if necessary. Then, basic vocabulary for the same ideas can be introduced in Hausa and English. This might mean that you need to mark different sections of your lesson plan with different languages.
6. Always encourage children to speak freely in their mother tongue – to you and to other people. You can prompt children to respond to questions in the language which you know to be their mother tongue.
7. Always try to increase the types and functions of language which children use, particularly in Fulfulde in Hausa. Children should frequently be asked to describe things; to express their opinions, likes and dislikes; to give reasons for their opinions; and to chat freely amongst their peers.
8. If a child is shy or does not like to speak, it is very likely that they need help to develop their mother tongue. This is not a sign that the child lacks intelligence.

## **Annex 2: Sample questions asked in focus group discussions**

### **A. 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?

### **B. Interview with School Support Committees and parents in nomadic schools (including women members, head teacher and Committee chair)**

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

### **Annex 3: School visit assessment criteria**

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

1. 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.
2. 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)
3. 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?
4. Is there demand among stakeholders for sustaining and replicating ESSPIN's model of upgrading schools?
5. To what extent were schools capable of sustaining quality services from this point?
6. To what extent are government and school communities currently capable of expanding and sustaining ESSPIN's model of nomadic school improvement after ESSPIN closes?
7. Was there any unexpected impact or unmet demands from school communities involved in the programme of support?

#### **C. Information observed to make an assessment of school performance against success criteria:**

##### ***Observable in school environment***

- Toilet accessible to children (inc disabled)
- clean water supply accessible to children
- teachers do not carry sticks in school
- children's work displayed in school/in class
- structures safe and clean, with sufficient light

- language of textbooks – any in 1<sup>st</sup> language?
- content of textbooks in terms of nomadic culture and life
- availability of reading materials in 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> language
- content of reading materials in terms of nomadic culture and life

***Observable from lesson observation***

- extent to which active and differentiated learning methods in use
- extent to which teachers use children's 1<sup>st</sup> language
- extent to which teachers use clear, simple language if 2<sup>nd</sup> language
- extent to which teachers engage all the class, esp girls and any disabled children
- level of attendance (check against expected numbers.)

***Reported teacher behaviour***

- teachers not beating children / not being cruel to children
- teachers attend on time and do not miss days
- teachers willing to work with girls
- teachers willing to work with disabled children

***Reported school management***

- timing of school hours in relation to expressed community needs
- eating or drinking while at school
- engagement with parents and SSC from HT and teachers

***Reported SSC behaviour***

- monitoring teachers
- supporting attendance of most excluded
- raising external support needs
- mobilising community resources for school improvement
- seeking children's views
- seeking women's views

***Other support given to school***

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