

# **School Improvement Plan and Its Implementation**



Tribhuvan University  
Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development  
Tripureshwar, Kathmandu, Nepal  
July 2003

## STUDY TEAM

**Hari Prasad Upadhyaya**  
**Jaya Ram Thapa**

Researcher  
Research Assistant

**Dr. Shreeram Lamichhane**  
**Dr. Satis Ojha**  
**Hari Lamsal**  
**Dhruva Raj Regmi**  
**Ram Shorup Sinnha**

Resource Person  
Resource Person  
Resource Person  
Resource Person  
Resource Person

**Veda Nath Regmi**

Report Editor

**Bishnu Bikram Giri**  
**Basu Raj Giri**  
**Bhakta Bahadur Shrestha**

Secretarial Support  
Secretarial Support  
Secretarial Support

---

### **Formative Research Project, CERID**

Coordinator: Dr. Bijaya Kumar Thapa  
Associate Researcher: Mr. Rom Prasad Bhattarai

Project Advisor: Dr. Hridaya Ratna Bajracharya

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Decentralization was introduced after the restoration of democracy in the country to involve local people and organizations in the planning, management and implementation of local development affairs. In line with this reform process, BPEP II implemented the School Improvement Plan as a pilot programme in selected districts for the purpose of increasing the level of the participation of grassroots people and organizations in local education development and enhancing the pace of quality improvement of primary schools. Formulation of such plan was necessary also for the development funding of the schools in these districts. As a result, each school in each pilot district developed a periodic education plan, i. e. School Improvement Plan.

This report is an outcome of the study on School improvement Plan and its Implementation. The study reviews different facets of the plan, and attempts to examine its development and implementation processes. I hope the findings and action steps suggested in this report will prove useful for improving and strengthening educational planning and its implementation in the schools.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to DOE and DEO staff members, SMCs, teachers, members of local bodies and others for the kind cooperation they extended to me for this study. I would also like to thanks Prof. B. R. Shakya and Prof. G. M. Shrestha for providing their constructive suggestions during the study. Special thanks go to CERID for giving me the privilege to conduct this research.

*July 2003*

Hari Prasad Upadhyaya  
Researcher

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Chapters</i>	<i>Page</i>
Acknowledgement	
Abbreviations Used	
Executive Summary	
Introduction	
School Improvement Plan and Its Development	
Design of School Improvement Plan	
Contents of School Improvement Plan	
Implementation of School Improvement Plan	
Resource Mobilization and Resource Availability	
Monitoring of School Improvement Plan	
Major Findings, Conclusions and Action Steps	
Bibliography	
Annexes	
A. Roles and Responsibilities (Education) of Local Bodies	
B. Roles and Responsibilities of Village Education Committee	
C. Vision from Mid-Term Review (17-22 March 2002)	
D. Contents of SIP Training Package	
E. Observation of Training Program	
F. SIP-based Development Program: implementation Guidelines	
G. Content of SIP	
H. Programmes Proposed in VEPs (Partnership Program) in 2059/60	
I. Thematic Summary	

## LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table No.</i>	<i>Heads</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
2.1	District, RC and Schools Covered under Piloting of SIP	
3.1	Programmes Proposed in VEPs (Partnership Program)	
5.1	Programmes Implemented by Pilot Schools in 2001/02	
5.2	Programmes Implemented by Other Schools in 2001/02	
6.1	Resources for SIP and Development Activities of Pilot Schools in 2001/02	
6.2	Resources for SIP and Development Activities of Other Schools in 2001/02	
6.3	Fund Allocated by Waling Municipality	
7.1	Thematic Summary	

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

ASIP	Annual Strategic Implementation Plan
BPEP II	Basic and Primary Education Program
CBO	Community-based Organization
CMS	Community Managed School(s)
DDC	District Development Committee
DEC	District Education Committee
DEP	District Education Plan
DEO	District Education Officer
DOE	Department of Education
EFA	Education for All
EMIS	Education Management Information System
GER	Gross Enrolment Rate
GO	Government Organizations
HM	Headmaster
HMG	His Majesty's Government
HNEC	Higher Level National Education Commission
INGO	International Non-government Organizations
LSS	Lower Secondary School(s)
MEP	Municipal Education Plan
MOES	Ministry of Education and Sports
MTR	Mid-term Review
NER	Net Enrolment Rate
NGO	Non-Government Organization
PIP	Project Implementation Plan
PS	Primary School(s)
RC	Resource Centre
<b>RP</b>	<b>Resource Person</b>
SIP	School Improvement Plan
SMC	School Managing Committee
SS	Secondary School(s)
VDC	Village Development Committee
VEC	Village Education Committee
VEP	Village Education Plan

## TABLE OF CONTENT

Title	Page
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Chapter I Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Background</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Objectives</i>	<i>2</i>
Research Procedure	2
<i>Document Analysis</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Selection of District, School and Respondents</i>	<i>3</i>
Coverage of the Study	3
Observation of School and School Minutes, Letters, etc.	3
Observation of Training Programmes	3
<i>Preparation and Use of the Tools</i>	<i>4</i>
Discussion Guidelines	4
<i>Interview Schedules</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Field level Workshop</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Data Analysis Procedure</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>Chapter II School Improvement Plan and Its Development</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Focus of SIP</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Education Policy and School Improvement Plan</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Reflections</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Evolution of SIP Process</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Piloting of SIP</i>	<i>7</i>
Capacity Building for SIP Planning	7
Funding Arrangements	8
Implementation of SIP	9
<i>Reflections</i>	<i>10</i>
<b>Chapter III Design of School Improvement Plan</b>	<b>11</b>
<i>Necessity of SIP (as conceived by local stakeholders)</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Design of the SIP</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Planning Capacity Development</i>	<i>12</i>
Training Package	12
<i>Reflections:</i>	<i>13</i>
Training Program Operation	13
<i>Process of SIP Preparation</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Stakeholders Involvement</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Technical Soundness</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Data Support</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Formalization</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Reflections</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>SIP, VEP and DEP</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Reflections</i>	<i>18</i>
<b>Chapter IV Contents of School Improvement Plan</b>	<b>19</b>
<i>Contents of SIP</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Background of SIP</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Issues and Problems</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Vision and Objectives</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Program and Strategies</i>	<i>20</i>
Indicators and Targets	20
Sources of Funding	20
Coverage and Focus	21
Focus of Women and Disadvantaged Group	21

Community Mobilization	21
Monitoring and Reporting	21
<i>EMIS Support</i>	22
<i>Reflections</i>	22
<i>Focus of SIP in 2002/03</i>	23
<i>Reflections</i>	24
<b>Chapter V Implementation of School Improvement Plan</b>	<b>24</b>
<i>Programmes Implemented by Pilot Schools</i>	24
<i>Programmes Implemented by Other Schools</i>	27
<i>Reflections</i>	29
<b>Chapter VI Resources Mobilization and Resource Availability</b>	<b>30</b>
<i>Funding Process</i>	30
<i>Availability of Funds</i>	31
<i>Reflections</i>	33
<i>Involvement of Local Bodies</i>	33
<i>Reflections</i>	34
VDC Partnership Program	35
<i>Reflections</i>	35
<b>Chapter VII Monitoring of School Improvement Plan</b>	<b>36</b>
<i>Reflections</i>	38
SUMMARY	39
<b>Chapter VIII Major Findings, Conclusion and Action Steps</b>	<b>40</b>
<i>Findings</i>	40
<i>Conclusion</i>	46
Suggested Action Steps	46
<i>Bibliography</i>	47
<b>Annex A Roles and Responsibilities (Education) of Local Bodies</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Annex B Roles and Responsibilities of Village Education Committee</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Annex C Visions from Mid-Term Review (17-22 March 2002)</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Annex D Contents of SIP Training Package</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Annex E Observation of Training Program</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Annex F SIP-based Development Program: Implementation Guidelines</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Annex G Contents of SIP</b>	<b>65</b>



## **Executive Summary**

### **Background**

With a view to implement decentralization reform process in education, Basic and Primary Education Program (BPEP II) started piloting the School Improvement Plan (SIP) in five districts as bottom-up planning through the micro planning process for the planning, management and implementation of educational programmes. SIP implementation is, of course, an effort to translate the vision of decentralization into action. In this context, planning and implementation responsibility was shifted to the local school and local community to ensure the effort for reform. All the schools in the pilot districts developed their SIPs. However, schools of only one Resource Centre were covered in the first year and funds were made available to these schools through local bodies. In the following year, the SIP process covered all the schools of the pilot districts. The process is still in operation.

### **Objective**

The main objective of this activity was to study the nature and extent of people's participation in the planning, management and implementation of basic and primary education at the local level. The specific objectives were:

- to review the policy commitment and legal framework related to SIP
- to study the status of SIP design and implementation
- to review the contents of SIP
- to study the resource availability and resource mobilization for SIP
- to review the monitoring mechanism for SIP implementation
- to highlight the evolution of SIP process under BPEP II
- to suggest appropriate elements/contents of SIP (if necessary).

### **Research Procedure**

- Along with a review of the concept of decentralization, attempts were made to highlight the nation's efforts for promoting decentralized planning and implementation process in the education sector.
- Research reports prepared on SIP as such and SIPs of selected schools were reviewed.
- Field data were collected from the districts of Chitwan, Syangja and Dadeldhura. In those districts, discussions were made with the DEOs and School Supervisors, Resource Persons, Primary Education Unit Chief (Districts), HMs and Teachers, SMC members, Executive Officer of Municipality, Secretary of VDCs, parents and selected NGOs.
- School Minutes, Supervision Diary, letters and related documents were observed at the field.
- Training Programmes arranged for the Master Trainers, Trainers and grassroots level (HMs, SMC chairpersons) were observed in Syangja and Chitwan districts.
- Discussion was held with the central level staff members.

- Field level workshops were arranged in Syangja and Chitwan districts.
- The data gathered were analyzed qualitatively. As the nature of the data was unquantifiable, a discussion on the theme was made.

### **Findings**

1. In line with the commitment to implement decentralization in education, SIP has been regarded and followed as a major decentralization reform measure to improve school affairs at the policy level.
2. SIPs have only been informally discussed by SMCs; hence, it is difficult to develop ownership of SIPs.
3. SIP initiated planning exercises at the school level; hence, it is expected to promote bottom-up planning for school improvement.
4. As the training programme has little impact on enhancing planning skill at the school level, it appears that SIP preparation lacks necessary expertise.
5. The SIP implementation process has become instrumental in the involvement of local bodies, especially Waling Municipality, in local educational affairs.
6. SIP did not appear to be the only programme for the overall improvement of school problems.
7. Time factor was little considered while initiating the SIP process; hence, SIP implementation suffers from mismanagement of time.
8. Centrally designed models were being used for the planning and implementation of SIP process.
9. SIP was guided by the components of BPEP II rather than by the local ideas and strategies.
10. SIP process still requires to address the needs of women and the disadvantaged.
11. SIP focuses more on physical facility development, and that too of the primary school.
12. As SIP also included programmes that did not require any fund for its operation, it has less financial implication.
13. SIP implementation depended largely upon government resources.
14. Prompt communication still lacks between centre and district, between district and RC, and between RC and school.
15. Monitoring of the SIP process has not received due attention because it has not been institutionalized yet.
16. Some aspects such as funding, implementation and monitoring still need consolidation for the piloting of SIP process.
17. As quality and school-specific programmes were stressed in the second year, SIP gradually evolved as quality-focused and school-centred development plan.
18. Formulation of technically sound SIP has become the concern of all in the second year of SIP implementation.

### *Suggested Action Steps*

1. Insist on SIP as a basis for reform endeavours in education.
2. Adopt SIP as an official document through discussion and approval in SMC.
3. Institutionalize SIP at the school level by fostering closer proximity between the school and the community.
4. Develop a manual, precise, simple and contributory to enhance local stakeholders' skills and competencies necessary for school development efforts.
5. Encourage local bodies, especially DDC and Municipality, to be on lead in mobilizing resources and expertise for educational reform.
6. Make SIP a basis of funding for all development programmes of school.
7. Prioritize time element for the design and implementation of all reform programmes.
8. Replace the cascade or centrally designed model of SIP implementation by school-based approach.
9. Make interactive and participatory process the major focus of SIP implementation.
10. Make SIP gender and disadvantaged sensitive.
11. Stress integrated SIP so that it covers all the levels and problems of the school.
12. Activate the Rural Education Development Fund so that the school could get development funds regularly.
13. Convey messages timely to the district and grassroots level so that they could get information on time and make necessary adjustments in their programmes and strategies.
14. Institutionalize local monitoring and make it flexible so that the performance of schools could be monitored in the schools' own contexts.
15. Emphasize periodic reviews of school activities in SMC meetings.
16. Provide the inputs envisaged for SIP in time and continue the implementing strategies adopted for a reasonable period of time.



## **Chapter I Introduction**

### **Background**

The need for the decentralization in Nepal is not just an option for the policy reform; it is increasingly being necessitated by the circumstances, both local and international. Since the restoration of democracy in the country, the people have been urging for more information, greater accountability, access to the resources, better feeling of ownership and control in the governance and development process. As communication between centre and scattered localities throughout the country is not as smooth as the countries having adequate infrastructure, uniform policy measure does not work and have impact on local affairs. Therefore, local autonomy has become necessary to avoid delays in decision-making. Similarly, the diversities existing in the people and places, in culture and tradition, in geography and economy are not conducive enough for the centre to circulate its directives for everything and thereby not possible for it to engage in local affairs. In fact, democracy sustains only when the people themselves involve in shaping their lives and destiny and defining their own course of actions. In order to strengthen democracy and consolidate development efforts from the base, people's sovereignty in public affairs is essential. This becomes possible if the people's needs and aspirations are reflected in the policy and development discourse. It therefore calls for the growth of local leadership and entrepreneurship, and increased people's participation in grassroots matters including local governance. Decentralization reform process, no doubt, creates a base for opting policy for devolving power, responsibility and resources to the local units of self-governance, paves the way for involving grassroots people and organizations in the unit of governance, and unfold avenues for their self-development.

Keeping in view the significance of decentralization in the participatory democracy, the country has taken initiatives towards implementing the decentralization policy reform process. In the 9th Plan, emphasis had been laid on capacity building, self-governance and making local bodies accountable to the local people in matters of delivery of services. Commitment was made to introduce decentralization for enhancing local participation in the management and operation of educational institutes and for transferring the management of the schools to the local bodies. The Local Self-Governance Act 1998 was brought into force with the objectives: to provide opportunity to the people for sharing the benefits of democracy by involving in the process of governance, to increase the participation of the disadvantaged and ethnic minorities in the process of development, and to build local capability in planning and implementation of the programmes at the local level. The Act has made VDCs and Municipalities responsible for developing, managing and supervising the basic and primary education programmes on-going within their territories and DDCs for shaping policies and strategies regarding the operation of educational programmes in the districts. Similarly, the seventh amendment in the Education Act has empowered SMCs by giving them authority in decision-making. The Act also emphasizes the importance and role of the Village Education Committee (VEC) and authorized it to look after the educational activities of the schools in the VDC. In the 10th Plan, the government has reiterated its commitment that decentralization policy reform will be continued and that local bodies and local community will be involved in the planning, management and operation of the educational programmes at the

local level. All these indicate that the government attempts to shift the management responsibilities of the schools to the local bodies and communities.

However, it is equally important to empower the local bodies and communities and enhance their capabilities before responsibilities are transferred to them. For the purpose, BPEP II has emphasized local capacity building from its very initiation. Efforts were made to equip local bodies and SMC members with appropriate training and resources for the planning, management and operation of the educational programmes at the local level. As per the 9th plan, BPEP II intends to implement the decentralization reform process in basic and primary education for efficiency in the operation of the programmes and strives to involve local people and organizations in planning, management and implementation of the programmes. For the purpose, BPEP II has supported for the design of the school improvement plan (SIP) and assured a certain funds for its implementation. As a matter of fact, BPEP II has adopted strategy for promoting bottom-up planning based on SIPs and VEPs through participatory and micro-planning process. And SIP has been implemented for piloting in five districts. During the Mid-term Review of BPEP II (March 2002), the Mission showed concern for decentralization of the planning and management in education and stressed the preparation of SIP and its tie with the development programmes. In this context, it is essential to make a review of the SIP process for identifying problems during the design and implementation so that SIP could be improved in achieving its objectives in particular and advancement of basic and primary education in the country in general. Based on it, this study was carried out with the following objectives:

### **Objectives**

The main objective of this activity was to study the nature and extent of people's participation in the planning, management and implementation of the basic and primary education at the local level so that appropriate strategy may be implemented to promote bottom-up planning. The specific objectives were:

- to review the policy commitment and legal framework related to SIP
- to study the status of SIP design and implementation
- to review the contents of SIP
- to study the resource availability and resource mobilization for SIP
- to review the monitoring mechanism for SIP implementation,
- to highlight the evolution of SIP process under BPEP II
- to suggest appropriate elements/contents of SIP, (if necessary).

### **Research Procedure**

#### **Document Analysis**

The policy statement, training package, SIPs and other pertinent documents were collected for a review of the concept of SIP, policy support for SIP and its legal base. The attempt further provided information on the progress so far achieved and on its problems and prospects. The SIP of selected schools from each sample district was also reviewed.

### **Selection of District, School and Respondents**

The districts of Jhapa, Chitwan, Syangja, Bardiya and Dadeldhura are bottom-up planning districts where the SIP process has been piloted since the year 2001/02. In that year one cluster from each of these districts was chosen to start the process. In the following year, all the clusters of these districts were included.

For the study of SIP, pilot districts such as Chitwan, Syangja and Dadeldhura were selected. From each district, 2 clusters (one cluster started SIP in 2001/02, and the other in 2002/03) were selected. From each cluster, two schools were included as sample schools and visited for study.

Children, parents, teachers, HMs, SMC members of these schools were contacted for discussion. Besides, the local authority of the school area and local organizations working in that area were also contacted for the purpose. Discussions were also held with DEOs and the selected school supervisors of the sample district and the RPs of the selected cluster. Moreover, discussion with the central level staff was also made after field visit.

#### *Coverage of the Study*

District	3
DEOs	2
Supervisor/RPs	31
Schools	12
SMC members	52
HMs/Teachers	79
Students	45
Parents	84
Local bodies	7 (16 persons)
Local Clubs	4

#### *Observation of School and School Minutes, Letters, etc.*

Observations were made to verify the responses and to see the changes that have occurred after the implementation of SIP. The school minutes, supervision diary, administrative report, letters, etc. were observed for relevant information.

#### *Observation of Training Programmes*

The training programmes arranged for different levels were observed for the assessment of the planning capacity and development efforts of DOE. For the purpose, MTOT arranged in Syangja and TOT organized in Chitwan were observed. The grassroots level training program was observed only in a centre of Syangja district. These training programmes arranged in the year 2002/03.

## **Preparation and Use of the Tools**

### *Discussion Guidelines*

Discussion guidelines were prepared for the following respondents:

- School children and their parents
- Teachers and HMs
- SMC members and local authority
- Local organizations
- DEOs and supervisors

### **Interview Schedules**

***Interview schedules were prepared and used to get information from the Program Coordinator of district level BPEP and the RPs of the selected clusters.***

### **Field level Workshop**

A one-day workshop was organized at the headquarters of Chitwan and Syangja districts. In the workshop, DEO, Program Coordinator of the district level BPEP II, RPs, supervisors, HMs and SMC chairpersons of sample schools participated. The workshop was arranged after the preparation of the draft report. The preliminary findings of the study were presented and discussed in the workshop. Comments and suggestions made in the workshop were included in the report.

### **Data Analysis Procedure**

The data gathered were analyzed qualitatively. As the data were unquantifiable, a discussion on the theme was made. Attempts were also made to triangulate opinion and perceptions of the respondents with the information available at the schools and the observations of the researcher. Based on these, the researcher finally judged the current practice of SIP implementation in pilot districts.



## **Chapter II**

### **School Improvement Plan and Its Development**

SIP in Nepal has recently been introduced under BPEP II to implement the decentralization policy reform process. At though the SIP-type program has been in practice in many parts of the world for a decade or more, it is relatively a new concept in Nepal. The main purpose of SIP is to encourage the school to work closely with the community for resolving its problems and promoting its development. SIP promotes ideas and solutions to development problems that come from the school itself and the community rather than from outside. It recognizes the strategies or interventions proposed by the school and its community for the resolution of problems. In fact, SIP places emphasis on school-community links and participatory approaches to facilitate them, involvement of members of the community in decision-making process, promoting and encouraging schools to look at planning as a tool to provide locally based solutions, developing better teaching-learning conditions in schools, gradual devolution of authority and freedom of control over resources by school and community itself. Thus, SIP stands as a major instrument for implementing the decentralization reform process in the education sector.

#### **Focus of SIP**

- Enhanced participation of community members in educational affairs
- Emphasis on teaching-learning process besides building and equipment
- Emphasis on local ideas, strategies, interventions and resources for the progress of the school
- Instrument for planned development of the school
- Promotion of better school-community links
- Gradual devolution of power, freedom and autonomy to the community to control and facilitate the school and school affairs
- Promotion of the decentralized reform process in education.

#### **Education Policy and School Improvement Plan**

In the 9<sup>th</sup> Development Plan, the government showed its commitment to introduce decentralized policy reform for enhancing local participation in the management and implementation of local development activities including educational programmes. For the purpose, the Local Self-Governance Act 1998 was brought into force. The Act has endowed on local bodies several powers and responsibilities including management and supervision of basic and primary education programmes. The *modus operandi* of local plan development and their implementation has been stated in the Local Self-Governance Regulations. However, the Regulations do not mention anything about school development or improvement plans e.g. SIP.

The Education Act (seventh amendment), which was brought to empower SMCs by authorizing them to look after matters related to school operation. However, it also does not explicitly mention about SIP even though SMC may plan for the schools. Similarly, the Education Regulations also have no mention of SIP and its importance, even though it entrusted VECs the responsibility to prepare VEPs. However, CMS Operation Directives valued the SIP and have made the provision that CMS would be involved in the SIP-related activities undertaken by BPEP II and other

programmes. The Directives explicitly mentioned that SMC should prepare the periodic and annual plans (SIPs) of the school. Moreover, it also stated with stress that SIP should be developed after discussions with parents and through parents' conferences.

From the very beginning, BPEP II insisted on decentralized planning for the improvement and development of education at the local level. PIP, a major guideline for BPEP II operation, introduced the district planning procedure and envisaged that the procedure should be increasingly participatory and build upon VEPs or SIPs. In fact, PIP emphasized the initiation of bottom-up planning by strengthening the schools level EMIS and enhancing local capacity. Micro-planning exercises were assumed as necessary for the preparation of SIP that would include action plans for the physical and instructional improvement of the schools. Fund would be provided if the schools demonstrated capacity and improvements. However, SIP was regarded as an integral part of local capacity building, not as an independent program.

The Annual Strategic Implementation Plan (ASIP) 2001/02 was another document which pushed up the SIP concept. Though ASIP commented on the ineffectiveness of SIP because it lacked commitment of authorities and participation of stakeholders the need for bottom-up planning was reiterated with stress on empowering and capacitating HMs and increasing the role of SMC, VEC and VDCs. The MTR of March 2002 has restructured the BPEP II programmes. It made SIP a major program component (see Annex C). Previously, SIP was a sub-component under local capacity building. MTR shifted the priority and focus of BPEP II, so SIP has emerged as a major thrust of BPEP II because all development programmes of the schools require to be based on the SIP. The idea of block grants has also been tied up with it. The provision of MTR was included in the ASIP 2002/03. It stressed the need of SIP and of revisiting it for making it more practical and effective. ASIP intended to establish partnership with SMCs and other stakeholders including the civil society for achieving the objectives of EFA, to align the concept of SIP with the secondary education, and to execute SIP-based development programmes for the test of block grants in all the schools of the pilot districts.

In the 10<sup>th</sup> Plan, it is explicitly mentioned that SIP will be implemented in line with the effort for the empowerment of local bodies and local people. Thus, the Plan has regarded SIP as a tool for decentralization in education and for the local empowerment and participation in the educational process. Besides, the policy strategies of EFA as adopted by the government includes SIP as an important aspect of BPEP II for ensuring better quality of school and improving classroom process and children's learning.

### **Reflections**

- No legal documents, except the CMS Operation Directives which introduced the concept of decentralization in all sectors including education, underline the necessity and importance of SIP. The CMS Operation Directives values the SIP in CMS.
- However, government regarded SIP as a tool for promoting participatory bottom-up planning and the commitment has been reflected in several documents such as PIP, ASIP, MTR, the Tenth Plan, and EFA: National Plan of Action.

- As the concept of SIP has recently been incorporated in the policy, SIP has yet not got a concrete shape as a regular program of the DOE. SIP is currently being implemented as an experimental program. Therefore, necessary arrangement for SIP has not been made in the Educational Rules and Regulations. Hence, the existing Act did not mention anything about SIP.

### **Evolution of SIP Process**

As mentioned earlier, PIP – a main document of BPEP II implementation - incorporates SIP as an integral part of local capacity building for the initiation of the bottom-up planning process. It was assumed that each school would prepare SIP that would include action plans with focus on physical facility and instructional activities through micro-planning process.

During the first year of BPEP II implementation (1998/99), the SIP process started in the schools of 12 districts. In that year 65 persons were trained as master trainers and 1213 SIPs were prepared. In the following year, 103 master trainers were prepared and 4249 SIPs were developed in 20 districts. In 2000/01, 75 districts were covered. In that year, 215 master trainers were produced and 3736 SIPs came into existence.

As SIP generated from the schools and operated at the school level, the role of HMs and SMCs in its design and its implementation was considered significant. Therefore, an effort was also made to enhance the capacity of HMs and SMCs by providing them training with the use of the cascade model. Moreover, the centre also developed a training package for the purpose. Schools were given freedom to design their own programmes in consideration of their own problems and needs. In addition, management trainings were also provided to them to enhance their managerial capacity and to strengthen the school level EMIS. EMIS training was further provided to schoolteachers and RPs.

As regards the funding of the SIP, it was confined to definite districts and limited schools. For making resources available to the schools, the schemes of Fund A (Rs. 2000/-), Fund B (Rs. 11000/-) and Fund C (Rs. 15000/-) were introduced. As the amount allotted under these schemes was limited and the schemes covered only a limited number of schools, these schemes did not do much for SIP operation. Consequently, SIP implementation did not evolve as a major instrument for school development.

### **Piloting of SIP**

Even though the effort to introduce SIPs in the country could not gather momentum, the importance of SIP for change in primary education has not shrunken. DOE did not undermine the contributions SIP could make for the development of schools. Therefore, the Department altered the strategy and introduced SIP as a pilot program in the 5 selected districts in order to record its strengths and limitations and to observe the changes it could make for the advancement of primary education.

#### *Capacity Building for SIP Planning*

For the implementation of SIP in the pilot districts, planning skill development of stakeholders was considered important. Therefore, DOE started to develop the planning skills by developing and introducing training packages and organizing training programmes.

*Development of Training Package:* With a view to assist the district, RC and school level for the design and implementation of SIP, DOE refined the previous training package (see Annex D). The package was refined and improved at the centre.

The package contains information that a planner requires for the designing of SIP. It also contains several formats facilitating exercises on SIP. Besides, the package contains formulae to derive some educational indicators useful for planners. In the first year of the piloting, the package was used. In the following year, districts were given freedom to prepare their own packages based on the package developed by the centre. Moreover, the contents of the package developed by the districts were jointly finalized by the district and the centre. In the second year, the training packages prepared by the pilot districts were used.

*Organizations of Training Program:* For providing planning skills to field level persons, training programmes were arranged in all the pilot districts. In the first year, a 6-day training program was organized. This program was reduced to 3 days in the following year. The training program was arranged at three levels using the cascade model of training.

Master Trainer's Training (MTOT): Central level trainers conducted this training at the headquarters of the pilot districts. In each district, 35 persons (selected from among the school supervisors, RPs, HMs etc.) were trained.

Trainer's Training (TOT): To prepare a pool of trainers (5) for every RC in the pilot districts, TOT was arranged. The participants were selected from among the resource persons, HMs, retired teachers, social workers, and representatives of NGOs, CBOs, Dalits and Women. The master trainers conducted TOT. The central level trainers were also present in the TOT as observers. The districts were given the responsibility of the management of TOT including training procedures and schedules. The centre provided logistic support.

Grassroots Level Training: The trainers developed in TOT were made responsible for conducting the training for the head teachers, SMC chairs and other people (5) from the VDCs and municipalities. The participants were given the task of developing and refine SIP. The grassroots level training program was arranged for the HMs and SMC chairpersons of each and every school of the pilot districts.

*Focus of Training:* Training Programmes were organized in the first and second years in all the pilot districts. The training model used in the first year in these districts was not changed in the second year. However, the focus of training was modified. In the first year, the focus of training was all three areas of BPEP II, such as access and retention, quality, and management. In the next year, these areas were replaced by the quality aspect only. In addition, matters related to grade I were also considered in the training sessions. As the intention of the centre was the materialization of the concept of VEP, the trainees were also expected to contribute for development of VEP/MEP.

### *Funding Arrangements*

Bottom-up schools in the pilot districts received funds for SIP implementation. For the year 2001/02, lumpsum grants based on the criterion known as formula funding was provided to all bottom-up or pilot schools. In order to involve local bodies, the fund disbursement authority was delegated to VDCs and municipalities where these

schools were located. For the purpose, DOE released funds to the concerned local bodies, and the local bodies provided them to the schools. Funds were available for all programmes such as access and retention, quality, and management improvement. For funding of the other schools in the pilot districts, the funding scheme previously designed (Fund A, B, and C) was continued. Furthermore, VDC partnership program was also launched. Under this program, each VDC of the piloted districts would receive up to Rs. 20000/-, provided they submitted proposals to DEO.

In the year 2002/03, all the RCs and schools came with the fold of bottom-up planning in the pilot districts. DOE intended to fund SIPs of all the schools. However, the purpose of funding was changed. Previously, the fund was made available for the whole SIP program. In the following year, it was provided only for the quality component, not for access and retention. Similarly, the funding criteria were modified. Previously, a lumpsum grant was made available on the basis of the given formula, i.e. formula funding, whereas the per child (6-10 years of age) allocation was made the basis for funding in the following year. As the local election had not taken place, DEO itself made the fund available to the schools, not the local bodies. As regards the VDC partnership program, it would continue in the current year, provided VDCs submitted their VEPs.

#### *Implementation of SIP*

SIP was introduced in 2001/02 as the pilot program in the 5 districts. It covered only one cluster of each district in that year. The scope of SIP was increased in the year 2002/03 and all the clusters and schools of the pilot districts came under the SIP process.

In the year 2001/02, 90 persons were trained as master trainers. In the following year, the number of master trainers rose to 450. Similarly, 1962 schools developed their SIPs.

Table 2.1  
**Districts, RC and Schools Covered under Piloting of SIP**

District	2001/02		2002/03	
	RC (1)	Schools	RC (all)	Schools
Jhapa	Haldibari	23	22	478
Chitwan	Dibyanagar	23	14	451
Syangja	Bhumre	22	33	571
Bardiya	Kanthapur	34	11	243
Dadeldhura	Khalanga	35	10	219
Total	5	137	90	1962

Previously, the Basic and Primary Education Section of the Department took the sole responsibility to implement SIP. The section designed the training package and conducted training programmes at the district and local levels. The staff members of other sections were not involved. Following the restructure of the BPEP II programmes, SIP-based development program has emerged as a major component. Therefore, the staff members of other sections too got involved in it. The staff of other

sections participated in training/workshops for SIP. The Department attempted to make SIP a matter of concern for all sections.

Recently, the Department has also developed Implementation Guidelines for SIP-based development programmes (see Annex E). The guidelines have been sent to the districts. Moreover, provisions have also been made to examine the technical soundness of SIP. For the purpose, a three-member appraisal committee was formed in the coordination with RP.

### **Reflections**

- Focus of SIP was shifted from three areas of BPEP II to one area i.e. quality improvement.
- The cascade model of training was followed, but the duration of the training was reduced from 6 days to 3 days.
- The funding criteria were changed – from a lumpsum grant to per student allocation, and DOE ensured fund for the quality aspect only.
- An attempt was made to ensure technical soundness of SIP.
- SIP was made the concern of the whole DOE staff.

## Chapter III Design of School Improvement Plan

### Necessity of SIP (as conceived by local stakeholders)

The success of any plan or program depends upon the participation of stakeholders in terms of physical, financial and moral support. If the stakeholders believe that a certain plan or program addresses their needs and reflects their aspirations, then they definitely show their concern for it. If they feel it is necessary to implement a plan, it creates environment, which contributes to the success of the plan. If the plan or program involves the stakeholders from the designing to the implementation to the evaluation, the success of plan could be ensured. The introduction of SIP has created an environment where the stakeholders could feel that the plan is necessary for the school development where their children are learning. The effort has further provided the stakeholders the opportunity to participate in the designing and implementation of the plan.

During the discussion, teachers and headmasters expressed the view that the process of SIP helped them to identify the school problems and find out ways to resolving them. The process further created an environment where parents could get aware of the learning of their children and the school conditions where their children learn. The teachers thought that SIP was necessary to draw the parents' attention to the education of the society where they lived. They perceived that this was an important achievement which would finally improve the conditions of the schools and the quality of education.

Parents felt that plans were necessary to develop the schools and their activities. They thought that as agriculture plan, irrigation plan, drinking water plan were necessary for development, so was educational plan necessary for the development of the schools. They believed that the plan could improve the learning of the community children.

Resource Persons and school supervisors believed that schools used to make efforts for more teachers, building construction, and level upgrading before implementing the SIP process. Now the scenario has changed after the start of the SIP process. Now, the schools are aware of the need for quality improvement and right utilization of the resources. They invite guardians and other concerned people to discuss the matters related to education. This is, of course, an attempt to mobilize the local community in the improvement of local education. Schools have begun to identify their problems and prioritizing their solutions. Schools have started to think about construction of new buildings, development of teaching learning materials or children's regular attendance. The process has raised the level of community concern in local education. For these reasons, SIP was felt necessary.

As the stakeholders perceived, SIP is necessary for the following reasons:

- SIP has created a vision for the development of the local school through the mobilization of the community and the community resources.
- The process provides opportunity to the parents, teachers and other stakeholders to sit together and discuss children's learning, school conditions and community education.

- Community people, especially parents have begun to show concern for local schools (Chitwan).

## **Design of the SIP**

### **Planning Capacity Development**

To provide knowledge and technical skills for the preparation of SIP, DOE developed a training package and arranged training programmes at different levels: at the district level for the master trainer's and trainer's training, and at the RC level for the grassroots' training. The purpose of these programmes was to enhance the capacity of grassroots people to contribute to the preparation of SIP and VEP at the local level.

#### *Training Package*

The training package developed by DOE was distributed in the first year. It was not used in the training program in the following year. But the package much influenced the design of the packages developed by the districts, which were distributed after the training session. The contents of training package are given in Annex D.

As regards the use of the training package, the supervisors and RPs expressed the view that the package did provide knowledge of planning but it did not help the SIP planners because it did not enhance the planning skill. One of the RPs of Chitwan district stated that the package provided knowledge and led the planners to think of the existing problems of schools and education at the local level but dictated what was to be done. The RP opined that guidelines for the stakeholders would be useful. The RP was against the imposition from above. These respondents also commented that the package included technical terminology, which were difficult for local level planners. One of the RPs of Syangja thought that the package provided knowledge but was not practical because the planners were not able to comprehend the terminology and jargons. Moreover, the package included several formats. The PC of Syngja district also seconded the opinion of the RP and added that the package might motivate the HMs to fill out the formats rather than formulate the SIP. The PC experienced that almost all the schools filled out the list of indicators and targets, which were not necessary. The PC viewed if one looked into the indicators and targets of SIPs, he would find the SIP of all schools nearly the same. He further said that the package could provide neither skills of EMIS management nor the skills pertaining to the use and analysis of data. RPs of Dadeladhura reported that the package was useful, but not easy to understand. They held that the package included standard terminology and could not provide the expected support. They felt that they faced problems during outlining of the vision. The most confusing part of the package was the assignment of different numbers to priority orders. Moreover, time was not enough for the planners to prepare SIP. So they could not consult the package and only filled out the formats.

HMs and some SMCs, and planners reported that the package was useful for gaining knowledge of planning for imbibing the concept of improved schools and so forth but did not provide any skills. They accepted that the package insisted on activity and group works for the planning. Moreover, they viewed that the technical terms used in the package confused them. They could not grasp their meaning. They commented that professionals used these terms rather than practitioners like school HMs, SMCs and teachers.



### **Reflections:**

- The training package provides knowledge and information on planning and other related things and contributes to make the planners knowledgeable about improved school, school management, EMIS and the like. The package dictates to do what it intends and motivates the local planners to copy the examples and to use the set of indicators, targets and formats given in it.
- The package can not enhance the planning skills of the HMs and SMCs, as it does not provide how to set the vision, specify the objectives, identify the strategies, determine the priority and so on.
- It has several technical terms and jargons too tough for the grassroots level planners such as HMs and SMCs.
- It confines itself to primary education; it does not insist on preparing an integrated SIP.
- It does not deal with the problems of girls and of the deprived and Dalits. It does not give any examples. It does not help in analyzing the problems, issues and needs of disadvantaged groups.

### *Training Program Operation*

In order to enhance the planning capacity of grassroots people, the cascade model of training was adopted. The DEO staff conducted master trainer's training (MTOT); the master trainers conducted trainer's training (TOT); and, finally, the trainers conducted grassroots level training. All the training programmes were conducted in the field.

Of the 31 MTOT participants 3 were females. In TOT, 5 of the 70 as trainees were females. Similarly, the number of women participants was 4 (out of 22) in the grassroots level training. There was no females trainer. The participation of Dalits or other disadvantaged groups was negligible.

The training sessions were conducted after a review of the SIPs prepared by the schools in the previous year. These were discussions on how the SIPs were prepared, what programmes were implemented, and what problems were encountered during the operation of the programmes.

In the sessions, the trainers spoke on the components of SIP and attempted to make the trainees knowledgeable about the vision, objectives, priority, indicators and the like. The quality aspect was also emphasized. Efforts were made to base the program on exercise and to prepare a dummy SIP. But the exercises were limited. No materials were provided to the trainees. A detailed discussion on training program is given in Annex E. However, the following aspects were noted during the observation of the training sessions:

- As the quality of primary schools was emphasized, the SIPs prepared might centre on quality aspects only. In fact, SIP should be a comprehensive plan covering all aspects including quality.
- There was no discussion on the SIP-based development programmes, and its contents. The discussion was centred on 3 areas (access, quality and management efficiency) and the related components.

- As it was known that DOE funds would be available on the per-child basis there was no discussion on other sources of funding. In fact, the resource generation part was not given due importance.
- During TOT, it was mentioned that the school should keep a school - related data register and the VDC a register with education-related VDC and community data. But these were not discussed in the grassroots level training.
- As different peoples at different levels conducted the training, it was felt that the nature of the training varied from one level to another. Moreover, enough exercises were not conducted in the sessions.
- In the training, there was no discussion on how to address the needs of the girls, the disabled and the disadvantaged group.
- Monitoring and reporting aspects did not receive attention. There was no discussion on them.
- The discussions centred on primary education and primary schools. There was not much discussion on designing integrated SIP which should embrace lower secondary and secondary schools as well.
- No attempt was made to get the training feedback from the participants.
- VEP was given little importance even though trainees were expected to assist in the preparation of VEPs.
- Planning methods were discussed but it seemed that there was no attempt at raising the planning skills of the trainees.
- Communication gap between the centre and the district and between the district and the sub-district (resource centres, schools) got distinct. For example, the trainers could not explain what MTR (March 2002) expected from the designing and implementation of the plan, what the SIP-based development program really meant and how the civil society could help in education, and so on.

### **Process of SIP Preparation**

SIP was introduced as a tool for mobilizing the local community and local resources for the improvement of local schools. The SIP process was started to implement the philosophy and concept of decentralization. Therefore, the process requires involving local parents, community members, teachers, etc. in the design and implementation of SIP. It is, in fact, a participatory bottom-up planning process, which also ensures the stakeholders' autonomy for the design and management of the programmes, implementation of the strategies, and monitoring of the programmes.

### **Stakeholders Involvement**

The discussion with the HMs and teachers revealed that the schools invited parents, VDC members and other stakeholders for the purpose of preparing SIP (Chitwan). Parents, community members, teachers and other stakeholders, had also taken part in the discussion sessions. In their opinion, SIP was developed based on the deliberation and outcomes of the discussion. When the parents were contacted, they declined to accept that school had organized any session on the preparation of the

school plan. The parents stated that schools never invited them for developing any plan like SIP. The RP of the cluster where these schools are located said that he had not any idea about the matter. He was skeptical about a gathering that provided inputs for the design of SIP. He added that the HMs and teachers prepared the SIP. One of the schools visited, had organized "awareness symposium on bottom-up planning" in which 44 parents and teachers participated. The school also organized a "mother's conference" which 48 mothers attended. But the records did not say what they had discussed. Teachers mentioned that the purpose of organizing these gatherings was to make parents aware of the importance of the education of their children, to arouse their interest in the school and, finally, to create in them the feeling that the school belonged to the community. Whatsoever the matter was, the gathering comprised different sections of the society including women, the Dalits, and the disadvantaged groups. The teachers observed that the effort was a success because the school could draw the attention of the community people towards school affairs.

In Syangja mostly HMs and teachers developed SIPs. In the bottom-up or pilot schools too, only a few people were involved in formulating SIPs. HMs and teachers are crucial for developing SIPs. During discussions, HMs and teachers stated that they had solicited ideas of parents, mothers and other stakeholders, but the school minutes did not confirm this. The school documents did not even show whether these persons were invited. In fact, they did not have any idea and skill to solicit the opinions of parents and other stakeholders and place them in the plan. As training was given to HMs and SMCs, they thought that it was HMs' responsibility to develop the plan and submit it to DEO. Thus, SIPs were mostly developed by HMs and teachers.

Similarly, the responses of DEO, PC, RPs, HMs, teachers, SMC members and parents regarding SIP preparations were not very different from those of their counterparts in other districts (Dadeldhura). They said that SIP could initiate the decentralized reform process in education. DEO said that the norms of decentralization were followed by the schools during the preparation of SIP, while the PC and RPs declined to say so. They denied any attempt by the schools to solicit ideas and opinions of the parents and stakeholders. But their participation in the formulation of SIP did not go to the extent desired. They state that only a few schools had made such effort. However, they all accepted that the time for preparing SIP was so short that parents and other stakeholders could not be involved in the process. During discussion, HMs, teachers and SMC members said that the school had done their best to make SIP reflect the needs and aspirations of local parents and stakeholders. They reported that they had met parents for the purpose. But their responses could not be verified during discussions held with the parents. Moreover, the school minutes did not show whether schools, teachers or SMCs had made any effort.

However, Ghatal Secondary School of Dadeldhura was able to call parents' meetings for the preparation of SIPs. The HM of the school reported that school held parents' meetings time to time. Meetings were also called for the preparation of SIP. The teachers of the school confirmed the responses. The parents admitted that the school invited them from time to time for discussions on several matters and that they attended the meetings. However, one thing was obvious. The SIP process created awareness in teachers and SMC members that a plan is necessary for improving the school and school affairs.

It was experienced that the participation of community people in the preparation of SIP was minimal. The teachers and HMs designed the SIP. Because the schools were autonomous in this regard. The DEO staff members and RPs did not intervene in the process of SIP preparation. Schools were free to set their own vision and objectives, choose their own strategies and act upon the programmes and activities they had developed. These are positive signs. However, the participation of community people did not go to the extent expected. In fact, the process is in its initial stage. Expected responses have not been received. But it can be assumed that the practice of inviting community members for discussion on the matters and problems of local schools and its activities has started.

### **Technical Soundness**

In spite of the trainings provided, the SIPs prepared in these districts in the first year did not seem to be sound in terms of problems analysis, prioritization, target setting, resources survey and the like. The HMs said that shortage of skills and techniques created problems. Therefore, the SIPs contained similar kinds of problems and programmes. Few SIPs have unique programmes. The programmes mostly cluster around the three major areas and 17 components of BPEP II. Furthermore, no feasibility study of SIP has yet been made to ensure its relevance and appropriateness. Once the plan was prepared, it could be given for implementation without examining its feasibility and technical soundness.

SIP process was also affected by lack of technical expertise. Almost all the HMs contacted reported that training did not provide skill necessary for developing SIP. They mentioned that trainers did not make clear how vision relates with objectives and targets, how the programmes are prioritized, how the strategies are selected and so forth. As these terms were technical, the trainers themselves were confused in catching up their meaning. Trainers mostly gave information on why SIP was important, what components were to be included in SIP, and so forth.

As plenty of time was spent on SIP training, the schools did not get much time for the preparation of SIPs. The SIP fund was released on completion of third phases of the training. The third phase of the training was organized close to the fourth quarter of the fiscal year. If the schools did not submit their SIPs on time, the fund earmarked might be frozen. Therefore, the schools prepared their SIPs hurry-scurry for getting the funds. The schools did not get time for consulting parents and stakeholders. In Dadeldhura the schools submitted their SIPs almost at the end of the fiscal year.

### **Data Support**

The SIPs were further affected by the paucity of reliable data and information. PC, the person responsible for the BPEP matters reported that community-related data used by the schools could be questioned on the ground of reliability (Syangja). As the schools used more information than was necessary, considering the problems given and programmes proposed in the SIPs. On the other-hand, very few schools maintained records and documents (sources of data). One of the RPs mentioned that some schools used inflated data. The schools reported one figure in the student register and another figure in the data sheet provided to DEOs. HMs and teachers also reported that they had filled out the format. Actually, the formats provided were only examples, but the schools filled all the formats and submitted them as SIP. Moreover, the analysis of data was also weak. The SIPs used plenty of data, but they were not analyzed. SIPs had little EMIS support.

### **Formalization**

Legitimacy of the plan was another problem. SIPs were never presented to and approved by the school boards. Minutes of the schools did not have the record that SIPs were presented and discussed in school boards. Moreover, school did not hold any general convention to endorse the plan. The HMs and teachers reported that SMC chairpersons gave their consent on SIP by putting their counter signatures on it. However, SIPs were never discussed in the board meetings. Even SMC members accepted that SIPs were never discussed in board meetings. The school documents also verified the responses. As regards the budget estimates of the plan, only one school (Durgadevi PS of Syangja) presented it to the school board. The board minutes incorporated the programmes and budget included in the plan. In fact, the schools did not have the tradition of discussing the annual program and budget in their board. Therefore, it is difficult to accept that the process developed ownership of SIP.

### **Reflections**

- The SIP process gradually created awareness that a plan is necessary for the advancement of school and the school affairs.
- HMs has significant roles in the formulation of SIP. Participation of parents and other stakeholders in the preparation of SIP was limited even though the schools strove for their involvement.
- SIP preparation was affected for want of technical expertise. Training did not provide skills.
- SIPs were prepared almost at the end of the fiscal year and in haste.
- SIP could not be technically sound.
- SIPs suffered from paucity of reliable data and information.
- As school boards did not discuss and approve SIPs formally, SIPs could not become as legal documents.

### **SIP, VEP and DEP**

SIPs, VEPs and DEPs are assumed as bottom-up plans developed by involving local stakeholders for the schools, VDCs and districts respectively. These plans were envisioned for implementing decentralized planning at the local level. Moreover, the planning concepts were introduced to ensure stakeholders' participation in the process of the design and implementation of local plans and programmes in education.

While introducing DEP, it was agreed that the DEP process was participatory and built upon SIPs developed by VECs, and SMCs (MOE: 1999). As has been said, DEPs were developed prior to the formulation of SIPs. The VEP concept was introduced recently. VEPs were in the process of development. It reveals that DEPs have not been built upon SIPs and VEPs.

VEP was assumed as VDC's educational programmes supposed to cover access and retention in primary education. In order to look at the focus of VEPs, 6 VEPs developed by the local bodies of Syangja and Chitwan districts were reviewed. It was found that VEPs had been developed as partnership programmes by local bodies

(Syangja) and as VDC's educational improvement plans (Chitwan). The focus of VEPs was as shown in the table below.

Table 3.1  
**Programmes Proposed in VEPs (Partnership Program)**

Local bodies	Number of Programmes				
	Physical Facility	Access & Retention	Quality	Management	Other
<i>Syangja</i>					
- Waling Municipality	-	1	-	-	-
- Jagat Bhanjyang VDC	1	4	1	-	-
- Chinnebas VDC	1	4	1	-	-
<i>Chitwan</i>					
- Sukranagar VDC	1	4	1	2	2
- Bachhyoli VDC	7	15	6	2	-
- Dibyanagar VDC	4	7	5	-	-

As it was presumed, the focus of VEPs as shown in the above table was access and retention in primary education. Even though VEPs also included quality-related programmes, the proportion of these programmes was relatively small.

In Annex H, programmes proposed in VEPs are given. It indicates that in Syangja VEPs were designed with a view to getting the funds allotted for the partnership programmes. DOE would earmark up to Rs. 20,000/- as the matching fund for VDC if it developed VEPs and showed commitment to allocate at least the same amount as DOE did for its implementation. The local bodies in Syangja developed the programmes for the year 2002/03 for getting the allotted programmes. In case of Chitwan district, the budget estimates were much higher than the matching funds even though VDCs developed programmes for a year. However, it appears that Bachhyoli VDC of Chitwan district developed programmes for the five years and so the budget estimates were very high. In fact, the VEPs of Chitwan district were supposed to be funded by the Decentralized Action for Children and Woman (DACAW) program of Unicef. Therefore, the cost estimates of VEPs developed in Chitwan were considerably high.

### Reflections

- As DEP was introduced prior to SIP and VEP formulation, it was not built upon SIP and VEP.
- The focus of VEPs was on the access and retention components of BPEP II.
- In Syangja, VEPs intended to utilize matching funds.

## **Chapter IV**

### **Contents of School Improvement Plan**

In order to study the contents of SIP, effort was made to review the SIPs of schools where the SIP process was piloted. The SIPs developed by 12 sample schools of 3 of the 5 pilot districts in the year 2001/02 were studied. The SIPs of two pilot and two other schools from each district were reviewed for their contents. In this section, a summary of the contents and reflections are presented. The contents of individual SIP are given in Annex G.

#### **Contents of SIP**

##### **Background of SIP**

Each SIP gives a brief account of the school establishment. Every school conducted a household survey. The SIP attempted to provide the population of the school catchment area and information regarding school age children (schooled and out of school).

Similarly, SIPs present the status of school entrants and provide statistics on repeaters, dropouts and promotees. The SIPs try to include physical and educational facilities available in the schools. They also include the number of teachers (primary teachers only) with their background. Even in the SIPs of lower secondary and secondary schools, the numbers of teachers are not given.

##### **Issues and Problems**

No SIP attempts to review the problems and issues. SIPs do not present the issues and reasons with analysis and justification. The information given in the background section does not explain the problems. SIPs just mention the problems. The SIP of Bhumre Lower Secondary School attempts to explain the problems but does not present them well. SIPs did not pay attention to them even though they are crucial for planning. SIPs do not present any realistic profile of the school or the school community.

##### **Vision and Objectives**

Of the 12 schools, only 6 mentioned their objectives and 10 schools their vision. In most SIPs, coherence of vision and objectives could not be observed. For example, Rastriya Primary School of Labournagar, Chitwan set the vision of developing into a model school with the help of community but the objectives given were to increase the access of all school age children to primary education and to maintain GER and NER at 100%. The visions and objectives of some SIPs are not clear. For example, Bhumre Lower Secondary School of Waling, Syangja has the vision that the support and grants obtained for physical facility improvement, quality enhancement and increase in access will be used for the same and the programmes will be completed in time by mobilizing the local community. The objectives given in SIP were: compulsory education for the children of the catchment area, quality education, schooling of out-of-school children and educational development of the catchment area. Shree Adarsh Secondary School, Dibyanagar, Chitwan presented a list of visions: to provide knowledge and skills to the children, to develop them into good citizens, to improve the quality of learning, to provide the children of the catchment area access to education, to maintain the school regularity of students and teachers, to discourage social, economic, cultural and gender discrimination, to manage

playground, maintain transparency in the income and expenses of school, to consolidate school management and to supervise and monitor school activities.

### **Program and Strategies**

At though SIPs could not present visions and objectives exactly as required, they outlined programmes for school improvement. But the emphasis was on the physical facility development, (building, classroom, toilet, furniture and the like). SIPs further listed strategies and responsibilities for implementing programmes.

But the programmes thus given did not match the programmes given in another section of the SIP of (all schools). For example, the SIP of Rastriya Primary School of Labournagar, Chitwan states 4 programmes (with objectives) in one section but proposes 23 programmes in another. Similarly, the SIP of Bhumre Lower Secondary School of Waling, Syangja has 7 programmes in one place, and 30 in and the programmes. Ghatal Secondary School of Amargadhi, Dadeldhura has the same problem (5 programmes and 15 programmes). Moreover, almost all the SIPs have similar types of program. SIPs could not bring in school-specific programmes.

However, SIPs have some good things too. Some programmes do not require any fund for their implementation and the numbers of such programmes were nearly equal to the number of programmes which require funds. For example, parent's conference, household visit, school cleaning, mother's conference, children's rally, demonstration of model class, awareness raising, use of waste materials for developing educational materials, increase in students' and teachers' regularity etc. are programmes which do not have any financial implication.

Another good thing in SIPs have is mobilization of HMs, teachers, SMCs parents, students etc. in implementing the programmes. Almost all the SIPs included mobilization of community people as a strategy for the implementation of the programmes. However, this strategy is mentioned in all the SIPs.

### *Indicators and Targets*

Indicators and targets are same in all SIPs. All the SIPs mention GER, NER, teachers' and students' attendance, cycle completion rate, student's achievement etc. as indicators for measuring the progress of SIP programmes. There was no attempt at providing other indicators, so progress in physical facility development availability of teaching-learning materials, managerial efficiency, etc. could not be traced. In fact, schools filled out the formats given in the training package. The formats listed several sample indicators and schools filled them out. The schools did not propose other indicators.

### *Sources of Funding*

The SIPs developed by the schools attempted to identify funding sources. Almost all the SIPs identified local bodies (VDC/Municipality), DDC, NGO and school communities as the prospective sources of funding. Few schools dropped NGOs from their lists. The schools now started exploring local fund for the financing of their educational programmes.

However, the funding sources traced out in SIPs were the same. SIPs could not add other sources e.g. CBOs (forest user group, water user group, etc.), school generated resources and the like.



### *Coverage and Focus*

All the schools directed their SIPs to the improvement of primary education in general even if they conducted lower secondary and secondary education programmes. The information given in the SIPs were confined to primary level two. For example, Ghatal Secondary School and Janata Secondary Schools mention primary teachers only. Similarly, the programmes proposed and targets set in all the SIPs did not include other levels of education. SIPs did not integrate lower secondary and secondary levels.

Further, almost all the SIPs laid emphasis on physical facility development for enhancing access to primary education. In these SIPs, the proportion of programmes related to physical facility was not as low as in other programmes. Moreover, it received a significant place because it in priority and was tied up with the responsibility for implementing and monitoring the physical facility development programmes.

### *Focus of Women and Disadvantaged Group*

In the process of social development, the needs of women and of the deprived, disabled and Dalits have to be addressed. In the SIPs, the needs of girls and disadvantaged group children were not analyzed. For examples, the SIPs of some schools have the program such as getting an additional teacher or a new teacher. But SIPs did not say anything about getting female teachers. Similarly, the needs of girl children were overlooked in matters of toilets and lavatory facilities. Only two SIPs included scholarship programmes for girls and the Dalits. No SIP mentioned anything about the disabled. In fact, SIPs were not sensitive towards the problems and needs of these groups.

### *Community Mobilization*

The SIPs considered mobilization of the community as essential for the development of the school and improvement of its affairs. All the SIPs included HMs, SMCs, teachers, students, parents and other concerned in the implementation of the programmes. Some of the SIPs further recognized the role of these in the monitoring of school programmes. SIPs also expected financial support from the community.

### *Monitoring and Reporting*

Monitoring is an essential instrument for measuring progress and effect. Of the 12 SIPs, 3 did not mention anything about monitoring. The remaining 9 mentioned monitoring but did not provide any monitoring mechanism as such. A few SIPs included the persons who monitor the program and the time of monitoring. As regards the persons, SIPs entrusted the monitoring responsibility to HMs and SMCs. RPs were also given the responsibility.

Moreover, monitoring was confined to programmes, having financial implications. The programmes, which did not require fund, were left out. Further the schemes given in SIPs did not indicate how the programmes were to be monitored, how to report the result and who should use the feedback. All these indicate that monitoring and reporting did not receive due attention.

## **EMIS Support**

Household surveys were conducted in the catchment areas for designing access-related programmes. The surveys provided school-related data but the data were not analyzed properly. SIPs mentioned the data but did not interpret them for the needs assessment and prioritization of the programmes. No SIP made any effort in designing SIP programmes based on these data, which indicates that SIPs lack EMIS support.

## **Reflections**

- DOE made training package available for the preparation of SIP. The package contained formats, which provided reference to the planners. The schools filled out these formats and claimed that they had developed SIPs.
- The schools conducted household surveys and presented basic data on population, enrolment and enrolment rates. (School data have also been given). But SIPs did not analyze them. Thus the analysis aspect was weak. SIPs could not link the needs with the problems. They did not benefit from EMIS.
- Little attention was paid to include school-specific problems, programmes, priorities and strategies in the SIPs. In fact, SIPs contained similar sets of programmes and strategies related to access, quality and organizational improvement.
- Coherence of vision, objectives, programmes and targets/indicators was absent. The vision was so set as to develop the school into a model school with the help of community. But the objectives given were to increase access of all school age children to primary education and to maintain GER and NER at 100%. Similarly, the awareness and rehabilitation program did not relate with the targets and the indicators given in the plan. Moreover, the programmes given in one place did not tally with the programmes given in another place of the same SIP.
- SIPs lacked technical expertise. No effort was made to assess the soundness of SIPs. Therefore, SIPs were technically not sound.
- In SIPs, the physical facility development aspect received more attention than any other aspect.
- School having lower secondary or secondary grades was expected to develop its SIP in such a manner that it covered all the grades and all the levels. But. The focus of SIP was on the primary education. Therefore, SIPs did not give any integrated plan.
- SIPs did not pay enough attention the matters related to women and disadvantaged groups. SIPs were not sensitive to the problems and needs of these groups.
- Monitoring and reporting were given little importance.
- SIPs also included programmes which did not require any fund for their implementation, so the financial implications of SIP were not very high.
- SIPs emphasized getting locally available resources. It indicates the desire to depend more on the local community for the implementation of school's

programmes. The age-old tradition of depending on the government for the development of the school is gradually changing.

- SIP envisioned the necessity of community mobilization for the progress and betterment of the school and school programmes.

### **Focus of SIP in 2002/03**

As mentioned earlier, SIP was introduced for the improvement of school programmes. Therefore, SIP incorporated programmes aiming at enhancing access and ensuring retention and at improving the quality and management efficiency of schools. SIPs of all schools emphasized physical facility development. However, the proportion of programmes that related to access and physical facility development was high compared the proportion that related to quality and management. SIPs also included programmes based on the community. But the number of these programmes was smaller. In other words, SIPs focused more on access and physical facility development.

In the year 2002/03, i.e. the second year of SIP implementation, the focus of SIP gradually shifted from physical facility development to quality of education. Almost all the SIPs emphasized quality. The proportion of quality-related programmes was greater than of those related to other areas of BPEP II. The objectives and visions previously set covered almost all the areas of BPEP II. But in the second year of operation, SIPs underlined quality as the major objective and programmes were proposed accordingly. Further, SIPs did not insist on taking programmes beyond the school premises. Eight out of 12 SIPs confined their programmes within the school boundaries. The schools, which still wanted to implement programmes in the communities, included very few programmes in their SIPs.

It appeared that schools were cautious in selecting the indicators for the second year of SIP implementation. Previously, SIP included all the indicators listed in the format irrespective of whether they were related to the programmes or not. But in the second year, most SIPs used selected and program-related indicators. They did not use the other indicators printed in the format. However, 4 schools did not mention any indicator for assessing the progress of the programmes. This indicates that the schools attempted to develop plans that might be technically better but that appropriate expertise had not gone into the preparation of the plan.

Grade I was considered as a problem grade in many respects, viz. student pressure, enrolment of the under-aged, dropout and repetition case, crowded classroom, poor facilities, use of untrained and less experienced teachers, poor learning outcomes and the like. This grade requires special care in terms of the effectiveness of primary education as a whole. However, the SIPs developed in the second year did not focus much on grade I. Four out of 12 schools included programmes for grade I in their SIPs. One school proposed distribution of pencils and exercise books to all children. Another school suggested scholarships for diligent children. The third school underlined competition in sports and extra-curricular activities while the fourth school proposed drinking water facility in the classroom, and inter-school visits for grade I children. No school proposed any specific programmes for grade I children in Syangja and Dadeldhura districts.

## Reflections

- The focus of SIP gradually shifted from all areas of BPEP II in general and physical facility development in particular to quality improvement.
- SIPs intended to confine activities within the school areas.
- Schools attempted to design plans technically better.
- SIPs did not propose any specific program for coping with the problems of grade I.

## Chapter V Implementation of School Improvement Plan

This chapter discusses the programmes implemented by the pilot and other schools in the first year of SIP and the problems faced during their implementation.

### Programmes Implemented by Pilot Schools

Programmes implemented by the pilot schools are given in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1  
**Programmes Implemented by Pilot Schools in 2001/02**

Chitwan		Syangja		Dadeldhura	
Rastriya PS	Adarsh SS	Amilithum PS	Bhumre LSS	Janjyoti PS	Ghatal SS
<i>Programmes that did not require funds</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mother's conference</li> <li>• Children's rally</li> <li>• Household visit</li> <li>• Use of child-centred teaching methods</li> <li>• Interaction among teachers on student learning</li> <li>• Parental visits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mother's conference</li> <li>• Children's rally</li> <li>• Parents' conference</li> <li>• Household visit</li> <li>• Joint meeting of SMC and teachers</li> <li>• Cleaning program</li> <li>• Question paper setting and examination of answer scripts</li> <li>• Demonstration of model class</li> <li>• Keeping records of students with maximum and minimum attendance</li> <li>• Staff meeting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness program</li> <li>• Cleanliness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mothers' conference</li> <li>• Children's rally</li> <li>• Cleaning program</li> <li>• Question design and answer script examination workshop</li> <li>• Students'/teachers' regularity</li> <li>• Interaction between teachers</li> <li>• Interaction between teachers and students</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents' conference</li> <li>• Awareness-related programmes</li> <li>• Labour donation</li> <li>• Household visit</li> </ul>
<i>Programmes that required funds</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drinking water</li> <li>• Furniture</li> <li>• Library</li> <li>• Extra-curricular activities</li> <li>• Administrative expenses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Furniture</li> <li>• Scholarships for girls, Dalits and poor children</li> <li>• Prize distribution</li> <li>• Sports materials and extra-curricular activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance of 5 classrooms</li> <li>• Construction of 1 classroom</li> <li>• Furniture construction</li> <li>• Uniform distribution</li> <li>• Scholarship distribution</li> <li>• Furniture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toilet</li> <li>• Drinking water</li> <li>• Furniture construction and maintenance</li> <li>• Development and purchase of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scholarship</li> <li>• Purchase of sports materials</li> <li>• Purchase of educational materials</li> <li>• Prize distribution</li> <li>• Building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance</li> <li>• Building maintenance (contd.)</li> <li>• Educational materials</li> <li>• Scholarship</li> <li>• Teacher training</li> </ul>

			educational materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scholarships</li> <li>• Dalit</li> <li>• Sports materials</li> <li>• Extra-curricular activities</li> </ul>	maintenance (contd.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of drinking water (contd.)</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

During school visits in Chitwan district, SMCs, HMs and teachers said that they had launched several programmes. HM and teachers of the pilot schools reported that they had organized mother's conference and children's rally. The parents confirmed this. However, Rastriya PS could not produce the minutes or anything else for substantiating its response. Adarsh SS produced photographs and minutes to confirm what the school had done.

The teachers and HMs of Adarsh SS reported that they had started to warn the teachers and students who did not come to the school in time. This response was recorded in the supervision diary of the school. The school had formed "students' club" for conducting extra-curricular and school cleaning activities whereas Rastriya PS had benefited from the "Intellectuals' society" formed by the parents. In that particular school, parents had started visiting the school regularly and holding discussions with HM and teachers on the learning of children and facility development. The local consumer committee had provided Rs. 30,000/- for the fencing of the school. This has also been recorded in the minutes of the school.

The school board had initiated discussions not only on the physical facility development aspect of the schools but also on the children's enrolment, quality improvement and the like. Moreover, SMC had taken interest on scholarship distribution and maintenance of furniture of the school. Drinking water facility had been developed in Rastriya PS with the assistance of a parent. In Adarsh SS, the school supervision dairy showed the teachers had started to use teaching aids and materials for enhancing the quality of education. During his observation of a class of a teacher, RP found that the teaching materials developed during the Whole School Training Program were being used.

The children of grade V in Chitwan reported some change. They stated that the school now organized children's day, quiz contest, and painting and handicraft programmes. Teachers used teaching materials more than before. Parents were invited to schools and teachers visited homes of the children who were temporarily absent from the school or did not attend the class. RC conducted orientation and training programmes. VDCs made RP fund available for the purpose. But these were confined to bottom-up schools only.

In Syangja district, one of the pilot schools, Amilithum Primary School had completed construction of a classroom and maintenance of 5 classrooms. The school had also maintained the furniture. However, it could not work on fencing, drinking water and playground development for lack of funds. Bhumre Lower Secondary School distributed school uniform and conducted awareness programmes for enhancing access to the primary education. Reference materials distribution, motivation and management of sport materials were the activities launched for improving quality. Development of annual and monthly work plans, furniture construction, development of drinking water supply and toilet facilities enhanced the organizational effectiveness of schools. Like Amilithum PS, Bhumre Lower

Secondary School could not complete all the programmes given in the SIP because for want of funds and delay in the start of the programmes.

In Dadeldhura district, the pilot schools have conducted several programmes proposed in the SIP. Janjyoti PS had completed programmes like scholarship distribution, purchase of teaching and sports materials and distribution of prizes. Maintenance of classrooms and drinking water supply were continued. The school had conducted children's rally and mother's conference, but no evidence of these activities was found in the school records. The school was unable to get furniture or construct its main gate due to shortage of funds. It could not put up demonstration of the model class due to absence of experts. HM of the school reported that RP did not make any contribution in this regard. From a brief study of the minutes, it was found that the school held parents' meetings on maintenance of classrooms, improvement of drinking water facility and the like. HM and teachers reported that parent's attitude was affirmative. During the school visit, selected parents were found present in the school for discussing the improvement of drinking water supply.

Another pilot school, Ghatal SS, had also implemented the SIP programmes. The school distributed scholarship and conducted educational materials development activities. It continued maintenance work. The school has also been able to get free labour from the community people in this regard. Five teachers had been sent for refresher training. Owing to shortage of resources, the school was unable to begin toilet construction, fencing and playground development. However, it arranged parents' conference; awareness program and household visits. These programmes did not require any fund. Street drama and drama could not be staged because time was short. The school has a tradition of holding parents' conference for conducting facility development programmes, maintenance etc. Record showed that the school has organized parents' conference for adding two classrooms. For the purpose, a committee of parents has been formed for resource generation and mobilization. The school did not include parents in other programmes.

HM and teachers of Ghatal SS confirmed parents' involved in the enrolment of all children in the school. They reported increase in the enrolment of Dalit children. But the regularity of Dalit children had not increased compared with that of the other children. Remarkably, the SIP process has made parents positive towards school even though they did not know anything about SIP. SIP has helped the school develop some facility with the assistance of SIP fund and labour donation from the community.

The children of grade V reported some changes (since the previous year). They referred to works such as fencing, renovation of classrooms, and new furniture items and to activities such as cleanliness and parents' conference. Teachers also visited the homes if they did not attend the school or classes regularly. Frequency of parents visits to the school had increased. The school distributed exercise books, pencils and uniform to the children who did not have them. The minutes of the schools revealed that the school board had decided on scholarship and uniform distribution. The minutes also included decisions regarding cleanliness activities, renovation work and the like.

HMs and teachers observed that the completion of these programmes enhanced the efficiency of schools in providing quality education. But these efforts had partial

result. However, the school learned the following lessons from SIP and its implementation:

- SIP helped identify the problems of schools,
- School would get assistance from community and stakeholders if it proceeded with a definite plan.
- Plan is necessary for the advancement of the school.
- Plan is gradually creating the feeling of ownership in the community people.

Attempts were also made to solicit the opinions of the respondents on impact of SIP implementation. They stated that SIP implementation had the following results:

- Previously, schools were looked upon as government entities. This notion has gradually changed. Now the people feel that community and parents should both be active for the development of the school.
- Teaching-learning environment has started improving. This is expected to enhance the quality of teaching learning.
- Students' school regularity is improving.
- Educational awareness has increased in the deprived and disadvantaged groups.
- The level of parental concern for children's learning has been rising. Parents have become more responsible.

### Programmes Implemented by Other Schools

Programmes implemented by other schools are given in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2  
Programmes Implemented by Other Schools in 2001/02

Chitwan		Syangja		Dadeldhura	
Adarsh Rastriya PS	Malpur LSS	Durga Devi PS	Saraswati LSS	Saraswati LSS	Janata SS
<i>Programmes that did not require funds</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School compound cleaning</li> <li>• Household visits</li> <li>• Awareness against smoking, drinking and drug abuse</li> <li>• Awareness against girls trafficking</li> <li>• Awareness against misuse of forest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness-raising</li> <li>• Household visits</li> <li>• School cleaning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cleaning program</li> <li>• Staff meeting</li> <li>• SMC and teachers' meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Household visits</li> <li>• Cultural programmes</li> <li>• Parents' conference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cleanliness program</li> <li>• Plantation</li> <li>• Children's rally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mother's conference</li> <li>• Cultural programmes</li> <li>• Household visit programmes</li> </ul>
<i>Programmes that required funds</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toilet facility development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fencing</li> <li>• Purchase of land</li> <li>• Maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drinking water</li> <li>• Furniture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building maintenance</li> <li>• Furniture construction</li> <li>• Drinking water</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance of furniture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toilet</li> <li>• Drinking water</li> <li>• Fencing of the school compound</li> <li>• Furniture items</li> </ul>

The other (non-pilot) schools in Chitwan implemented programmes but only on a limited scale. All these indicate that schools started to implement programmes what

they had incorporated in SIPs. However, they were not able to conduct all the programmes for the following reasons:

- Late start of the program: The programmes were designed for a year, but the schools did not get even 6 months' time to accomplish them. The schools have not yet developed programmes for the current year because of the delay in the start of the training.
- Paucity of resources: In fact, the schools did not receive the expected amounts to conduct their programmes. VDCs could not add funds owing to cuts in the government grants.
- Lack of human resources: The school could not spare any teacher for program responsibility. Since the programmes are the concern of all, they have become nobody's concern. HMs and teachers were grossly engaged in their routine job. Therefore, SIP did not receive expected attention.

In Syangja district also the non-pilot schools completed only a few program because funds were not adequate. Durgadevi PS only received 10 sets of furniture. Though the school had improved the drinking water facility, their local water users' committee added to the improvement. The school conducted programmes that did not require funds such as staff meeting, joint meeting of SMC and teachers, and school cleaning activities. The school were unable to conduct other proposed programmes e.g. maintenance of classroom, fencing and development of playground due to shortage of fund. Saraswati LSS conducted SIP programmes but on a limited scale. The school had proposed the renovation of 3 classrooms but it was able to renew only one classroom. It could not build new classrooms. The school received only 15 sets of furniture even though it had proposed for 100 sets. The school playground could not be developed, but the drinking water facility was somewhat improved. The school also conducted programmes like cultural show, home visit and parents' conference, which did not require any funds. However, the school could not organize other programmes that did not require fund e.g. Holi and Deusi due to the Maoist insurgency.

In Dadeldhura the other schools implemented SIP programmes, but only limitedly. For example, Saraswati LSS had proposed for fencing, furniture construction, maintenance of classroom, and drinking water facility with the assistance of Unicef. Some furniture items were repaired. HM and SMC members reported paucity of resources as the major problems in the implementation of the proposed programmes. SIPs of these schools did not receive funds. The schools also conducted programmes that did not require any funds e.g. school cleaning, children's rally and tree plantation. HM reported that school sought parents' consent to conducting the physical facility development programmes. From school minutes it was found that SMC met every month and parents were also invited to take part in the discussion. The meeting decided which works should get priority. But the meetings were restricted to facility development matters only.

Like Saraswati LSS, Janata SS conducted SIP programmes. The school completed fencing, drinking water facility, toilet construction and furniture programmes. But the school was unable to renovate classrooms for lack of funds. HM and teachers reported that they had also conducted programmes that did not require funds e.g. mothers' conference, cultural programmes, household visits and the like. But the school did not invite parents to discuss on these SIP programmes. The school minutes verified it. Teachers and HM of Janata SS were happy to say that



implementation of the SIP programmes had brought about positive changes. They reported that the school regularity of teachers and students was increasing and dropout declining on account of the mother's conference and household visits. The parents also said that they were sending their children to attend classes regularly.

### **Reflections**

- Schools conducted both types of programmes: programmes that required fund and programmes that did not require any fund.
- Both the pilot and other (non-pilot) schools implemented the SIP programmes. But the other schools mostly implemented programmes which did not require funds while the pilot schools implemented programmes that required funds.
- The schools did not complete all the programmes on account of the paucity of resources. The incompleteness incidence was more acute with the schools which did not get any fund for SIP programmes.
- SIP implementation suffered from shortage of time. Belated start of programmes was one of the reasons why the works could not be completed on time.
- In Dadeldhura district, schools involved parents in the implementation of SIP programmes, especially the facility development program.
- Enrolment and students' regularity was gradually getting better.
- SIP implementation contributed to positivising the attitude of parents and community people towards schools and to creating awareness in them.

## **Chapter VI**

### **Resources Mobilization and Resource Availability**

This chapter attempts to present process adopted for the disbursement funds, use of VDC partnership funds and involvement of local bodies in the process of funding SIP.

#### **Funding Process**

For the implementation of the SIP programmes, funds were made available to schools. Funds were provided to schools on the criterion known as formula funding. DEO provided lump-sum grants to the VDC and the Municipality where the pilot schools were located. The concerned VDC and Municipality provided fund to the schools for implementing the SIP programmes. Last year, the grants received by the VDCs under Dibyanagar RC in Chitwan district amounted to Rs. 535200/- DEO made an amount of Rs. 994,000/- available to Waling Municipality in Syangja district. Involving local bodies in the funding process followed two basic strategies:

- to encouraging local bodies to contribute financially for the development of local education
- to involving local bodies in the local educational affairs.

These strategies worked well. Local bodies started to show their concern for educational matters. They visited schools for observing school activities. They instructed the schools to organize programmes for the development of education. For example Sukranagar VDC letters to the schools telling them to organize Mothers' conferences. However, Dibyanagar, Sukranagar and Meghauri VDCs could not add funds from their resources due to the cut on their own development grants.

But the case of Waling Municipality of Syangja district is different. The Municipality not only added its resources, but also sought other sources of funding for the schools. The Municipality staff members stated that school uniform, scholarships, sport materials, furniture had also been provided to the schools to add to the fund provided by the DEO office. The Municipality contributed to construction work and drinking water supply. The Municipality made efforts to get resources from the Town Development Fund for providing furniture to the 7 schools running within its territory. It conducted training programmes for schools and school staffs on account management. It also provided for the salary of 4 teachers working in 4 schools besides assisting in facility development. To see if the fund was rightly used, the Municipality visited the schools and observed the school activities. For the purpose, the Ward Chairman was made responsible. The Executive Officer of the Municipality also observed the school activities. Sometimes, a certain staff was assigned for the purpose. Besides, the Municipality organized HM's conference 2 times in a year to review the progress of the schools. A Teacher's Diary was developed and provided to every teacher to facilitate the monitoring of teachers' activities. Teachers have to note down their daily activities in that diary. The above observations provide the following clues:

- Local bodies use their resources besides the government grants, when these bodies are involved in local educational programmes.
- Local bodies monitor the progress of local schools, which help institutionalize the local monitoring of educational programmes.

- Participation and representation of local people in educational programmes is increased in the design and implementation of local educational programmes.

However, Amargadhi Municipality in Dadeldhura was not involved last year in the disbursement of funds to the schools. In the district, DEO itself released the funds to the schools for SIP implementation. As Municipal Council had met and approved the annual programmes and budget before the start of SIP process in the district, the Municipality did not accept the proposal of DOE to involve in the matters of SIP and fund disbursement.

### Availability of Funds

The fund available for financing the SIP programmes of the pilot and other schools is given in the tables that follow. The tables show that the government is still the major donor to the schools for conducting their development activities. In the pilot schools, local bodies made funds available to the schools. However, DEOs provided these funds to the local bodies. The contribution of schools and local donation was minimal.

Table 6.1  
Resources for SIP and Development Activities of  
Pilot Schools in 2001/02

Funding Sources	Chitwan		Syangja		Dadeldhura	
	Rastriya PS	Adarsh SS	Amilithum PS	Bhumre LSS	Janjyoti PS	Ghatal SS
1.VDC/Municip-ality for SIP	7700/-	7514/-	37000/-	83250/-	16000/-	17075/-
2. BPEP						
• Fund A	2000/-	-	2000/-	2000/-	-	2000/-
• Fund B	11000/-	-	-	11000/-	-	11000/-
• Fund C	-	-	-	15000/-	-	-
• SIP Design	1000/-	-	1000/-	1000/-	-	-
• Uniform for Dalit	-	-	-	4250/-	-	-
• Scholarship	-	-	1500/-	-	1500/-	9000/-
• Maintenance	-	-	-	-	-	14000/-
3. School Sources						
• Land & other	14800/-	44000/-	3750/-	100/-	625/-	28363/-
• Fees	2200/-	-	2750/-	9200/-	700/-	116628/-
4. Donation						
• DDC	-	-	-	-	10000/-	21000/-
• Municipality	-	-	-	-	23000/-	1500/-
• Local	-	-	-	2700/-	-	13000/-*

Note: DEO made fund available to schools in Dadeldhura district.

\*labour donation.

**Table 6.2**  
**Resources for Development Activities of**  
**Other (non-pilot) Schools in 2001/02**

Funding Sources	Chitwan		Syangja		Dadeldhura	
	Adarsh Rastriya PS	Malpur LSS	Durgadevi PS	Saraswati LSS	Saraswati LSS	Janata SS
<b>1. BPEP</b>						
• Fund A	2000/-	-	2000/-	-	-	-
• Fund B	11000/-	-	11000/-	-	-	11000/-
• Fund C	-	-	-	15000/-	-	15000/-
• Scholarship	1500/-	-	1500/-	1500/-	-	3800/-
• SIP Design	1000/-	-	1000/-	1000/-	-	-
• Maintenance	11000/-	-	-	14100/-	-	-
• ECD classes	6500/-	-	6500/-	6500/-	-	-
• Educational materials	-	-	500/-	-	-	-
• Drinking water	-	-	-	-	-	6000/-
• Fencing	-	-	-	-	-	10000/-
<b>2. School Sources</b>						
• Land & other	3830/-	54107/-	-	-	11432/-	-
• Fees	10515/-	212310/	12266/-	5850/-	10234/-	-
• Bank interest	956/-	-	1924/-	-	-	-
• Saving	-	470210/	-	72221/-	-	-
<b>3. Donation</b>						
• VDC	-	-	-	-	40000/-	-
• Local	15940/-	-	-	-	-	-
• Forest conservation	-	-	33165/-	-	-	-
• Water users	-	-	70000/-	-	-	-

During discussions, HMs and teachers said that communities could not contribute because their ability to donate or pay for education was below the mark. As mass poverty is still a phenomenon, one cannot expect a community to provide funds to the schools. Moreover, those who are able to pay, send their children to private schools. Therefore, they do not donate to public schools. However, the community people donated labour. But the school record did not show how much free labour was rendered for construction, renovation and other works. The school resources were made up of fees and school property. But most schools did not have their property so that they could not get additional funds. Recently, the schools have refunded the fees to the parents due to the Maoist insurgency. Therefore, the schools could not raise funds to make their resources of their own.

As primary education is regarded as the responsibility of the government, the community did not consider donating or making fund available. HMs, teachers, SMC members, RPs, supervisors, PC and DEO were of the view that school depended solely upon government funds. School could not generate additional funds. Moreover, they could not provide any alternative sources of sustained funding. In the field level workshop, the participants were unanimous that donors stressed local resource generation for primary education. Because the resource base of the local

bodies, especially VDCs, is so low and also because they have other priorities too, these bodies cannot provide funds for primary education. But exceptionally, some local bodies like Municipalities could make funds available. As the Municipalities have powers and authority they could generate funds for financing local educational programmes. Similarly, local communities could also not make funds available because of mass poverty in the rural areas. As the concept and provisions of Rural Education Development Fund has not materialized as yet, local stakeholders were not aware of it, and of how it works for sustainable funding.

From the funding point of view, SIP did not seem to be a major instrument for school improvement. As funds were also made available for other purposes (e.g. scholarship and uniform covered in SIP), SIP has not been regarded as the only plan for school improvement. In fact, DOE took contingency measures to implement its priority and programmes by providing additional funds on top of the fund for SIP. Providing additional funds to the schools (which usually did not require funds to finance their programmes and implement their priorities) was a commendable act. However, these funds need to be channeled through SIP. It solves the fund scarcity problems of schools on one hand and enhances the importance of SIP and its relevance on the other.

In addition, pilot schools also received funds from different funding schemes of DOE. Fund A (general purpose), Fund B (physical facility development which requires a matching fund) and Fund C (enhancement of the enrolment of the disadvantaged, Dalits and of girls) are the funding schemes. These schemes were developed for the schools which did not receive any fund for their SIPs. In fact, the schemes were designed for the schools other than the pilot schools. In practice, pilot schools also received funds from these schemes on top of the SIP fund. It reveals that criteria for Funds A, B and C have not been appropriately followed at the district level. The district staff did not maintain discipline in this matter.

### **Reflections**

- Schools highly depended upon the government fund for the implementation of their development activities.
- Schools have little capacity to generate funds.
- The ability of the community to donate funds to the schools is limited.
- Local bodies, especially Municipalities, can make funds available for school development activities.
- Local stakeholders are unaware of the Rural Education Development Fund.
- Even if SIP is regarded as a major plan for school improvement, funds were provided to other programmes conducted in the same schools.
- The eligibility criteria governing Funds A, B and C have been overlooked at the district level.

### **Involvement of Local Bodies**

To get information on the involvement of local bodies in education, an interaction session with the chief of Waling Municipality was arranged.

The Executive Officer of Waling Municipality expressed the view that the involvement of local bodies in education is indispensable. He thought that

educational is development aspect of local development. He said that the Municipality played significant role in promoting primary education last year. In that year, the Municipality involved in developing the physical facility, providing teaching manpower, and enhancing the enrolment of the deprived and disadvantaged. Moreover, the Municipality also observed school activities and provided training in school management.

Last year, the Municipality released Rs. 825000 for SIPs (bottom-up planning) submitted by the schools located within its territory. This fund was used for renovation of the school buildings, construction of new classrooms, toilets and improvement of drinking water facility. It was also used in providing scholarships and uniform to the Dalits and disadvantaged. Moreover, the schools received around Rs 193000 for getting additional teachers and maintenance of furniture. The Municipality also received assistance from the Town Development Fund for providing furniture to 7 schools. Besides, the Municipality provided training in accounts, record keeping, store management, etc. Municipality staff members and the Executive Officer also visited the schools for observing regular and development activities of the schools.

In the current year, the Municipality allocated funds under the following heads:

Table 6.3  
**Fund Allocated by Waling Municipality**

Heads	Amount in Rs.
Grants for schools	300,000/-
Scholarships and uniform	140,000/-
Sports	35,000/-
Development of the disadvantaged and ethnic minorities	25,000/-

Besides, the Municipality assisted the schools in drinking water, toilet and feeder road matters.

The Municipality staff members observed that the incidence of dropout was gradually decreasing but they felt that many parents were still indifferent to the education of children. The Executive Officer of the Municipality alleged that DEO did not provide training to teachers whom the Municipality had appointed.

However, the case of VDCs is different. VDCs are not able to make financial contributions due to resource constraint. But they have observed the school activities.

### Reflections

- Municipality made has funds available to the schools for renovating and developing school facilities and making teaching manpower available to the schools.
- Municipality has contributed in the development of human resources by providing training on accounts, record keeping, program and budget, and school management and operation. This has helped the school run as organized institutes.
- Local bodies monitor school activities.

- As their resource bases are small, VDCs have not been able to provide as much support as is expected.
- Involvement of local bodies in education enhances the pace of educational development at the local level.

#### *VDC Partnership Program*

In order to involve VDCs in local educational affairs, the VDC partnership program was launched in the bottom-up districts. A VDC could receive up to Rs. 20 thousand, if it submitted a proposal to the DEO office. In the year 2001/02, Syangja earmarked Rs. 1200 thousand for the purpose. Similarly, the district of Chitwan allocated around Rs. 1200 thousand and Dadeldhura allotted Rs. 500 thousand. In the year 2002/03, Syangja and Chitwan allocated Rs. 1240 thousand each while Dadeldhura stuck to the previous figures. These funds would be provided for implementing VEPs. But these funds were not used in the year 2001/02. Syangja distributed only Rs. 210 thousand to the VDCs while Chitwan distributed around Rs. 400 thousand. The fund was frozen in Dadeldhura district.

One of the reasons for the under-utilization of the Partnership Fund was the lack of awareness on the part of VDC. PC of Syngja district reported that publicity was not made for attracting VDCs. Moreover, the VDCs did not have the idea of the necessity of preparing a proposal for asking for fund. In Syngja, only 11 VDCs submitted the proposal and received money. In fact, VDCs did not have elected representatives. Due to Maoist insurgency, most VDC buildings have been burnt or torn down. Therefore, VDCs may not take any initiative in this direction.

Regarding the non-utilization of the Partnership Fund in Dadeldhura district, PC of the district reported that communication gap was responsible. In the district, funds were already earmarked. But the programmes were not started in time. Delay in the program operation kept the funds unutilized or frozen.

#### **Reflections**

- The partnership funds were underutilized.
- Lack of awareness and belated start of the program were the reasons for the under-utilization of the Partnership Fund.
- VDC partnership program did not help the involvement of VDCs in educational affairs.

## **Chapter VII**

### **Monitoring of School Improvement Plan**

For tracing out the progress of any plan, monitoring is essential. Monitoring is done for the operational improvement of the plan and also for the enhancement of program effectiveness. SIP visualized participatory monitoring of the programmes. During the designing of SIP, it was decided who monitors what. Emphasis was given to the mobilization of the local community for the monitoring of the program operation. For example, HMs were generally made responsible for monitoring the classroom activities of the teachers, SMC members for overseeing the development activities of the schools, RPs for all aspects of SIP, VDCs for the physical facility development, and so forth. SIPs have included targets and indicators that help measure the progress of the plan.

#### **Chitwan District**

In a discussion, HMs of Chitwan district reported that they had observed the class teachings and provided the teachers suggestions regarding the improvement of the learning of children. They expected that these observation motivated teachers to use teaching materials and student-focused methods for improving the learning activities. The HMs stated that they maintained the diaries for the purpose but they could not produce them when requested.

School supervisors were found to observe the classes. The supervision diary of one of the schools showed that the supervisors observed school activities, teachers' and students' attendance, methods of teaching and the like. The supervisors have also made suggestions. They had supervised schools several times.

RPs are central in the monitoring of school activities including SIP programmes. One of the RCs had developed 4 formats, 3 of which were used by RP. During the RC visit, it was observed that RP had used the formats for school supervision. The supervision diaries of schools recorded the visits of the RP. However, the formats contained the teaching-learning items, teachers' and students' attendance, use of teaching and instructional materials and the like. Therefore, RPs mostly observed the teaching-learning activities. In spite of all this the overall progress of SIP programmes could not be monitored.

The fourth format contained things other than the teaching-learning items. This format could be used by anybody. During the RC visit it was found that one of the VDC chairpersons visited schools and observed the attendance of teachers and students, physical conditions, school records and the like. And the chairperson suggested the updating of the school records. The format was submitted to RC. But no parent or community member had visited the schools and for observation.

The SMC members of the schools also reported that they also monitored the school activities. But there was no record that they had supervised and monitored the SIP activities. Neither did the school minutes provide any information regarding this.

Those who supervised and monitored the school activities were unaware of the reporting. They were virtually not familiar with the reporting procedure. Therefore, it is very difficult to give reflections on monitoring and feedback for the revision of SIPs or their funding.



### **Syangja District**

RPs of Syangja district acknowledged that one of their major jobs was to supervise and monitor the school activities. From the supervision diaries of the schools, it was found that RPs did not visit the schools so often. When they visited, they mostly observed the classes and provided feedback. They hardly monitored other aspects. In fact, they were not trained in monitoring the school development activities. They reported that because they had to complete several assignments they could not spare time to visit the schools. One of the RPs explained that he had to spend 3 days in RC and 3 days in DEO in a month. He had only 20 working days for school supervision. He had to do other works related to: data and EMIS, RC management, training (every type), distance education, teacher record and school profiles, headmasters' meeting, and Friday meeting etc. Besides, he had to get involved in other assignments which often came from the centre or DEO. The distance between the cluster schools was another reason. On account of all these, he hardly visited 10 schools in a month. He had a cluster of 33 schools. It indicates that RPs were highly work-loaded. DEO and PC also admitted that they could not spare time for monitoring the SIP activities because of their engagement in routine works. Although RPs were responsible for overall supervision, they mostly supervised the teaching-learning activities. In the field level workshop, RPs said that they visited the schools for monitoring, their visits centered mostly on teaching-learning activities. They did not monitor the SIP programmes. In fact, they were not trained for this.

In some SIPs, HMs were made responsible to supervise the teachers' activities. Some of the HMs reported that they supervised the classes and provided suggestion but they could not produce any evidence in this regard. Moreover, HMs supervision was also confined to teaching learning. As regards the monitoring by SMC members, there was no record to show that they supervised the construction or renovation work. Some of the parents visited schools. But they were not sure whether they visited the school for the monitoring or for the other purposes. However, Waling Municipality started to visit the schools to which it provided funds. The Ward Chairmen, members and sometimes even the senior staffs of the Municipality visited the schools for supervising renovation and construction.

Reporting and follow-up has not come up yet. No school could produce any record regarding the matter. Moreover, those who supervised the school activities did not report what they observed and found what follow-up they suggested. It is difficult to say how the feedback was used.

### **Dadeldhura District**

The school teachers, HM and SMC in Dadeldhura had the notion that RP had the sole responsibility for monitoring and supervision of school activities. Therefore, the SIP activities should be monitored by RPs. But they were not satisfied with RPs' monitoring and supervision. They stated that the frequency of RPs' visit to schools was not satisfactory. They did not provide any suggestion for improvement. In fact RPs did not monitor all SIP activities. From the supervision diary of Ghatal SS (pilot school) it was found that RPs had visited school two times in the year 2001 and once in 2002. In the year 2001 RPs, along with other people, visited the schools and recommended the preparation of lesson plans and instructional materials. In 2002 recommendation was made for the use of directives and child-centered methods. Similarly, RP visited Janjyoti PS (pilot school) two times with other persons in 2001. RP did not observe the classroom activities but recommended the use of lesson plans

and lesson notes. Later, RP recommended for a substitute teacher. In this school, many of these recommendations were not followed. Supervisors and DEO also visited the school (in a team) once in 2001. The team suggested the use of educational materials. RP did not visit Saraswati LSS in 2001 and 2002; he visited Janata SS only once in 2 years (2001 and 2002). Other people (DEO, RED, and an engineer) visited Saraswati LSS to observe development works. All these indicate a lack of serious efforts on the part of RPs in monitoring activities. Moreover, frequency of school visits was only minimal.

When contacted, RPs admitted that they could not visit the schools frequently because of other assignments. They said that they had to conduct all the training programmes intended for teachers, HMs and SMCs. They had to organize contact sessions on Interactive Radio Instruction program and attend workshops and seminars organized in the district. Therefore, they could not spare time for the monitoring of school activities. PC and DEO had the notion that no separate monitoring model was developed for the SIP activities even though SIP had been piloted. BPEP II increased the number of programmes, but did not assign the monitoring responsibility to any body. Therefore, RP was made responsible to monitor the SIP program additionally. PC and DEO did not mention anything about participatory monitoring.

In fact, SIP had also started the concept of participatory monitoring i.e., monitoring by HMs, SMC, local bodies and parents. But no sign of participatory monitoring could be traced. HMs and teachers reported that SMC members and parents visited the schools, but not as a system. They came to the schools for a limited purpose. They came only when the school invited them. SMC members also had the same opinion. The school minutes did not reveal any discussion on SIP implementation, problems in SIP implementing and the like. No local body staff or representative visited the school. The Executive Officer of the Municipality said that the Municipality provided grants to the schools. And it came to be known that the grants were mostly used for appointing additional teachers. Therefore, the Municipality did not monitor school activities. Executive Officer stated that the Municipality could not think of it because of absence of elected representatives. In fact, the Municipality also did not form any committee to look after the local educational affairs.

### Reflections

- SIP was conducted as a regular program in spite of its pilot nature. No monitoring mechanism was developed.
- Only teaching-learning aspects of the programmes were mostly supervised. Little emphasis was given to the overall monitoring of the SIP programmes.
- Confusion between monitoring and supervision still persists. RPs, supervisors, HMs were not trained in the monitoring of SIP programmes. Monitoring suffers for want of conceptual and methodological clarity.
- As RPs have to perform their assigned jobs along with other *ad hoc* assignments which come from DEO and DOE, their monitoring visit to schools was only nominal.
- SIP implementation was not discussed or reviewed at the school level.
- Local bodies did not involve themselves in the monitoring of the school activities (Waling Municipality of Syangja excepted).

- Reporting of monitoring has not yet evolved. Therefore, reflections of monitoring feedback could not be given.
- Participatory monitoring is still absent.

### SUMMARY

In the pilot schools, where the SIP process was started from the first year of piloting, some positive changes have been noticed. Pilot schools have been able to improve their physical facility (to some extent) with SIP funds. As parents have started visiting schools, their concern on children's learning is getting better. Children's school attendance and regularity have been gradually increasing. All these reveal that SIP process has started to improve the affairs of the pilot schools. Overall, SIP has not been able to bring about significant change. As SIP process was started a year before it will, perhaps, be premature to trace out tangible change in SIP.

The following table presents a comparative view of changes in pilot and other schools. (Details are given in Annex I).

Table 7.1  
Thematic Summary

Theme	Pilot Schools	Other Schools
Involvement of SMC, HM and teachers in SIP Design	yes	yes
Involvement of community people in SIP design	no	no
Technical soundness of SIP	weak	weak
Formalization of SIP	no	no
Women and disadvantaged group concerns	a little	little
Focus of SIP (2001/02)	physical facility	physical facility
<b>Focus of SIP (2002/03)</b>	quality	quality
Place of grade I in SIP (2002/03)	nominal	nominal
Involvement of schools in SIP implementation	yes	yes
Involvement of community people in SIP implementation	a little	a little
Financial support from community	a little	a little
Local monitoring	no	no
RPs' monitoring visit	fewer	fewer
Increase in local bodies' involvement	yes	no
Extent of programmes conducted (fund required)	much	a little
Extent of programmes conducted (fund not required)	much	moderate
Facility development of school	moderate	a little
Increase in parental concern for children's learning	yes	a little
Increase in children's school regularity	yes	a little

## Chapter VIII Major Findings, Conclusion and Action Steps

### Findings

1. Since the restoration of democracy, Nepal has been trying for reform of education through: formation of several commissions and accommodation of their recommendations in periodic development plans, enforcement of LSGA, and amendments of the Education Act. In fact, the reform process began with the implementation of decentralization policy and the enforcement LSGA which devolves powers and authority to the local bodies. The Act gave managerial and supervisory authorities to the local bodies. Similarly, the seventh amendment of the Education Act empowered the local people to govern and facilitate local schools. These reform efforts pave the way to involve the local community in local education and support local ideas, strategies and interventions for the development of local schools through the implementation of SIP. Previously SIP is counted as an integral part of local capacity building. PIP, a major guideline for BPEP II, emphasized the start of bottom-up planning by strengthening the school level EMIS and local capacity building. Micro planning was thought necessary for the preparation of SIP. It was not regarded as an independent program. However, MTR (March 2002) made SIP a major program component, a major thrust of BPEP II. So now all school development programmes have to be based on SIP. Moreover, the idea of block grants is tied-up with SIP. After coming of the MTR, SIP has been regarded as a strategy for promoting participatory bottom-up planning. This is reflected in major policy documents of the government such as the **Tenth Plan and EFA: National Plan of Action**. **Thus, in line with the commitment to implement decentralization in education, SIP has been regarded and followed as a major decentralization reform measure to improve school affairs at the policy level.**
2. As SIP covers the 5-year plans and programmes of a school, SIP is considered as an important policy and plan document of the school. SIP requires to be discussed and approved at least by the school board. Better if the parents' conference approves it too. All these things are important, because they make it an official document of the school. But the case is different when one goes through the process of SIP preparation. No SIPs were presented and discussed in the school board meetings, even though the board members were aware of them and the board chairpersons and HMs endorsed them with their signatures. Therefore, SIP did not appear as a legal document and its legitimacy could be questioned. Moreover, the process could not help develop ownership of SIP among the stakeholders. Truly speaking, **SIPs have been informally discussed by SMCs; hence, it is difficult to develop ownership of the SIP.** In fact, schools did not have the tradition of discussing and finalizing their annual programmes and budgets before the commencement of fiscal or academic year. Schools assumed that the budget for them came from the DEO office and that they could neither add to it or deduct from it. So they did not think it necessary to discuss them in the school board meeting. However, the school boards met to discuss scholarship and uniform distribution, resources generation and so forth.
3. SIP was initiated for implementing the decentralization reform process. The process was introduced for the involvement of local stakeholders in the designing, managing, implementing and monitoring of local schools

programmes. The stakeholders recognized that the SIP process provided them opportunities to sit together and discuss the matters related to children's learning and conditions of schools. The process motivates parents to be interested in matters pertaining to local education. It involves the community people in the process of educational reform. It also helps create a vision for educational development, formulate objectives, set priorities work out strategies and interventions, seek resources and so on at the local level. In the process of study, it was found that SIP started involving school-related persons such as HMs, teachers and SMC chairpersons in the design and implementation of reform programmes. **SIP initiated planning exercises at the school level; hence, it is expected to promote bottom-up planning for school improvement.** The process, however, did not involve community members, parents and other stakeholders in the design and implementation of the programmes. However, it initiated planning exercise at the school level.

4. As mentioned earlier, training programmes were organized at different levels for enhancing the planning skills of the grassroots people. To facilitate the training programmes, the centre had prepared a training package. But the training programmes do not seem to have enhanced the planning skills of the grassroots people. The grassroots people who were trained could not even identify the problems. Coherence of vision and objectives, and of programmes and targets could not be observed while the SIPs were being reviewed. SIPs have uniform sets of programmes and similar sets of strategies in regards to access, retention, quality and organizational development. As a matter of fact, training packages and training programmes could not impart planning skills to the grassroots people. A training package is expected to make the planners knowledgeable about improvement of schools, school management, EMIS and the like. It should provide knowledge of and information about planning. Training programmes arranged at different levels to the participants also imparted knowledge rather than skill. The programmes did not focus on problems, vision, objectives and targets etc. In the training package and program, technical terms and jargons confused the participants. **As the training program has little impact on enhancing planning skill at the school level, it appears that SIP preparation lacks necessary expertise.**
5. **SIP implementation has become instrumental in the involvement of local bodies, especially Waling Municipality in local educational affairs.** Waling Municipality in Syangja involved itself in educational activities after the start of SIP process. The Municipality engaged in organizing HMs' conference, getting resources from the Town Development Fund, providing management training to the school staff and HM, and school visits. It realized that education is also one of its development concerns. In fact, the Municipality got involved after it was given the responsibility to look after the schools within its territory. It was also involved in the process of releasing funds for school development programmes. It indicates that Municipalities could run schools and school programmes if they were given authority, responsibility and resources.
6. Initially, it was assumed that SIP covered all development programmes of the school. Therefore lumpsum grants were made available to pilot schools on formula funding. Fund A, B, and C schemes were designed for the funding the other (non-pilot) schools. During the implementation of the program, it was observed that pilot schools also received funds from Fund A, B and C. Moreover,

funds for scholarships, uniform, maintenance etc. were made available to the pilot schools besides the SIP funds (even though SIPs have their own programmes for these aspects). In fact, DOE adopted contingency measures for its programmes and priorities by providing additional fund to the pilot schools. Additional funds helped schools resolve their fund shortage problems, however, **SIP did not appear to be the only program for the overall improvement of school's problems.**

7. The SIP process also suffered from mismanagement of time. SIP had to be started after the training of grassroots people. But the grassroots training was arranged in the middle or third quarter of the fiscal year. Prior to the grassroots level training, Master Trainers' Training and Trainers' Training were arranged by the DOE and DEO. These trainings were organized after the release of funds from the Ministry of Finance. Therefore, time for SIP formulation was too short. Consequently, SIPs were developed without participation of community at large and submitted for funds almost at the end of the year. Programmes were started late and so they could not be completed on time. It reveals that **time factor was little considered while initiating the SIP process; hence, SIP implementation suffers from mismanagement of time.** In Dadeldhura district, schools submitted their SIPs almost last date of the fiscal year for the release of the fund. In fact, the fiscal administration system in the country is very clumsy and time consuming. It takes around 3 to 4 months to release even the initial installment from the Ministry of Finance after starting the fiscal year. DOE staff should make several visits to get the funds released. If proper attention is not given in this aspect, it is sure that program cannot be conducted in time and gets expected outcomes.
8. For the last two years, SIP has been piloted in 5 districts of the country. Training packages were developed and training programmes were conducted at district and grassroots level for enhancing planning capacity. Though the training programmes were arranged for HMs and SMC chairpersons of the schools in these districts, the cascade model was adopted for the implementation of the SIP process. At the outset, DOE conducted training programmes at the districts for selected staff members to develop the master trainers. These master trainers conducted trainings for the preparation of trainers. Finally, the trainers conducted training programmes for grassroots level (SMC chairpersons and HMs) to enhance their planning skill. The cascade model is, by nature, pre-determined and biased towards the centre. It is a centre-dominant model of program operation. This model does not contribute to generate or promote local ideas and strategies for the formulation and implementation of local development programmes. The model does not help the decentralization reform process. The centre determined and altered, even the funding criteria for schools. As a matter of fact, DOE still retains the power, authority and resources in matters related to the development of local schools and local education. DOE determines the amount of grants and funding criteria for each individual school. Focus of educational development lies in the centre rather than in the district or local community. On the other hand, the centre is not convinced that local communities can work out development programmes and implement them. In fact, **centrally designed models are being used for the planning and implementation of SIP process.**
9. SIPs are largely based on the components of BPEP II. In its initial period of planning, SIPs proposed programmes covering access, retention, quality and

management -the main areas of BPEP II. Funds were also made available in a 30:40:30 ratio. Therefore, the designers, HMs and SMC chairpersons got inclined to design SIP considering these areas and the components related to them. In fact, SIP was introduced to identify the problems and needs of the school and encourage local interventions for addressing the needs and solving the problems. However, the programmes proposed in most SIPs clustered around the three broad areas and components of BPEP II. Physical facility development, scholarship distribution, children's rally, mothers' conference, teacher training, arrangement for additional teachers, teachers' and students' regularity, etc. were the programmes which all the SIPs proposed. SIP could not include ideas and opinions of community people in the design of programmes and strategies. It proves that **SIP was guided by the components of BPEP II rather than by the local ideas and strategies.**

10. At present, women and disadvantaged groups are the major targets of any development program. As women and the disadvantaged (Dalits and the deprived, oppressed and disabled) are outside the mainstream of development, any development program should address their needs and problems. From the point of view of social justice, the needs and problems of these groups should be so addressed that disparities could be reduced. While the SIP process was observed, it was found that the needs and problems of these groups were not addressed properly. For example, the training package did not include the problems and needs of girl students and disadvantaged groups. No discussion was made on the problems and on the strategies to address their needs in the training programmes so that any disparity in the school could be minimized. Besides, there was no woman and no person from a disadvantaged group to participate as trainer and the number of those who participated as trainees was quite small. Moreover, the SIPs that were reviewed had not much to say about problems of these groups, nor had they designed any program. All these reveal that the problems of these groups were not considered in the process of SIP implementation. In fact, the **SIP process still requires to address the needs of women and the disadvantaged.**
11. Ideally, SIP is an important plan, which covers all the problems and issues of the school. Therefore, SIP has to include problems regarding physical infrastructure, teaching-learning environment, HRD, school community relations, management and so forth. Moreover, it should include the problems and issues of all the grades taught in the school. However, the emphasis given in the SIPs was physical infrastructure development. In the first year of piloting, construction and maintenance of school building, classroom, furniture, toilet, playground, fencing, etc. were the major agenda of SIPs in almost all these schools. The mobilization of community resources such as local labour and local materials was confined to infrastructure development. Many SIPs envisioned monitoring of facility development activities. Moreover, no SIP included problems of school grades other than the primary grades, nor did they mention strategies to resolve the problems and issues of the other levels. All these indicate that **SIP focuses more on physical facility development, and that too of the primary school.**
12. SIPs included several programmes which, of course, did not require any fund for their implementation. Reviews of SIPs revealed that every SIP had programmes that did not need any fund but could enhance the quality of learning. These programmes were: to improve the school regularity of teachers and children,

classroom observation, interaction with parents, and so on. These programmes were emphasized in SIPs. As mentioned earlier, one of the purposes of SIP is to enhance the quality of the teaching-learning process besides improving the physical infrastructure development. In this regard, SIP has been able to make effort for improving the teaching learning in the schools. **As SIP also included programmes that did not require any fund for its operation, it has less financial implication.**

13. However, **SIP implementation depended largely upon government resources.** The share of government grants in SIP implementation was very large. Schools could not generate themselves funds, nor could they receive any financial assistance from the local bodies, and organizations and the communities. As a matter of fact, the resource base of local bodies, especially that of VDCs, does not permit the financing of the local schools. May be education is not their priority. On the other hand, the community people cannot donate much to the local schools because their economic condition is not good. The involvement of NGOs and CBOs in formal education is very limited. So the local schools could not get much support from the local bodies, local community and local organizations.
14. The SIP process also suffers from communication gap between the centre and the district, between the district and RC and between RC and the school. Mostly the district level staff received the message very late. For example, the MTR of March 2002 significantly modified BPEP II and restructured it from 3 areas and 17 components to 5 main areas. The emphasis of BPEP II has also been modified. But DEO, the district level staff who took care of BPEP II jobs and RCs who periodically met at the DEO office were unaware at these changes even during the period of Master Trainer and Trainer Training programmes. In Syangja district, they received a letter from the centre almost six months after the MTR Mission. The intents of MTR were not discussed in the training. So they were not aware of the provisions made by MTR. Even the central level staff, who conducted the Master Trainer Training programmes in the district did not organize any discussion on the provisions of the MTR because they were unaware of it. In fact, the bureaucracy did not consider the power of information and the importance of prompt communication. In bureaucracy, if somebody is assigned a job, he or she hardly shares it with others. It is also true about information. Information is rarely shared. Therefore, **prompt communication still lacks between the centre and the district, between the district and RC, and between RC and the school.**
15. The monitoring of any development program is considered essential because it helps to catch the program right in its course of action and provides feedback for enhancing its operational efficiency. Unfortunately, monitoring did not receive due attention in SIP implementations. In the design of SIP, each school mentioned monitoring but monitoring as such was confined only to physical facility development. And monitoring responsibility was entrusted to HM, teachers, community members and, of course, SMC members. It is really a good example of participatory monitoring. Observations of the SIP implementing did not show any of these people doing the monitoring. Even HMs could not spare time for the monitoring. In fact, these people thought RPs were responsible for the monitoring. But RPs also had several other assignments. So RPs hardly visited schools for the monitoring purpose. For them monitoring and supervision were not very different. For them observing classroom activities was monitoring



even while SIPs had several programmes other than classroom teaching. These programmes were not observed during the supervision of teachers' activities. In fact, monitoring has not been given proper attention. Since no monitoring reports were available, correction measures could not be taken up. Truly speaking, these people were not oriented and trained on monitoring of educational development programmes in general and SIP in particular. Monitoring suffers for want of conceptual and methodological clarity. Therefore, **monitoring of the SIP process has not received due attention because it has not been institutionalized yet.** When the programmes were being implemented, nobody cared to see if they were being conducted as required.

16. While some development program is piloted, care should be taken to conduct them in tune with the norms and standards set which generally do not vary time wise. If not, the program would not produce the results which help one decide whether or not to extend or replicate it. As mentioned earlier, the SIP process suffers from mismanagement of time. The time available for SIP implementation was very short. And monitoring of SIP was paid little attention. Without monitoring, no one could evaluate the operational efficiency of the SIP process. Besides, the emphasis of SIP changed in the second year. Funds were made available for quality enhancement only. Similarly, funding criteria have also been changed - from lumpsum grants (formula funding) to per student allocation. In the past year local bodies were involved in fund disbursement, (except in Dadeldhura). In the following year, DEO itself released the funds for SIP to the schools. The involvement of local bodies was considered not necessary. Therefore, **some aspects such as funding, implementation and monitoring still need consolidation for the piloting of SIP.**
17. When the evolution of SIP was being considered, it was found that the focus of SIP had been gradually shifting. Previously, all the areas of BPEP II in general and physical facility development in particular received attention in the formulation of SIP. However, this focus underwent a change in the year 2002/03. Quality became the concern of schools and it was reflected in SIPs. As the quality aspect was emphasized in the training programmes and DOE earmarked funds for quality enhancement, all the schools laid emphasis on quality. Thus, quality became the major area of SIPs in the following year. At the same time, SIP also confined its activities within the boundaries of the schools. Most SIPs proposed programmes which would be conducted in the school rather than in the community. Thus, school-specific programmes got enough space in the SIPs of 2002/03 compared to the SIPs of 2001/02. **As quality and school-specific programmes got stressed in the second year, SIP gradually evolved as quality-focused and school-centred development plan.**
18. Concern for technically better SIPs has grown up in the second year of SIP implementation. SIPs developed in the year 2002/03 included indicators, which were related to the proposed programmes. Previously, SIP included all the indicators given in the formats without setting whether they related to the proposed programmes or not. The provision of SIP appraisal was made in 2002/03. Similarly, SIP implementation guidelines were developed and the centre gave the districts the responsibility of developing their own training packages and conduct training programmes accordingly. All these indicate that bodies and organizations concerned wanted to have SIPs realistic and technically

sound. It evidences that **formulation of technically sound SIP has become the concern of all in the second year of SIP implementation.**

### **Conclusion**

Since the restoration of democracy in 1990 the government seems to be committed to decentralization policy reform process in every sector of national life including education. Devolution of power and authority to the grassroots people has become the policy thrust. To give momentum to the decentralization efforts, Local Self-Governance Act 1998 was brought into force. Similarly, the seventh amendment of the Education Act provides for the involvement of local stakeholders in the planning, management, implementation and monitoring of local education programmes. But the government still depends upon the central level staff in regard to the concept and principles of authority devolution. So the central model and structure is still prevalent in the reform process. SIP did not go beyond the prevailing model of operation. In the initial stage the involvement of the centre in the grassroots level reform process is natural. However, the reform endeavor such as SIP has now been able to draw the attention of the local community even if the community participation in the planning process has to be increased and strengthened.

#### *Suggested Action Steps*

1. Insist on SIP as a basis for reform endeavours in education.
2. Adopt SIP as an official document through discussion and approval in SMC.
3. Institutionalize SIP at the school level by fostering closer proximity between the school and the community.
4. Develop a manual, precise, simple and contributory to enhance local stakeholders' skills and competencies necessary for school development efforts.
5. Encourage local bodies, especially DDC and Municipality, to be on lead in mobilizing resources and expertise for educational reform.
6. Make SIP a basis of funding for all development programmes of school.
7. Prioritize time element for the design and implementation of all reform programmes.
8. Replace the cascade or centrally designed model of SIP implementation by school-based approach.
9. Make interactive and participatory process the major focus of SIP implementation.
10. Make SIP gender and disadvantaged sensitive.
11. Stress integrated SIP so that it covers all the levels and problems of the school.
12. Activate the Rural Education Development Fund so that the school could get development funds regularly.
13. Convey messages timely to the district and grassroots level so that they could get information on time and make necessary adjustments in their programmes and strategies.
14. Institutionalize local monitoring and make it flexible so that the performance of schools could be monitored in the schools' own contexts.
15. Emphasize periodic reviews of school activities in SMC meetings.
16. Provide the inputs envisaged for SIP in time and continue the implementing strategies adopted for a reasonable period of time.

## Bibliography

1. Acharya, S. and Singh, G. B. (2002). *Rapid assessment of school improvement plan*. Kathmandu: Department of Education.
2. Dahal, P. (2002). *A study on SIP: Good practices, problems and challenges*. Kathmandu: Save the Children Japan.
3. Dahal, R. D., et. al. (2002). *Good governance and decentralization in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Centre for Governance and Development Studies.
4. DOE (2001). *BPEP II Annual strategic implementation plan (2001/02)*: DOE, MOES, Bhaktapur.
5. DOE (2002). *BPEP II annual strategic implementation plan (2002/03) Draft*: DOE, MOES, Bhaktapur.
6. DOE, (2002). *Community managed school operation directives*: HMG, MOES, DOE Bhaktapur.
7. DOE, (2002). *SIP training package*: HMG, MOES, DOE Bhaktapur.
8. DOE, (2002). *Status report of basic and primary education program II*: HMG, MOES, DOE Bhaktapur.
9. EFA: Plan of Action, Kathmandu
10. Govinda, R. (1997). *Decentralization of educational management: experiences from south asia: international institute for education planning*. UNESCO Paris.
11. HMG (1997). *The ninth plan*. Kathmandu
12. HMG (2002). *The tenth plan*. Kathmandu
13. HMG (1999). *Local self-governance act, 1999*. Kathmandu
14. HMG (2001). *Education (seventh amendment) act, 2001*. Kathmandu.
15. HNEC (2055). *Report of higher level national education commission, 2055*. Author, Kathmandu.
16. MOE, (1999). *Basic and primary education program (BPEP II) 1999-2004, program implementation plan (main report)*. Ministry of Education, Keisher Mahal, Kathmandu.
17. MOES (2001). *Basic and primary education program (BPEP II): Report of technical panel*: DOE, MOES, Kathmandu Nepal.
18. MOES (2002). *Mid-term review of Basic and primary education program* Kathmandu, Nepal
19. NEC (2049). *Report of national education commission, 2049*. Author, Kathmandu.
20. Shrestha, G. M., et.al. (2002). *SIP-based development program: a status report*. (Kathmandu: EC/World Bank, Nepal)
21. Team Consult Pvt. Ltd (2001). *A third party review of basic and primary education program phase II*: Team Consult Pvt. Ltd, Lalitpur.

**Annex A**  
**Roles and Responsibilities (Education) of Local Bodies**  
(As included in Local Self-Governance Act, 1999)

*District Development Committee*

- To set criteria for the establishment of schools in the district development area and recommend criteria-based establishment.
- To set rationales for approval to the establishment or liquidation of the schools.
- To supervise and monitor the school activities and assist in their operation and management.
- To formulate policies and programmes at the district level and run adult education as well as nonformal education.

*Village Development Committee*

- To establish pre-primary schools (on its own resources), grant permission to establish schools and operate and manage the schools
- To supervise and manage the schools operating within the village development area.
- To assist in providing primary education in the mother tongue.
- To make arrangements for providing scholarships to the students of oppressed ethnic communities.
- To start programmes in adult education and informal education
- To establish and operate (or get established and operate) libraries.

*Municipality*

- To establish, operate and manage pre-primary schools (on its own resources) in the Municipality area and grant permission to establish them
- To provide support to the operation and management of schools and recommend the establishment and closure of schools
- To assist in providing primary education in the mother tongue
- To make arrangements for providing scholarships to the students of oppressed ethnic communities
- To develop and implement (or get developed and implemented) programmes at the Municipality level in adult education and informal education
- To open, operate and manage (get opened and managed) libraries and reading halls.

*Ward Committee*

- To assist in the establishment and operation of schools and libraries within the ward territory.

**Annex B**  
**Roles and Responsibilities of Village Education Committee**

As included in Education Act (seventh amendment)

1. To motivate children to primary education (at least).
2. To keep update records of (school) enrolled and un-enrolled and other children well irrespective of age, gender and ethnicity.
3. To update the records of school's education planning, monitor the plan and forward suggestions concerned places.
4. To assist the school management committee to mobilize resources and distribute the resources to the school.
5. To maintain the records of families living below the poverty line and make necessary arrangement to get the children of these families to participate in education.
6. To maintain and establish co-ordination between SMC, supervise and monitor the school activities for quality of education, and provide timely suggestions to head teachers, teachers and SMCs. Give further assistance.
7. To implement awareness activities, trainings, seminars and workshops to improve the quality of education.
8. To survey and study the schools' physical facilities and request SMC for releasing funds as required.
9. To create and maintain healthy educational environment in the school.
10. To develop village education plan (VEP) and get to it the approval of VDC Council for its implementation.
11. To maintain the records of educated manpower available within the village development committee (VDC) territory.
12. To make provisions of rewards for teachers (for efficiency in work).
13. To assist school in collecting resources and mobilizing them.
14. To recommend f school mapping.
15. To organize and operate inter-school competitions in sports and extra-curricular activities with provisions for awards (for quality performance).

**Annex C**  
**Visions from Mid-Term Review (17-22 March 2002)**

The mid-term review of BPEP II was started at the end of 2001 and completed in the beginning of 2002 (March 17 to 22). The review was made with the objective to assess the progress previously achieved in program operation and makes necessary adjustments changes in the program for success in its implementation.

**Focus**

- It was found that the target and objectives of BPEP II needed a review for the adjustment of the goals of the Tenth Five-year Plan and Education for All (EFA) plan of action. This will provide a guideline for the redesigning of BPEP II for its remaining period and also a basis for further development of primary education in the country.
- Synergies will further be sought at different levels of education for a more holistic view of education.
- The role of the civil society has a great impact on the improvement of children's learning. So the civil society will be involved in community ownership of the schools, and public schools converted to community schools will be empowered through a block grant scheme.
- The role of implementing agencies (central to district) will be technical and so these agencies will work as facilitators to the community rather than implementers. The civil society will be included for support to education.
- More attention will be paid to the implementation process and output/outcome rather to input. Qualitative indicators will be given due respect, also. The 14 BPEP II indicators will be adjusted to the 18 EFA indicators.
- The importance of grade 1 will call attention in the preparation and implementation the programmes.

**Restructuring of BPEP II Programmes**

Previously, BPEP II had 3 main areas and 17 components. MTR reduced them to 5 main components (with corresponding activities). The five main components are:

1. School Physical Facility (5 activities)
2. Access and Retention (7 activities)
3. Learning and Achievement (4 activities)
4. Management and Capacity Building (5 activities)
5. SIP-based Development program (school development and quality enrichment activities as per the SIP approved)

## Annex D Contents of SIP Training Package

### Training Package Developed at the Centre

The training package on SIP was developed (by DOE) in pursuance of the concept "Let us improve our school ourselves". The package intends to provide planning skills to the SMC members for the preparation of SIP. The package was published in 2056. It was reproduced after a refinement in 2001 as the third impression.

#### *Features of Improved School*

The package is divided into 5 broad headings including annexes. SIP attempts to explain the features of an improved school as follows:

- An improved school has a clear vision, which guides the school to direct its efforts and resources towards the attainment of the vision.
- The school has a set of objectives defined on a consensus of the stakeholders. It facilitates to streamline the program efforts.
- An improved school determines strategies for achieving the objectives by mobilizing the stakeholders.
- It divides the work of strategic decision-making.
- In it stakeholders get opportunity to actively participate in the decision-making process and work with a feeling of ownership of the school programmes.
- The school encourages children to actively participate in the teaching-learning process. Teachers work as facilitators and children learn under their guidance.
- An improved school sets clear standards for work and level of performance.
- The school has a clear knowledge of the desired (optimum) level of performance on the mobilization of the resources that are available.

The package concludes that an improved school controls wastage and ensures optimum learning outcomes. It therefore expects that the school develop its plan in consideration of all these things.

#### *School Management*

The package believes that improvement efforts could be effective only if the management of the school is capable and efficient. It explains school management with the help of four cases or activities. To define the concepts of management and school management, it solicits the views of the trainees during the training sessions.

#### *EMIS*

The package attempts to define EMIS as a method to collect, manage and display education-related data and information generated by using different indicators. The significance of EMIS, as mentioned in the package, is not only limited to the designing and implementation of educational plans and programmes, but also helps to see how far the programmes have been successful to achieve the desired results.

To explain the importance of EMIS two cases for exercise have been given.

The package also mentions the ways and process of school-related data flow and provides tips for filling out the school statistics form.

### *Planning for School Improvement*

In this section, the package tells about the identification of problems and issues (with their causes) and suggests ways to resolve the problems. For this, it requires suggestions, interactions and discussions involving the stakeholders. It stresses that stakeholders' participation is essential for need specification, prioritization, determination of objectives, strategies, and so on. It indicates that SIP should include programmes such as physical facility improvement, checking the regularity of teachers and students, improvement of learning achievements, internal efficiency, and so on.

The package suggests the following steps for SIP designing:

- Analysis of the educational status of the school area based on a survey of the catchment area
- Analysis of the causes of problems and determination of resolution strategies
- Prioritization of needs
- Identification of funding sources and their analysis
- Determination of long-term and short-term objectives (based on vision)
- Program designing (with usefulness stated)
- Fixing of targets and determination of indicators
- Cost estimates and survey of resources
- Appraisal of the plan
- Implementation of the plan
- Monitoring of program implementation
- Feedback and readjustment in the plan

The above-stated steps are virtually the contents of the plan documents.

The package elaborates these steps by citing examples and cases. For example, the issue may be late to dropout or repetition. The causes may be irregularity of teachers (or school itself), no full-time class attendance of teachers, unattractive instruction, absence of environment for active learning, teachers' misbehaviors, lack of toilet facility, absence of female teachers, etc. Similarly, the vision of the school may include improvement of the quality of learning and development of the school into a community development centre. The programmes may cover creation of a joyful learning environment, development of children's garden, enhancement of regularity, and so on. These programmes are subscribed with strategies, usefulness check schemes and responsibility. The package also contains a list of possible indicators such as GER, NER, cycle completion rate, average attendance of teachers and students, achievement level, and so on. A list of additional items has also been attached.



Besides, lists of programmes, which do not require funds and programmes which require funds are also given in the package. The programmes given in the list are not similar to what have been mentioned above. The package provides potential funding agencies such as local bodies, DDC, NGO and the school community. It mentions the monitoring of the program, giving examples. The package also informs about SIP appraisal so that SIP could be examined in terms of compatibility with the current policy, target, resource mobilization and so on.

#### *Annexes*

Of the 59 pages, 37 pages contain several formats (to facilitate exercises on SIP) and instructions as annexes. In the annex the School Statistics Form is also included.

#### Training Package Developed in the District

In 2002/03, the pilot districts have also developed their own SIP training packages, of which the contents and messages are almost similar to those of the package developed by DOE.

The training package developed by the Chitwan district has two sections. The first section attempts to provide knowledge of and information about school management, EMIS, and steps of planning. The second section provides various formats for facilitating SIP exercises. The contents and formats given in the package do not structurally differ much from those developed by DOE at the centre.

Dadeldhura district also developed a training package, with stress on the steps of planning. It explains that SIP should have a clear vision, objectives, funding sources, activities, indicators and targets, budget, monitoring and evaluation. The package also provides formats. The contents and formats given in the package are similar to those of the DOE.

In contrast, the district of Syangja developed a guideline on SIP to assist the planners in the designing of SIP. The guideline explains the features of a good school and provides several tips for the design and implementation of the plan. It informs about school management as well as the roles and functions of SMC. It briefs on the decentralization effort in education made with the help of VEC and VEP. As regards SIP, the guideline attempts to explain the concept of SIP and its significance for school development. It suggests steps of planning and provides tips and clarifications to be considered during SIP development. It also mentions SIP as a rolling plan, to be revised every year for five years. It does not include any format. The messages included in the guideline do not differ much from those included in the package DOE.

**Annex E**  
**Observation of Training Program**

**Training Model**

***The cascade model of training was adopted to train the grassroots people for enhancing their planning capacity. The staff of DOE conducted MTOT. The master trainers conducted TOT and the trainers conducted the grassroots level training. This training model is, by its very nature, predetermined and centre-dominated. As the centre designed the training program, centre's desires were reflected in the cascade model.***

*Master Trainer's Training Program*

*Participation*

The persons who participated as trainees in the training were as follows:

HMs	-	7
Chairperson/member of schools	-	7
Resource Persons	-	8
School supervisors	-	2
Section Officer (PC)/DEO	-	1
Program Officer/DDC	-	1
Vice-Mayor, Waling Municipality	-	1
Staff, Waling Municipality	-	2
Representative, NGO	-	1
Dalit (Representative)	-	1

*The total number of participants was 31 and 3 of the 31 were women:*

Four persons conducted the training. Of these 4, 1 belongs to SIP business at the Department, 2 are associated with Planning and Monitoring Section of the Department and remaining one was recently deputed in Women's Education Section of DOE. However, the person who holds SIP business at the DOE played the lead role in the session even though he did not have any training related to SIP.

**Review of SIPs**

At the outset, SIPs prepared and implemented last year by the seven schools were presented at the session for their review. The headmasters and chairmen of SMCs presented their SIPs. The participants made their comments on each SIP presented.

Almost all SIPs had programmes on the access and quality components of BPEP II. Physical facility development received much attention in SIP; managerial improvement got a little. In the presentation session prioritization was not taken as a problem for planners. The DEO Office made fund available for the implementation of SIP activities through Waling Municipality. The Municipality provided support in cash as well as in kind. However, the shortage of fund and the delay in its release hindered the completion of the activities in stipulated time.

The participants felt that SIP had a positive impact on increasing local participation in educational activities and raising educational awareness in parents. They also felt that enrolment increased parental support to the schools gradually went-up, and students' absenteeism slowly declined. The participants expressed the view that SIP helped identify problems, work out relevant strategies, and mobilize resources for enhancing the quality of education.

### **Training Session**

In the training, it was informed that stakeholders (teachers, HMs, SMCs, students, parents and local bodies) should be involved in the review of the SIP and in the designing of SIP programmes. Of the technical soundness of SIP, the participants were made aware. For the purpose, a three-member committee for the VDC should be formed (with the concerned RP, a person nominated from the VDC and a person from the District Education Committee).

The trainers insisted that the quality aspect be incorporated in the SIP because fund would be available for this aspect only on the basis of per child allocation. As regards the access aspect, the trainers informed that the VDC should take care of it. In the session, monitoring and reporting of the programmes were emphasized. But it was stressed that the local bodies, RPs and SMCs. should take the monitoring responsibility and reliable indicators should be included to measure the progress of SIP implementation. However, how to monitor the progress was not discussed. Financial auditing (of the program) was suggested.

During the session, no materials or training packages were distributed. The trainers feared that the materials might mislead the planners. They felt that the planners could entirely imitate the training packages. Therefore, no materials were distributed. In the training, methods and skills related to problem identification, vision and target setting, prioritization, etc were not much discussed. However, the trainees felt thus benefited from the program, because the session was based on exercises. The participant prepared a dummy SIP too. They thought that they could conduct the training. It was observed in the training there was a covert warning that no development fund would be available if the schools did not prepare their SIPs.

However, training had the following shortfalls:

- Necessary theoretical and technical skills were not imparted in the session.
- The training session was organized only after the MTR Meeting of March 2002, the intent of MTR was not discussed.
- Problems of grade I were mentioned but not discussed.
- Participation of women and disadvantaged group people as trainees was nominal and none from this side worked as a trainee.
- No attempt was made to get feedback from the training.
- It was felt that training only transferred knowledge and information pertaining to planning rather than skills of planning.

## Trainers Training Program

### *Participation*

#### Trainees

The following persons participated in the training program as trainees:

Headmasters	-	43
<b>Teachers</b>	-	<b>14</b>
RPs	-	6
School supervisors	-	6
SMC chairman	-	1

Of these total participants, 5 were women.

#### Trainers

Out of 8 master trainers 6 took part in the training program.

### *Training Session*

At the outset, a plenary session was arranged to highlight the objectives of the training. The participants were made aware of SIP and VEP, of the distinction between them, and of the components to be included in these plans. They were requested also to include programmes that did not require any funds. SIP should focus on school and school activity e.g. learning environment enhancement; quality improvement and VEP should include access-related activities. Though matters like late release of funds and RC-based SIP design were mentioned, it was suggested that local stakeholders be included in the designing, implementing and monitoring of SIPs. Use of quantifiable and measurable indicators for progress monitoring was stressed. The participants were made aware of budgetary provisions and the budget.

After the plenary session the participants worked in groups and sub-groups. Each sub-group reviewed the SIP presented in the group. Discussions were made and, finally, it was seen if the vision, objectives, strategies, programmes and budget related matched and complied with each other. An attempt was made to establish link vision, objective, strategy and program by conducting exercises. However, these efforts were not enough for enhancing the planning skills of the trainees.

The session also highlighted the importance of information and EMIS, and insisted on the maintaining of the school register and VDC register. The participants suggested what contents to enter into these registers. An exercise was facilitated to prepare SIP. Each sub-group prepared SIP. And, finally, a separate discussion was made on measuring the progress (indicators), tracing the progress (monitoring), auditing, and reporting. A planning guideline was also distributed in the last session, but no discussion was made on it.

### *Review of SIPs*

In each group, the sub group reviewed the SIP, the programmes implemented last year, and the program achievement gained. The participants also mentioned reasons why the programmes could not be implemented. During the presentation, they

explained the process of SIP design. Other participants asked questions, which were answered.

Almost all the groups mentioned that VDCs, parents, community members, teachers were involved in the design of the SIPs, and that RPs assisted in the preparation of SIPs in some of the schools. They selected strategies and set priorities. The programmes were presented as programmes conducted by schools and communities. The reason for the non-completion of the school and community conducted programmes was shortage of time. Some programmes that required funds could not be started or completed due to budget constraints.

Though the focus of SIP was to enhance the quality of primary education, it did not include new activities. Most of the SIPs had programmes like appropriate teaching methods, lesson plan, preparation of educational materials, discussion with parents, child-centred learning methods, classroom observation, etc. Physical facility development was included in almost all SIPs. Even before the introduction of SIP, several schools did these things for quality enhancement. Previously, they did not contribute to raising the quality. Therefore, it was difficult to believe that these activities enhanced quality if they were included in SIPs. May be, previously the teachers did not use the things or these things had limitations (for enhancing the quality). These aspects were not discussed in the session, nor were they even referred to.

No SIP covered the whole of the school. As guided, SIPs were prepared for the primary level only. The schools that had the lower secondary and secondary levels overlooked these levels. Therefore, the programmes designed only reflected the needs of the primary level; they did not focus on any special grade or component.

### *Observation*

The session focused on discussion and exercises. No materials, manuals etc. were handed to the participants because it was assumed that these materials could mislead them because it was feared they would follow them blindly. Moreover, the organizers might have felt that the grassroots people themselves are able to analyze their problems and prescribe strategies for resolving them. Even though the participants exercised on developing vision, determining objectives, working out strategies and so on it was observed that they could not comprehend the meanings and connotations of technical terms and jargons like vision and objectives, strategies, context, identification of issues, targets and measurable indicators. They faced problems in linking vision with objectives, and strategies, strategies with programmes and activities, issues with objectives and so on. The trainers could not provide any solutions to these matters. Moreover, the trainees thought that SIP was crucial to receiving development funds. The trainees felt that they now could conduct the training at the grassroots level. When asked, some of the groups acknowledged that the program was useful because it provided knowledge of planning required for designing SIP. The participation of women and disadvantaged groups as trainees was negligible while their participation, as trainers could not be traced. Moreover, the educational problems and needs of these groups were also not discussed in the program. Feedback is essential to improving the training program. But the organizers did not make any attempt to get the reactions of the participants for the improvement of the program in the future. In the session, discussion centered mostly on the quality improvement of education, especially primary education. It did not emphasize that the school should design a complete broad-based improvement

plan with quality and level of education as components. At present, EFA has become the policy concern of government. Access to the primary education is one of the focuses. But this aspect did not receive due attention in the workshop even though it was mentioned that VEP would cover the access aspect. In the session, little effort was made to link SIP, VEP and even DEP. The significance of VEP in the context of EFA is considerably high. But the attention has not been given to this. VEP was mentioned only casually. HMs of the lower secondary and secondary schools also participated in such programmes. HMs mostly took part in the planning workshops and training programmes arranged by SEDU and other government agencies. But the training program aimed at designing SIP for the primary level, not all the aspects and all levels of education. Grade I is considered one of the problematic grades in many respect. The MTR (March, 2002) intended to focus on this particular grade. This grade, no doubt, requires special care in order to enhance the effectiveness of primary education as a whole. However, the workshop did not give much emphasis to this problem.

### **Grassroots Level Training**

#### **Participation**

It was expected that 24 persons (1 HM and 1 SMC member each from 12 schools) would take part in the training program. But 12 HMs and 10 SMC members or chairpersons attended the program. Of them, 4 were women. The HMs that participated had already developed and implemented SIPs (last year). A trainer who participated in TOT conducted the workshop with the support of RP.

#### *Review of SIPs*

In the session, SIPs developed and implemented by the schools last year were reviewed. The HMs presented on how SIPs were formulated, what programmes the schools conducted, the problems faced, SIP implementations and their effects, and the lessons learned from the first year's experiences. They said teachers and themselves developed the SIPs. However, they solicited the opinions of SMC members and parents. The schools could not implement all the programmes due to financial and time constraints. The Maoist insurgency stopped the schools from conducting programmes in the evening. The HMs experienced that SIPs made them able to work systematically and helped them create vision and the long-term goals of the schools. However, people's participation in schools affairs has gradually been increasing.

#### *Training Session*

Attempt was made to make the training participant-oriented. However, it was observed that trainer played the lead role in conducting the session.

At the outset, a discussion was made on planning and its benefits. Then, SIP was discussed and it was decided that SIP was a plan centered on the problems of school and students. A separate discussion was made on the components of SIP. Exercise on quality improvement of school took place. However, only a few exercises were conducted in the training. Using the meta-card, the trainer attempted to get the reactions of participants on effective learning outcomes. Different participants had the different views. However, the common suggestion was physical and educational improvement, use of lesson plan, teacher-parent relations, and use of instructional/teaching materials, and availability of trained teachers. Attempt was

also made to distinguish SIP from VEP. However, VEP got little attention even though the participants were supposed to contribute to VEP formulation. In the session, it was explained that SIPs need to be developed every year for five years, like a rolling plan. It definitely indicates that the trainer was confused. Moreover, effort was not made to link SIP, VEP and DEP. Also, the training did not discuss ways to address the problems of girls and the disadvantaged groups.

And, finally, a discussion was made on the steps of planning, which considered the importance of needs assessment, vision, targets, prioritization, programmes, resources, implementation strategies, monitoring and evaluation were discussed, and a model plan was developed. The model plan included the quality aspects of primary school and primary education. But these exercises could not teach how to set vision, specify objectives, identify needs, and decide strategies. Further, the exercise did not think of who should actually monitor the SIP activities. After the conclusion of the program, the organizers of the workshop did not attempt to get any kind of feedback from the participants. Some participants stated that training was useful for them because it helped them create long-term goals for the SIP. Some said that it did not require three days. They were of the view that contents and design could be provided in one day. Some of them reported that it was the first time that they received training on planning, which they believed certainly help them develop not only SIP but any other plan at the local level.

### **Observation**

As the quality of primary schools was highly emphasized, the SIPs may contain the quality aspects only. In fact, SIP should be a comprehensive plan covering all aspects including quality. In the training, No discussion was made on SIP-based development programmes and their contents. The discussion centred on 3 areas of BPEP II and the components related to these areas. As it was known that DOE funds would be available on per-child allocation criteria, no discussion was made on other sources of funding. In fact, the resource generation part was not given due importance in the training. During TOT, it was mentioned that the school should keep a register containing school-related data and VDC a register containing education-related VDC and community database. But these were not discussed in the grassroots level training. As different people of the different levels conducted the training programmes, it was felt that the nature of the trainings varied from one level to another. Moreover, enough exercises were not conducted in the session. In the training, no discussion was made on how to address the needs of the girls, disabled and disadvantaged groups. Monitoring and reporting aspects did not receive attention. Discussion centred for the most part on primary education and primary schools. There was no emphasis on designing an integrated SIP, which should include lower secondary and secondary levels also. No attempt was made to get feedback from the participants. VEP was given little importance even though trainees were expected to assist in preparing it. Planning methods were discussed but, clearly, it needs much more to raise the planning skills of the trainees. There was communication gap between the centre and the district and between the district and the sub-district (resource centres, schools). For example, the trainer could not explain what MTR (March 2002) expected from the designing and implementing of the plan, what SIP-based development program really means and how the civil society could help in education, and so on.

## **Annex F**

### **SIP-based Development Program: Implementation Guidelines**

#### **Background**

As local people do have potentials for planning, management and implementation their active participation in local development programmes cannot be ignored. Stakeholders should lay stress on local participation, and the Local-Self Governance Act and Regulations, which were introduced to bring local people to the development process, build the capacity of the stakeholders. As the role of the civil society in educational development is considered significant, especially for the development of the schools, the Education Act (seventh amendment) has provisions to pull the stakeholders to educational development efforts at the local level.

In fact, SIP and VEP are local-level plans evolved from micro planning. Their formulation requires involvement of stakeholders such as parents, local bodies, SMC, Head teacher, teachers, Dalits women and CBOs/NGOs. The decentralization process should go ahead capacitating the local community and organizations. Development programmes need guidelines for implementation. So the guidelines were prepared.

#### **Objectives**

The objectives of the guidelines are as follows:

- to assist in formulating and revising the local educational plan
- to ensure transparency in resource mobilization and maximize participation of stakeholders
- to entrust responsibilities to the stakeholders for achieving educational targets at the local level
- to enhance the quality of primary education.
- to assist in achieving the goals of Education for All

#### *Formulation of Plan and its Implementation*

VDC and the Municipality are to prepare the periodic plan to achieve the goals of education at the local level. The plan is of 5 years' period and is to be updated each year. SIP is an integral component of the VDC plan and Municipality Education plan. The monitoring and follow-up of the plan implementation is carried out on a regular basis (both internally and externally). The suggestions and feedback received from the monitoring and follow-up should help to revise the plan as required.

#### *Village Education Plan Municipality Education Plan*

The Village Education Committee (VEC) prepares the Village Education Plan (VEP) and the Municipality the Municipality Education Plan (MEP). One priority of VEP and MEP is equitable access of children to education, for which community mobilization and activities centred on the education of girls and women are very important. Moreover, unbiased distribution of resources (with transparency) needs to be stressed.



For the formulation of the plan (VEP or MEP) DEO with its local staff members should provide technical support. VEP and MEP require to be approved by VDC, the Municipality or its respective council. However, the plan will have to be finally approved by a sub-committee formed under the District Education Committee (DEC) and then be forwarded to the concerned authorities for necessary action.

The following aspects need to be considered in the preparation of SIP, VEP and MEP:

- Evaluation of the present educational status
- Identification of educational issues
- Needs identification
- Formulation of vision
- Target setting
- Identification of programmes/activities (with strategies)
- Resources, budget and auditing
- Monitoring
- Plan appraisal
- Reporting

The following activities, for example, can be included in VEP and MEP:

- ECD programmes
- Community mobilization, social awareness and parental awareness
- Literacy programmes
- Alternative schooling
- Development of school physical facilities and activities related to access.
- Activities to boost the relationship between school, community, CBOs, NGOs, local bodies, etc.
- Activities to increase quality of education and learning achievement of the students.

#### *School Improvement Plan (SIP)*

Each school should have a SIP, aiming at the development of the school. The school should prepare SIP with the active involvement of stakeholders. SIP will focus on activities related to improving the teaching-learning process, and enhancing the internal efficiency of the school (for quality education). The core concern of SIP is the upgrading of learning achievement. The followings are examples of activities that SIP may include. (The activities are not in the priority order):

- Development of basic life skills in students
- Preservation of social values and norms
- Regularity (teachers and students)
- Capacity building (teachers and students)
- Minimization of gender discrimination
- Activities related to special-needs children/students

- Creation of centers for students that are deprived and disadvantaged
- Extra-curricular activities
- Responsibility delegation
- Pre-primary classes/education
- Listing learning achievements of children
- Teacher training
- Scholarships for students
- Special activities for children who need them
- Classroom management, learning environment, etc.
- Activities related to the duties of teachers and staff members
- School management, administration improvement
- Continual assessment of students' learning
- Strengthening relationship between school, community, NGO, CBO, users' group, local body, etc.
- Capacity building of stakeholders.

Special attention should to be paid to the issues, identified by the Mid-Term Review of Basic and Primary Education Program, in the preparation of SIP activities.

Grade 1 must be given top priority. The following measures may be good for grade 1:

- enrolment of children of appropriate age
- assignment of trained and experienced teachers to schools
- teaching in small groups or class of smaller size
- providing appropriate physical facilities.
- creating joyful learning environment.
- facilitating use of mother tongue or any other language that may be appropriate.

#### *Fund Flow Mechanism*

DEO will release the fund to the school and VDC as per the norms developed by the center for the implementation of proposed activities. The schools should be entitled to get the funds under the following heads:

- Teachers' salary as per the approved teacher quota
- Administrative cost as per the norms
- Operating cost as per the teacher quota
- Incentive costs based on the norms decided by districts
- Cost for distribution of textbooks (free)

- Per child allocation for the advancement of learning achievement as per the criteria made by this year's program and budget. The criteria are: 150 Rs. 150/-per child in the Terai, Rs. 170/- per child in the hills and Rs. 200/- per child in the mountains [All for the schooled students following within the 6-10 age brackets].
- Other funds provided by donors and other agencies. Expenditure of this fund will be as per the agreement made between the two parties (government and donor).

For the implementation of VEP and MEP a matching fund will be released to VDC and the Municipality. The matching fund is token money only. The local bodies will have to find out other resource agencies. In the current fiscal year, the Department of Education (DOE) also will provide a fund to the local bodies through the District Education Office, provided they prepare innovative programmes. Transparency, objectivity and co-ordination have to be ensured in the preparation and implementation of the budget.

### **Monitoring**

The implementing agencies have the responsibility of seeing if the activities are being implemented correctly and effectively. The overall responsibility goes to the District Education Committee because it is this committee that prepares the monitoring mechanism. As the monitoring indicators are important, the input, process and output/outcome indicators must be identified at the local level through a participatory approach.

The community, VEC, VDC/Municipality and parents are to monitor the progress of SIP. Other responsible agencies are school, SMC, Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and Resource Center (RC). DEC and DEO also are required to monitor the plan activities.

#### *SIP Appraisal Committee*

The following are the members of SIP (including VEP and MEP) appraisal committee:

- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| • Resource person   | Co-coordinator |
| • Person nominated by DEC<br>(same VDC/Municipality)              | Member         |
| • Person nominated by VDC/Municipality<br>(same VDC/Municipality) | Member         |

The members of the above committee come from social workers, educationists, teachers, CBOs/NGOs/users' groups, etc.

The committee will appraise SIP and VEP and MEP and submit the plan to the respective VDCs/Municipality with necessary suggestions and comments. The concerned agency will approve the plan after a discussion and interaction with the stakeholders. Finally, the plan will go to DEC/DEO for necessary funding.

### **Auditing**

Authorized persons will audit the accounts of the schools and VDCs/Municipalities. For this purpose, DEO will nominate or select registered auditors from a list

provided by RED or concerned agencies after the decision made by DEC. The auditor's fee is to be paid either from the internal resources of the school or VDC, or from the administrative cost provided by the government. DEO needs to be aware of the audit and pay attention to the recommendations/suggestions made for the future. The audit report is to be forwarded to the concerned agencies.

### **Progress Report**

At the end of the fiscal year, a status report will be prepared. This is one of the main responsibilities of the implementing agencies and partly a responsibility of the stakeholders too. The report should clearly outline the progress achieved and the problems encountered during the implementation of the plan. The school should submit its report to the VDC/Municipality and the Resource Center. VDC/Municipality should report to DEC and RC to DEO. The report received in DEC and DEO will be compiled and forwarded to RED and the Department of Education.

### *Others*

DEC can form sub-committees to provide technical inputs for effect.

**Annex G**  
**Contents of SIP**  
Rastriya Primary School  
Labournagar, Sukra Nagar, Chitwan

**Background**

The SIP of the school outlines the history and development of the school and explains the school catchment area. It informs that the area is inhabited mostly by tribal aborigine people and Dalits who do not have regular sources of income. Those who have a better economic and social status in the community send their children to private schools. The literacy rate is about 60% but women's literacy is very low. The schools could not achieve because of these problems.

Referring to the school vision, the SIP states that with the help of the community the school will boost the access of the children (of the 6-10 age group) to primary education and motivate them to complete the primary cycle with good report. For the purpose, the school will arrange regular interaction sessions on the physical facility development and school management. The teachers' work time will be increased. Coordination with parents and teachers will be.

The SIP contains the population of the catchment area. It gives enrolment figures based on gender and caste/ethnicity, age and grade. It includes figures of dropout, repetition and promotion and of disabled children. The plan states the subjectwise and gradewise learning achievements of the children and briefly describes the teachers in terms of gender, qualification and date of employment.

According to the SIP the attendance of the teachers and students is satisfactory but it does not present the attendance percentage. The physical facility is adequate but there is no fencing. The school has a curriculum and teaching guide but no teaching aids and supplementary materials.

The school receives regular grants from the government. The money it gets from its own assets (land) is only enough for the salary of a peon. The proportion of the government share last year was around 100%.

**The Plan**

The plan does not mention why the children do not get enrolled in schools or why they drop out but lists problems. The problems, are drinking water, lavatory, fencing, furniture and educational materials. Drinking water and fencing are the major problems. For this, the school mobilizes the community fund and also seeks government grants. The vision is to develop the school into a model centre of education (on assistance of the community). The objectives of the school are to provide access to the children of 6-10 years of age to primary education and to maintain 100% GER and NER.

The programmes and activities given in the SIP to achieve the objectives are as follows:

Program	Strategy	Responsibility
Creation of attractive and learning joyful environment	Mobilization of teachers, parents and students	Teachers, parents and community
Increase in the school regularity of students and teachers	Preparation of code of conduct	Teachers, parents, students
Implementation of awareness programmes	Community mobilization	School
Rehabilitation	Community mobilization	SMC

To measure the progress of these activities the plan lists several indicators and targets. Some of them relate to the given programmes while most of them are mismatches.

The plan also gives programmes which do not require funds for their operation and programmes which require funds. These programmes are, however, quite different from those mentioned above. They are:

*Programmes which do not require fund*

- Mother's conference
- Children's rally
- Household visit program
- Interaction (with teachers and SMC members)
- Development of teaching materials (from locally available materials)
- Use of child-centred teaching methods
- Interaction among teachers on student learning
- Parental visits
- Class observation by head teacher and teachers
- Effective monitoring and feedback
- Preparation and use of lesson plan
- Use of teaching materials
- Recognition of teachers and students with top attendance records.

*Programmes which require funds*

- Rehabilitation
- Drinking water
- Fencing
- Furniture
- Additional teachers
- Library
- Scholarship (girls and poor children)
- Teaching materials
- Extra-curricular activities
- Administrative expenses

The plan also provides a budget estimate (of Rs. 637 thousand) for the five years. However, it is silent about the contribution of the community. The school expects these funds from VDC and DDC in the first year. The plan also includes a monitoring scheme which does not cover all the programmes. Further, it entrusts the monitoring responsibility to the head teacher.

**Shri Adarsh Secondary School  
Dibyanagar, Chitwan**

**Background**

The SIP of the school traces the history of the school. It mentions how the school got to the present shape. It briefly describes the household surveys and mentions the population of school age children and their enrolment. It provides the number of ever-enrolled and never-enrolled children. It classifies the school entrants by ethnicity/caste, grade and sex and gives age-grade specific enrolment figures and the figures of dropouts, repeaters and promotees (by gender).

The plan further gives the status of learning achievement of children by subject and grade. Moreover, it provides a list the teachers by gender, qualification, training and status of employment. It gives a profile of the physical condition of the school and includes the income-expenditure statement.

**The Plan**

The plan does not give any information about the problems and needs of the school but includes visions such as knowledge and skills to be imparted to the children, improvement of the quality of learning, providing access to the children of catchment area to education, ensuring the school regularity of children and teachers, and discouragement of social, economic, cultural, gender discrimination. It seeks to manage playground, maintain transparency in the incomes and expenditures of the school, consolidate school management, and supervise and monitor school activities. The programmes designed and the strategies adopted by the schools with regard to these visions are as given below.

Program	Strategy	Responsibility
Garden development	Mobilization of teachers and students	Teachers, students community
Using interesting games (lower grades)	Teacher training	HM, teachers
Timely improvement in teaching-learning activities	Teacher training	HM, teachers
Decrease of GER, and increase of NER and the cycle completion rate		Community, SMC, VDC, HM, teachers

The plan has also set yearly targets to GER, NER, cycle completion and learning achievement. Moreover, it includes targets pertaining SMC, teaching staff, parent-teacher meets, and so on.

The plan also presents programmes which can be conducted without financial support and the programmes which require financial support. But these programmes are quite different from those presented above.

*Programmes which do not require funds*

- Mother's conference
- Children's rally
- Parents' conference
- Household visit
- Joint meeting of SMC and teachers
- Posturing

- Folk-song competition
- Cleaning program
- Question paper setting and examination of answer scripts
- Classroom observation by head teacher and teachers
- Demonstration of model class
- Keeping records of students with maximum and minimum attendance
- Staff meeting.

*Programmes which require funds*

- Construction of new building
- Lavatory construction
- Furniture
- Scholarships for girls, Dalits and poor children
- Prize distribution
- Sports materials and extra-curricular activities

The plan also states yearly budgetary requirements. It expects VDC and DDC to make funds available. However, the budget provided for the first year activities did not match the annual financial targets.

The plan refers to the monitoring scheme, process and persons responsible for monitoring. But it does not cover the whole program. It assumes that head teacher; RP, teachers and students are responsible for the monitoring of the activities.

**Adarsha Rastriya Primary School  
Tarauli, Bachhyoli, Chitwan**

**Background**

The SIP describes the establishment of the school and the facilities available in the school at present. The plan includes the number of households and major ethnic castes/groups (Brahmin, Chhetry, Tharu, Gurung, Newar and Kami) in the school catchment area. The plan provides the figures of school-age children, ever enrolled and never enrolled, by gender and caste/ethnicity. It also gives the statistics of school children by grade, gender and disability.

The plan includes the learning achievement of children gradewise and subjectwise. It describes the teachers' qualifications, trainings and status of employment. The plan briefs on the financial and physical conditions and on the educational materials.

*The Plan*

The plan does not provide any information about problems and needs of the school. It does not analyze issues for feedback. However, the plan describes the vision relating to quality of education and improvement of the physical, financial, administrative aspects of the schools. But it does not mention the objectives. It proposes the following programmes and strategies as approaches to the visions:



Program	Strategies	Responsibility
Increase in teacher quota size	New initiatives	HM and SMCs
Students' regularity in school	Making parents aware	Parents and teachers
Development of drinking water and toilet facility	Requesting donors	SMC and parents
More classrooms	Requesting donors	SMC and parents
Maintenance of fencing	Requesting donors	SMC and parents

The plan also sets annual targets for GER, NER, cycle completion rate, learning achievement gradewise and subjectwise. It includes programmes which do not require any fund and the programmes which require funds. However, some of these programmes differ from those mentioned above.

*Programmes which do not require funds*

- School compound cleaning
- Development of school kitchen garden
- Household visits
- Awareness against smoking, drinking and drug abuse
- Awareness against girls trafficking
- Awareness against misuse of forest

*Programmes which require funds*

- More classrooms
- Renovation of building
- Maintenance of classrooms
- Maintenance of fencing
- Drinking water facility development
- Toilet facility development

The plan provides the total and annual budget requirements and identifies fund donors such as VDC, DDC, NGO and the local community. The plan provides the monitoring scheme only for programmes which require funds. It does not hold any person responsible for the monitoring; rather, it conceives that every one in concern is responsible.

**Malpur Lower Secondary School  
Sauraha, Bachhyoli, Chitwan**

**Background**

The SIP of this school mentions how the school came to be established and when it obtained formal approval. The plan refers to the households (on the household survey that was conducted) and the population of the school catchment area and to the number of school-going children (by age) and never-enrolled children (by caste/ethnicity). The plan categorizes school entrants school by gender, grade, caste/ethnicity and disability and mentions the number of repeaters and promotees.

The plan mentions the learning achievements of the children by grade and subject. It describes the teachers in terms of qualification and the level they teach and of gender

and training. The plan gives a glimpse of the physical facilities, teaching materials and income-expenditure texture of the schools.

### The Plan

The plan does not mention problems. It includes a list of works to be done. It gives the needs (proposed programmes) of the school. It also lists possible sources of funding without ensuring whether they are dependable or not. The vision set is to prepare competent students by giving them theoretical knowledge and to improve and expand the physical facilities including playground. The plan does not specify and educational objectives. However, it proposes programmes with strategies:

Program	Strategies	Responsibility
Purchase of land	Collecting donations	SMC, volunteers
Building construction	Mobilizing NGOs	SMC, donors, <i>Siksha Premis</i>
Furniture construction	Donations from parents	Students, parents, local bodies
Drinking water and toilet facility development		

The plan includes indicators on which to trace the measure the progress. However, these targets and indicators relate to GER, NER, cycle completion, etc., which may not match the programmes proposed.

The plan also gives programmes which require funds and which do not. The programmes which do not are different from those proposed above.

#### *Program which do not require funds*

- Fencing
- Plantation
- Awareness-raising
- Household visits
- School cleaning
- Identifying of causes of repetition

#### *Programmes which require funds*

- Purchase of land
- Building construction
- Furniture construction
- Drinking water and toilet facility development
- Maintenance

According to the plan estimate, the budget requirement is Rs 1188 thousand for conducting the programmes over the plan period (5 years). The plan expects the fund from VDC and DDC, NGO, the school community, etc. It does not explicitly mention the monitoring schemes.

**Bhumre Lower Secondary School  
Bhumre, Waling, Syangja**

**Background**

The SIP of the school provides detailed records of a household survey which gives information on the population of the school catchment area (by age) and on ever-enrolled and never-enrolled children (by gender, age and caste/ethnicity). It also mentions the entry of Dalit children into different grades but does not provide information on students by caste/ethnicity. The plan includes the figures of repeaters and promotees (gradewise and genderwise). It also mentions the number of disabled students by grade, gender and types of disability.

The plan includes the current level of student's achievement grade-wise and subject-wise. It describes teachers in terms of gender, qualification, training and status of employment. The plan mentions that the average school attendance of children is 195 days out of 205 days. The physical facility needs maintenance and renovation, and educational materials require funds. The plan also gives the income-expenditure statement.

**The Plan**

The plan does not analyze the problems. In the training package, four questions aimed at identifying the issues and problems are given, which the plan designers attempted to answer. The answers focused on the following:

- Low level of enrolment (reasons: age and economic condition).
- Drop-out (reasons: household chores and economic condition).
- Problems: lack of educational materials and unimproved physical facilities.
- Who should solve the problems? - Teachers, parents, local elites and representatives.

The plan mentions that physical facilities improvement and quality enhancement are essential. The plan does not specify what other things the school actually needs. It assumes that BPEP, DDC, the Municipality and the local community are the only sources of funds.

On the vision side, the school assures that the support and grants obtained for physical facility improvement, quality enhancement and increase in access will be used as per the plan and that the programmes will be completed in time by mobilizing the local community. The objectives of the school are: compulsory education to the children of the catchment area, quality education, schooling of out-of-school children, and educational development of the catchment area.

The programmes and strategies for achieving the objectives are as given in the table given below:

Programmes	Strategies	Responsibility
Improvement of physical facility	Parents, SMCs	Parents, SMC
Improvement of education	Teachers, students	Teachers, students, parents
Construction of furniture	SMC community	Parents, SMC, community
Teachers' regularity	Teachers, HM	Parents, SMC, community
Students' regularity	Teachers, students	Parents, SMC, community
Teachers' Directives	Teachers	Parents, SMC, community
Extra-curricular activities	Teachers, students	Parents, SMC, community

To measure the progress of the programmes, the plan enlists several indicators and targets for GER, NER, cycle completion rate, achievement level, and so forth. Most of them are not compatible with the programmes given above.

The plan also gives programmes which require funds and programmes which do not. But of these programmes are different from those mentioned above.

***Programmes which do not require funds***

- Mothers' conference
- Street drama
- Children's rally
- Parents' meet
- Household visit
- Posturing
- Folk song
- Video show
- Cleaning program
- Oratory contest
- Preparation of educational materials (from waste materials)
- Question design and answer script examination workshop
- Students'/teachers' regularity
- Interaction between teachers
- Interaction between teachers and students
- Interaction between teachers, students and parents
- Meeting of parents of irregular students
- Classroom observation by teachers and demonstration of model classes
- Use of learning outcome indicators
- Classroom observation and presentation by head teacher
- Staff meeting
- Identification of causes of drop-out
- Household visits by female teachers (for enhancing girls' enrolment)

***Programmes which require funds***

- Physical Improvement
  - **Construction of new classrooms**
  - **Renovation**
  - **Toilet**
  - **Drinking water**
  - **Fencing**
  - **Furniture construction and maintenance**
- Recruitment of additional teachers
- Development and purchase of educational materials
- Library

- Scholarships
  - Dalit
  - Girls
  - Poor and diligent students
  - Prize
- Sports materials
- Extra-curricular activities

The plan has a budget estimate of around Rs. 3081 thousand for 5 years and mentions different sources of funding (with expected funds). The major sources are DDC, the Municipality and the school community.

The plan also includes a monitoring scheme. But the programmes mentioned in the scheme do not seem to be appropriate.

**Durgadevi Primary School  
Dveisthan, Putali Bazar, Syangja**

**Background**

The SIP provides information on the population of the catchment area by age, gender, school entry and unschooled children. The plan also provides information on the never-schooled children by caste/ethnicity. It mentions the status of the school entrants in terms of grade, gender, age and caste/ethnicity, and disability. It also includes information regarding drop-outs, repeaters and promotees by grade and gender.

The plan gives gradewise and subjectwise learning achievement of children. It describes teachers by gender, qualification, training and status of employment.

**The Plan**

The plan does not mention anything about the problems and issues of the school But it provides a list of needs. It does not identify sources of funding. It lists up the materials that will be used to address the needs with the support of local bodies.

The objectives of the school, as mentioned in the plan, are: enhancement of the quality of education, coordination between the community and improvement of physical conditions. The programmes and strategies will be as follows:

Program	Strategy	Responsibility
Physical facility maintenance	Community mobilization	SMC, parents
Awareness program	Community mobilization	Community, school
Rehabilitation	Community mobilization	SMC, parents
School-community relation	Feeling of responsibility	Community, RP
Use of student-centered method	Teacher training	Teachers, RP, HM

To evaluate the progress of these programmes, the plan enlists several indicators and targets, which relate to enrolment, attendance, quality of achievement, cycle completion rate and the like. The plan also gives additional measures, which are, in fact programmes.

The plan also gives programmes which do not require funds and also programmes which require funds.

#### *Programmes which do not require funds*

- Parents' meet
- Household visit
- Cleaning program
- Holi
- Deusi
- Staff meeting
- SMC and teachers' meeting

#### *Programmes which require funds*

- Drinking water
- Classroom maintenance (physical)
- Playground and fencing
- Additional classrooms
- Furniture
- Additional teachers

The plan expects a budget of Rs. 420 thousand for 5 years. It also provides a yearwise breakdown of the budget and expects to obtain funds from local bodies, NGOs and the school community.

The plan provides monitoring schemes too, but the schemes govern programmes that require funds. The monitoring responsibility is given mostly to SMC and the head teacher.

### **Saraswati Lower Secondary School Barsare, Gairikhet, Putalibazar, Syangja**

#### **Background**

The SIP briefly traces the history of the school and maps the school catchment area. It gives the population of the catchment area in terms of age, gender caste/ethnicity, disability, school entrants and never-enrolled children. It includes figures of children currently studying in different grades (gender, age and caste/ethnicity). It also refers to drop-outs, repeaters, promotees (grade and gender).

The plan mentions the extent of the learning achievement of children by gradewise and subjectwise. It describes the teachers in terms of gender, qualifications, training and employment status. A brief information on teachers' and students' attendance, physical facilities and educational materials (that are available). There is the income-expenditure statement.

#### **The Plan**

The SIP does not mention any problem or issues. As the plan shows, the present need of the school is the physical facility infrastructure (building, furniture, drinking water and playground) development. The plan states that these needs will be fulfilled with the use of local materials. It neither analyzes the problems nor identifies the needs. It does not mention the sources of funding. However, it has set a vision.

The vision of the school includes: enrolment of all school age children in the school catchment area, programmes to increase students' attendance and development of physical facilities using local resources (materials). The objectives of the school, as mentioned in the SIP, are: expansion of physical facilities, boosting educational standard and development of the school as a community development center. To approach the vision and achieve the objectives, the plan proposes the following programmes and strategies:

Programmes	Strategy	Responsibility
Maintenance of physical facility	Community mobilization	SMC, parents
Rehabilitation	Community mobilization	SMC, parents
School-community relation	Feeling of responsibility	Community, school
Awareness programmes	Community mobilization	Community, school

The plan sets GER, NER, cycle completion rate targets as indicators for measuring the progress. Moreover, other indicators are also given. The plan also includes programmes which do not require funds and programmes which require funds.

*Programmes which do not require funds*

- Household visits
- Cultural programmes
- Deusi, Bhailo
- Parents' conference
- Holi

*Programmes which require funds*

- Building maintenance
- Building construction
- Furniture construction
- Drinking water
- Playground

The plan expects a budget of Rs. 490 thousand for 5 years and a yearwise budget breakdown. The plan expects funds from the Municipality, DDC, NGO and the school community. It includes monitoring schemes, which, however, are limited to physical development programmes. It has made SMCs and the head teacher are made responsible for the monitoring.

**Amilithum Primary School  
Waling, Syangja**

**Background**

The SIP introduces the school and gives its history, location and catchment area. The plan records a household survey showing the catchment area population by age and

gender. It describes the school entrants by grade, age, gender and caste/ethnicity. The plan also includes the statistical figures of the repeaters and promotees by grade and gender.

The plan gives the statistics of children's learning achievement by grade and subject. It describes the teachers in terms of gender, training and employment status. It gives the income-expenditure statement of the school and records teachers' and student's attendance (average), and the physical facility reality.

### **The Plan**

The plan does not analyze problems and issues but mentions that the access of the Dalits and disadvantaged children to education is poor for lack of awareness and owing to traditional way of living. Because of shortage of teachers, the quality of education is unimaginable.

The plan is not able to provide a clear vision either. It mentions that active participation of all concerned (e.g. parents, head teacher, SMC) is necessary to translate the vision into reality. The plan does not spell out its objectives. It envisions that resources available in the catchment area need to be used for physical and educational improvement of the school.

The plan proposes following the programmes to be carried out

Programmes	Strategy	Responsibility
Maintenance of 5 classrooms Construction of 1 classroom Furniture construction Fencing Drinking water supply Toilet facility Playground		

The plan further provides programmes which require funds and programmes which do not. The programmes are as follows:

#### *Programmes which do not require funds*

- Awareness program
- Children's rally
- Cleanliness
- Deusi/Bhailo/Holi
- Additional help to the weaker students

#### *Programmes which require funds*

- Uniform distribution
- Scholarship distribution
- Teacher training
- Reference materials (for children)
- Mid-day meal
- Educational materials
- Sports materials
- Furniture



**Ghatal Secondary School  
Nuwakot, Amargadhi, Dadeldhura**

**Background**

The SIP presents a short history of the school. It attempts to highlight the religions and social and economic lifestyle of the school catchment area. The plan includes the findings of a household survey and provides the ethnic composition and population of the catchment area (by age and gender). It provides the population of the school age children and enrolled children by age, gender, caste/ethnicity and age-grade enrolment in the catchment area. It provides information about the school entrants (by grade, gender, and caste/ethnicity).

The plan describes the teachers in terms of gender, qualification, training and employment status. However, the description covers only the primary teachers. The plan does not give the total number of teachers. But it tells about the physical facilities and educational materials that are available. It gives the income-expenditure statement of the previous year. It describes the student's learning achievements gradewise and subjectwise.

**The Plan**

The plan does not provide any information on the problems and issues nor does it analyze them. In the assessment of the needs, it says that the quality of education is below the average. Moreover, it states that compound fencing and toilet facilities are the needs of the school. As for the resources, the plan mentions that funds will be obtained by establishing relations (and holding discussions) with local bodies, DDC, NGOs, parents and HMG.

The vision of the school as mentioned in SIP is to provide standard education (by using community resources) to make the children capable citizens for the future. The objectives of the school are: providing standard education, maintenance of discipline and development of the school into a community and social development center. For the achievement of these objectives the plan proposes the following programmes (with strategies).

Program	Strategy	Responsibility
Improved school environment (fencing) for attractive teaching-learning activities	Mobilization of students, teachers and parents Teacher training	Teachers, parents
Regularity	Teachers, parents and SMCs	Community, teachers and SMC
Management of physical facility	Mobilization of community and parents	HMG, teachers, parents, SMC
School community	Feeling of responsibility	SMC, parents, community
Toilet construction	School and SMC	School, community

To evaluate the progress the plan sets yearly targets on GER, NER, cycle completion rate, attendance and the like. It sets the targets for learning outcomes by grade and subject. It provides other indicators such as parents' conference, SMC meeting, teaching staff meeting and drinking water facility. The plan also proposes programmes which do not require any fund and programmes that involve finance.

### ***Program which do not require funds***

- Parents' conference
- Meeting with parents
- Awareness-related programmes
- Labour donation
- Street drama
- Drama
- Household visit

### ***Programmes which involve finance***

- Maintenance
- Toilet construction
- Playground
- Fencing
- Building construction
- Educational materials (purchase)
- Scholarship
- Teacher training

The plan also expects a budget of total Rs 656 thousand and annual budget breakdowns for conducting these programmes. The plan attempts to identify the funding sources (local bodies, NGO, the school community) and estimates the amounts expected from each of them.

The SIP also gives a monitoring scheme. For most programmes, the head teachers and teachers are made responsible. SMC and parents are made responsible for monitoring the maintenance aspect.

### **Janjyoti Primary School Adityapur, Amargadhi, Dadeldhura**

#### **Background**

The SIP presents a brief history of the school establishment. In this connection it highlights the activities that helped to bring the school to the present shape. The plan also mentions the current status of school in terms of physical facilities and educational facilities.

The plan provides the population of the school catchment area by age and gender. It presents the statistics of Dalit children, literacy rate, and ever-enrolled and never-enrolled children of the catchment area by age, gender and disability..

The plan also gives the statistics of children in school by grade, age, gender and caste/ethnicity. It gives a record of dropouts, repeaters and promotees by grade and gender. The plan describes the teachers in terms of gender, qualification, training and status of employment. It also includes the income- expenditure statement.

## The Plan

The SIP does not mention any problem and issue and the factors that raised them. The plan does not analyze anything nor does it present the needs, visions and objectives of the school. However, it presents programmes and strategies which are as follows:

Program	Strategy	Responsibility
Creation of attractive and joyful school environment	Mobilization of teachers, SMC, parents	Teachers, parents community
Maintenance of physical facilities	Community mobilization	SMC, parents
Supply of drinking water	Mobilization of donors and community	Donors, SMC, DDC, teachers, parents
Construction of furniture	Mobilization of donors and community	Donors, DDC, parents, teachers
Strengthening of school-community relations	Enhancing the feeling of responsibility	Parents, community, teachers
Recruitment aging additional teachers	Donor, parents, Bhailo, Holi	Parents, teachers, DEO

The plan sets yearly targets on GER, NER, cycle completion rate, student-teacher attendance, gradewise and subjectwise learning achievements of children for a trace out of the progress of the plan.

The plan also proposes programmes which require funds and programmes which do not require.

### ***Programmes which do not require funds***

- Children's rally and household visits
- SMC meeting
- Regularity of school operation
- Extra-curricular activities
- Promoting discipline (in teachers and students)
- Demonstration of model classes
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Reduction of grade repetition
- Making birth certificate compulsory for admission
- Provision of food (nutrition)

### ***Programmes which require finance***

- Mothers' parents' conference
- Scholarship
- Purchase of sports materials
- Provision of additional teachers
- Purchase of educational materials
- Prize distribution
- Building maintenance

- Provision of drinking water
- Construction of entrance (main gate)
- Provision of furniture
- Plantation

The plan outlines an annual budget breakdown. However, it does not provide any monitoring scheme.

**Saraswati Lower Secondary School  
Malkanda, Asigram, Dadeldhura**

**Background**

The SIP presents the population of the school catchment area by gender and broader age group. It provides the statistics of schooled and out-of-school children in the catchment (by gender and caste/ethnicity).

The plan gives the statistics of children in school by grade, gender, caste/ethnicity as well as by age and grade. It mentions the current statistics of dropouts, repeaters and promotees by grade and gender. It includes the learning achievement of children grade-wise and subjectwise. It describes the teachers in terms of gender, qualification, training and employment status. The plan also mentions the physical and educational facilities that are available and presents the income-expenditure statement.

**The Plan**

The plan does not analyze the problems in depth; it only highlights the causes of non-enrolment and drop-out. The plan mentions household chores and economic conditions as causes of non-enrolment and non-awareness and traditional thinking as causes of drop-out. The plan states that the fencing and unavailability of drinking water facility are the current problems of the school and expresses the view that the problem can be solved by mobilizing the community people and getting financial support from the concerned agencies. The plan identifies VDC, DDC, parents and donor agencies as the sources funding.

The vision, as mentioned in SIP, is all-round development of the school through a healthy educational environment. The objectives: are raising the educational standard conducting awareness programmes in the catchment area and development of the school into a model institute. To achieve these objectives, the plan proposes the following programmes (with strategies).

Program	Strategy	Responsibility
School cleanliness	Mobilization of students (campaign of cleanliness will be conducted in the catchment area)	Teachers, students, parents, Unicef
Emphasis on regularity of school attendance	Reward and punishment	Teachers, parents

Like other SIPs, the SIP of the school sets yearly targets on GFR, NER, cycle completion rate, gradewise and subjectwise learning achievement, and so on. It includes additional indicators such as teaching staff meeting, SMC meeting, formation of a parent-teacher association and use of Teacher's Directive. All these targets and indicators will be used to trace out the progress of plan.

The plan also proposes programmes which do not require funds and programmes which require funds.

*Programmes which do not require funds*

- Cleanliness program
- Plantation
- Children's rally

*Programmes which require funds*

- Fencing
- Construction of furniture
- Maintenance of furniture
- Maintenance of rooms
- Maintenance of drinking water facility

The plan proposes a budget estimate of Rs. 175 thousand and presents an annual budget breakdown for 5 years. It also identifies the sources of funding such as local bodies, DDC, NGO and the school community and expects definite amounts from each of them. It presents a monitoring scheme confined to programmes which require funds. The monitoring responsibility is given to the school and SMC, and the monitoring is merely supervision.

**Janata Secondary School  
Sakayal, Mastmandu, Dadeldhura**

**Background**

The SIP describes in short the school and its catchment area. The population of school age children is given (by gender, age, caste/ethnicity). The plan presents the statistics of ever-enrolled and never-enrolled children by age, gender and caste/ethnicity. It also provides the figures of school entrants by grade, gender, age, caste/ethnicity and disability. It gives the statistical figures of drop-outs, repeaters and promotees by grade and gender.

The learning achievement of children is given gradewise and subjectwise. The description of teachers (primary teachers only) is given in terms of gender, qualification, training and employment status. The plan also includes the attendance (average) of the teachers and students. It highlights the physical and educational facilities currently available in school and presents the income-expenditure statement.

**The Plan**

The plan does not analyze the problems and issues. It gives the list of needs: more classrooms, fencing of the school compound, drinking water and toilet facilities. The plan identifies local bodies, DDC, local community as the major funding agencies.

The vision of the school include, among other things: better: knowledge and skill to the children (so that they can later become good citizens), enhancement of the learning achievements of children through effective management, and use of locally available resources. The objectives of the school are: toning up the learning

achievement and development of the school into a community development centre. To achieve these objectives, the plan proposes the following programmes and strategies:

Program	Strategy	Responsibility
Classroom teaching through interesting games	Teacher training	Teachers
Use of child-centred methods	Teacher training	Teachers, HM, RP
Maintenance of physical facility	Community mobilization	SMCs, parents
Rehabilitation of physical facility	Community mobilization	SMCs, parents

Like other SIPs, the SIP of Janata SS also sets yearly targets on GER, NER, teacher and student's attendance, learning achievements (by grade and subject) and the like for tracing out the progress.

The plan also proposes programmes which do not require funds and programmes which require funds.

*Programmes which do not require funds*

- Mother's conference
- Street drama
- Parents' visit
- Folk song program
- Cleanliness program
- Joint meeting of SMC and teachers
- Preparation of educational aids from waste materials
- Regularity of teacher and students
- Discussion with the parents of children with the least attendance (in a month).

*Programmes require fund*

- Construction of new classrooms
- Rehabilitation of classrooms
- Toilet
- Drinking water
- Fencing of the school compound
- Purchase of educational materials
- Scholarship
- Prizes
- Management

The plan gives a budget estimate of Rs. 733 thousand for 5 years and also a yearly breakdown of the budget. Further, it underlines possible funding sources such as local body, DDC and the school community (amounts expected).

The SIP presents monitoring a scheme governing child-centre methods, regularity of teachers and students, maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities only. Mostly HM, SMCs and RP are entrusted with the monitoring responsibility.

Annex H

**Programmes Proposed in VEPs (Partnership Program) in 2059/60**

Local bodies	Proposed programmes	Budget estimates
Waling Municipality Syangja	- Incentives to Dalit Student (for providing exercise books, pencils and erasers)	40012/-
Jagat Bhanjyang VDC, Syangja	- Awareness raising among Dalits and ethnic groups - Uniform distribution and mid-day meal for 6-10 years old children - Parents incentive award - Extra-curricular activity - Sports and educational materials purchase - Furniture for secondary school	40,000/-
Chinnebas VDC, Syangja	- Scholarships for poor, Dalit and special focus group children - Uniform distribution for children ethnic minority and poor family - Extra-curricular and prize distribution - Organization of seminar, orientation and awareness programmes - Furniture for schools - Educational materials distribution	40,000/-
Sukranagar VDC, Chitwan	- Parents interaction program - Mother's conference - Discussion among local intellectuals, headteachers, SMC members - Identification of unenrolled children and to admit them in schools - Site visit of school and grants distribution by identifying problems and conditions of physical facility - Collection and tabulation of educational statistics by schools and RC - Organization of workshop/seminar for enhancing managerial skills of SMC members - Arrangement of interaction session among VDC teachers - Coordination and monitoring of NFE centres running in the VDC - Arrangement of interaction sessions among NFE centres	321,000/-
Bachhyoli VDC, Chitwan	- Annual action plan development - Cleanliness program - Children's rally - Development of educational materials - Short visits - Extra-curricular activity - Interaction among teachers, SMC and VDC - Awareness program - Class observation - Parent's meeting - Preparation of lesson plan (daily) - Household visits - Model class demonstration - Plantation - Parent's conference - Building construction - Renovation of classrooms - Furniture construction	23,38000/-

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintenance of windows, gates</li> <li>- Toilet construction</li> <li>- Water tank construction</li> <li>- Science labs construction</li> <li>- Library development</li> <li>- Purchase of reference books</li> <li>- Teacher's training (6 days long)</li> <li>- Scholarships</li> <li>- Uniform</li> <li>- Awards</li> <li>- Health check-up</li> <li>- Mother's conference</li> <li>- Extracurricular activity</li> </ul>	
Dibyanagar VDC, Chitwan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mother's conference</li> <li>- Folk song competition</li> <li>- Cleanliness</li> <li>- Oratory competition</li> <li>- Staff meeting for sharing teaching problems</li> <li>- Identification of cases for drop-outs and repeaters</li> <li>- Meeting with parents of irregular children</li> <li>- Improving annual attendance of teachers and students</li> <li>- Joint meeting and interaction of teachers and SMCs</li> <li>- Model class demonstration by observing classes by teachers themselves</li> <li>- Regular class observation by headteacher and discussion</li> <li>- Physical facility improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Classrooms construction</li> <li>- Furniture construction and maintenance</li> <li>- Toilet construction</li> <li>- Fencing</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Scholarship including prize distribution to the poor, diligent and Dalit children</li> </ul>	219,000/-



## Annex I

### Thematic Summary

Theme	Pilot Schools						Other Schools					
	Chitwan		Syangja		Dadeldhura		Chitwan		Syangja		Dadeldhura	
	Rastriya PS	Adarsh SS	Amalthum PS	Bhumre LSS	Janjyoti PS	Ghatal SS	Adarsh Rastriya PS	Malpur LSS	Durgadevi PS	Saraswati LSS	Saraswati LSS	Janata SS
Involvement of SMC, HM and teachers in SIP Design	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Involvement of community people in SIP design	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
Technical soundness of SIP	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w	w
Formalization of SIP	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
Focus of women and disadvantaged group concern	os	os	x	sh	os	os	x	x	x	x	x	os
Focus of SIP (2001/02)	pf	pf	pf	pf	pf	pf	pf	pf	pf	pf	pf	pf
Focus of SIP (2002/03)	q	q	q	q	q	q	q	q	q	q	q	q
Place of grade I in SIP (2002/03)	y	y	x	x	x	x	i	y	x	x	x	x
Schools involved in SIP implementation	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Involvement of community people in SIP implementation	n	n	n	n	y	y	n	n	n	n	y	y
Financial support from community	n	n	n	no	n	al	al	y	al	al	n	al
Local monitoring	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
RPs' monitoring visit	al	al	al	al	al	al	al	al	al	al	al	al
Increase in local bodies' involvement	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
Extent of programmes conducted (fund required)	m	m	m	m	m	m	al	al	al	al	al	al
Extent of programmes conducted (fund did not require)	m	m	m	m	x	m	mo	mo	mo	mo	mo	mo
Facility development of school	mo	x	m	mo	c	c	n	mo	n	n	n	mo
Increase in parental concern for children's learning	y	y	y	y	al	al	n	al	n	n	n	mo
Increase in children's school regularity	y	y	y	y	l	al	co	co	co	co	co	co

Note: **al**=a little, **c**=continued, **co**=constant, **i**=indirect, **l**=little, **m**=much, **mo**=moderate, **n**=no, **no**=nominal, **os**=only scholarship, **pf**=physical facility, **q**=quality, **sh**=scholarship and home visit, **w**=weaker, **y**=yes.