

ANNEX A

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE EDUCATION SECTOR SUPPORT PROGRAMME (ESSPIN) IN NIGERIA

BACKGROUND

The Education Sector Support Programme (ESSPIN) is one of five interlocking sector and governance State Level Programmes (SLPs) financed by the United Kingdom's (UK) Department for International Development (DFID).¹

In a country where an estimated 8.5 million children of primary school age are out of school and a similar number of 15-24 year olds lack basic literacy², ESSPIN (2008-2014³) is designed to support State governments in Nigeria to make more efficient and effective use of their own resources in order to achieve the education Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Its focus, therefore, is on improving equitable access to a basic education of good quality.⁴ Its specific programme purpose is that the ... *planning, financing and delivery of sustainable and replicable basic education services in terms of access, equity and quality are improved at federal level and in up to six states.*⁵

Four main outputs are designed to deliver ESSPIN's purpose. These are: the strengthening of Federal Government agencies to reform and improve basic education in the country's 36 States (plus the Federal Capital Territory of Abuja [FCT]); improved planning, financing and management of education services at State and Local Government levels; improved resourcing and management of primary and junior secondary schools; and better managed, more responsive and accountable basic education services, through stronger demand from communities and civil society. Increasingly these outputs at State level are conceived around a holistic approach to school improvement.

ESSPIN work is focused on six States: Enugu, Kaduna, Kano, Kwara, Jigawa and Lagos. It also assists Federal education agencies to generate and coordinate reforms in basic education and to replicate good practice in improving the performance of primary and junior secondary schools. The total grant allocation for ESSPIN is £84 million.⁶

ESSPIN began life in 2008 with a strong focus on better governance in the education sector. This was seen as a necessary prerequisite for improving education service delivery in Nigeria. With the coming of a new UK Government in May 2010 there have been changes in DFID policy and practice. As a result, ESSPIN is being challenged to revisit and reframe its work in order to meet well defined targets, impact directly on basic education service delivery and improve educational outcomes, all within the six year lifetime of the programme. Scaling up and the replication of good practice across the six ESSPIN States and more broadly across Nigeria is a key requirement.⁷ In so doing ESSPIN is being charged to measure and achieve increased value for money against results.

ESSPIN is also being asked by DFID to look at all possible ways of improving access to basic education including through private schooling, innovative ways of financing girls through their education, and bridging gaps

¹ The other four being: the State Partnerships for Accountability Responsiveness and Capability (SPARC); the State Accountability and Voice Initiative (SAVI); the Partnership for Transforming Health Systems (PATHS 2); and Growth and Employment in States (GEMS),

² See the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2011.

³ August 2008 to July 2014 – a six year programme.

⁴ Basic education refers to primary and junior secondary schooling.

⁵ In the February 2011 log-frame this footnoted to mean ...*sustainable and replicable basic education services improved with indicators showing how access, equity, quality and management have been addressed*

⁶ Of which £32 million has been spent (May 2011).

⁷ Early in 2011 DFID Nigeria initiated a new operational plan for Nigeria, setting specific programme targets for the next three years.

between State schooling and different forms of Islamic education. The most disadvantaged communities – especially in the Northern States – are a major focus for DFID across its programmes and not just in education.

As well as changing DFID paradigms and priorities, ESSPIN will also have to adjust to the arrival of new governments in Nigeria as a result of the April 2011 Presidential, Federal and State level elections.

OBJECTIVE

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) will provide a clear and independent assessment of the performance of ESSPIN in making progress towards its stated goals and objectives. It will analyse and assess the reasons that explain current indicators of progress and good practice. Based on lessons learned, it will set out recommendations to improve ESSPIN's effectiveness and impact (2011-2014). In addition, it will identify issues for the SLP review later in 2011⁸

RECIPIENTS

The primary recipients of the findings of the MTR will be the six State governments (Enugu, Kaduna, Kano, Kwara, Jigawa and Lagos), the Federal Ministry of Education and DFID.

EVALUATION FOCUS AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The MTR will focus its attention on issues of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. It will take particular account of whether ESSPIN is providing value for money (VFM) and is driven by the achievement of key targets and results in access, equity and quality.

Relevance

- To what extent are the current objectives of ESSPIN consistent with the educational needs, policies and education sector plans and strategies of Nigerian State and Federal governments?
- Is ESSPIN demonstrably aware of, and responsive to the needs and circumstances of the direct beneficiaries of basic education services? Are its intended results and strategies widely understood and seen as of continuing relevance by ESSPIN beneficiaries, partners and key stakeholders?
- Is ESSPIN both relevant and responsive to different educational, religious and political circumstances across the six States (e.g. private schooling in Lagos, Islamiyya, Qur'anic, Tsangaya Education [IQTE] in Northern States)?
- Have any significant changes occurred in ESSPIN's operating environments (Federally, across ESSPIN States, within individual States, and within DFID) which may require its objectives and its approach to be modified in order to ensure its continued relevance? If so, what are these changes and what modifications are required?
- Are the assumptions which underpin ESSPIN's intervention strategy robust? Do the assumptions in the log frame remain valid? Has interrogation of the assumptions resulted in a clear risk mitigation strategy within ESSPIN and across the SLPs?
- Is the latest iteration of the log-frame a robust tool against which to judge ESSPIN's performance? If not what improvements should be made?

⁸ In October/November 2011, DFID through the Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Project (IMEP) will undertake an overall strategic review of the SLPs collectively, looking at their influence on Nigerian government systems.

Effectiveness

Results

- What results (outputs and educational outcomes) have been realised to date (May 2011)? How have these been achieved? What strategic lessons have been learned? And how is it intended that they will be applied in the period 2011 to 2014?
- How effective has ESSPIN been to date in achieving its purpose? What is the likelihood that it will do so within the rest of its time-span? What explanatory factors are important?
- What monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and processes are in place to analyse and assess programme effectiveness, results and, in due course, the overall impact of ESSPIN? Are these appropriate and sufficient? Do they involve Federal and State agencies? Are these agencies involved in programme review and planning? Overall, is the monitoring and evaluation system 'fit for purpose, enabling management and governance bodies to ensure ESSPIN programme efficiency and effectiveness, and its primary stakeholders to hold the programme to account?
- Are ESSPIN results perceived clearly to be the outcomes of State education strategies? If so, how has this been achieved; if not, why not? Do Nigerian implementation agencies understand and 'own' ESSPIN's objectives and strategies? And to what extent are they involved in programme review, planning and implementation processes?

Value for Money

- How is ESSPIN demonstrating VFM? To what extent do the costs of activities and outputs thus far (and projected to 2014) represent acceptable value for money when examined against comparable programmes in Nigeria and elsewhere?

Effective Coordination

- Is ESSPIN adequately aligned with the collective work and objectives of the other SLPs, especially in support of the education and health MDGs? Is there evidence that well co-ordinated collaborative work maximises ESSPIN's effectiveness?
- What is the level and quality of coordination between ESSPIN and other major education sector development projects/programmes in the focus states and at federal level? For example, how will ESSPIN dovetail with the new DFID supported UNICEF Girls Education Project (GEP3)?

Management Performance

- Are ESSPIN's programme management systems and processes effective in planning, implementing and reviewing strategic and operational work programmes? Do ESSPIN consortium partners coordinate their work effectively?
- To what extent has ESSPIN been consistently and effectively overseen, guided and supported by DFID-Nigeria?
- To what extent is ESSPIN systematically analysing its implementation experiences and results to draw lessons and identify good practice? How is it communicating this knowledge widely and to what effect?
- To what extent is ESSPIN staffed with sufficient and appropriate skills to achieve the programme's purpose? Has the use of technical assistance been both effective and conducive to achieving value for money?

Efficiency (and economy)

- What progress has been made to-date in implementing the programme's agreed strategic plan (activity log)? What are the reasons for the level of progress achieved?
- What has been the level of ESSPIN's programme performance to-date in terms of the production/achievement of its expected outputs (substantiated by appropriate quantitative and qualitative data)⁹? What are the reasons for this?
- What is the likelihood that the planned outputs will be achieved within ESSPIN's lifetime?

⁹ The analysis will be presented by major activity area under each log frame output (which may be conceived as 'sub-outputs').

- Are results being obtained at an acceptable and reasonable cost? How are unit costs calculated and how do these compare with comparable programmes? Are there indicators of efficiency savings over time? [see VFM section above]

Impact

- What effects (direct and indirect, positive and negative) have resulted from the ESSPIN programme beyond the results identified under “results” in the preceding section? What can and should be done to minimize negative effects and strengthen positive developments?
- What lessons have or are being learned as to how to take ESSPIN good practice to scale? How can the widespread replication of a holistic approach to school improvement be achieved in ESSPIN’s six focus states? How can lessons learned be applied on going to scale in school improvement and better service delivery beyond the six States in the ESSPIN programme? What are the implications for the design and the cost of ESSPIN 2011-2014?

Sustainability

- What is the actual or likely level of the sustainability of the outputs (and sub-outputs) produced to-date? What reasons underpin judgements in this regard? Where problems are identified how should the approaches taken by ESSPIN be modified to improve the likelihood of sustainability?
- What evidence exists to date of good practice being embedded in the planning, financing and management of basic education at the Federal, State and local government levels? How can lessons learned – technical and political – be applied to maximum effect in the second half of the ESSPIN programme?
- To what extent are ESSPIN and the SLPs collectively leveraging additional resources for basic education in ways that can be sustained?

Lessons and recommendations

The MTR team will also formulate lessons and present recommendations on:

- Improved performance.
- Adjustments to the ESSPIN results framework

SCOPE OF WORK

In addressing the questions set out in the preceding section, the MTR will pay particular attention to:

- The full range of demand and supply side considerations that impact on issues of access, equity and quality in basic education in Nigeria and how these are reflected in ESSPIN design and implementation.
- The centrality of gender equality in basic education and the extent to which ESSPIN objectives and ways of working are maximising progress towards gender equity and the progression of girls through formal education systems. The relationship with UNICEF’s GEP 2 and (planned) GEP 3 projects (funded by DFID) in 2011-2014, and the potential for expanding significantly a programme of Conditional Cash Transfers (CCTs) especially in the Northern States of Nigeria, will both be important in this regard.
- Ways of increasing access and sustaining participation in primary and secondary schooling that require a range of innovative responses. Better schools help to stimulate and sustain demand. The private sector – widely defined (and including faith-based schools) – has a role to play. The use of IT will be important too. Communities mobilised in support of education and seeking greater engagement with, and greater accountability from schools are also of major importance.
- Sustainable scaling up and replication of ESSPIN supported strategies beyond programme assisted LGAs.
- Teacher development to improve the quality of teaching and learning.
- The communication and stimulation of knowledge of, and media attention to improving basic education across Nigeria.
- ESSPIN’s internal approach management approach to review and self learning as this is reflected in attention to review recommendations, monitoring and evaluation strategies, research, feedback from a broad array of partners and changing DFID emphases and programme intentions.

- Ways of maximising the potential of joined up SLP working including activities under the rubric of Big Common Implementation Areas (BCIAs).
- Key issues for the strategic and political review of SLP interrelatedness in October/ November 2011.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The MTR will be primarily based on the information provided by ESSPIN. The team will start with a review of existing documentation prior to the start of the mission (see list of background documents below) and data at federal level and state level (see list of background documents below).

The team will conduct interviews and organise focus groups. The review team will interview ESSPIN programme managers (both National and State level), and key government, other donors, private sector and civil society partners.

Field visits will be organised to preferably all six states – including visits to local governments and supported facilities. The review team may divide into two teams, each led by an external consultant, so as to enable more detailed review in each state.

For the VFM analysis a specific methodological approach will be developed. Apart from analysing detailed expenditure data from ESSPIN benchmarks, efficiency indicators and contextual expenditure indicators need to be defined and information collected for comparative purposes.

The list of evaluation questions is rather long and not all questions might be fully answered. This is definitely the case for the questions related to impact that can only be answered more completely at the end of the project in the final review. The MTR will focus on potential impact. The MTR team will at the start of the evaluation elaborate the methodological approach in more detail and indicate how the questions will be answered.

The design of the three week in-country programme will be defined and agreed by key partners by the end of April 2011 at the latest. This will also include debriefings at state level and national level in order to validate preliminary findings and conclusions.

ORGANISATION AND COORDINATION

IMEP

The ESSPIN independent review team will be made up of consultants provided by IMEP (Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Project for DFID Nigeria's State Level Programmes):

- a lead education adviser (Steve Packer: Team Leader);
- a primary education specialist (Joseph McCormack: teaching and learning, research and media);
- a social development specialist (Catherine Gaynor: community mobilisation, School-Based Management Committees [SBMCs], gender and inclusion);
- an educational economist (Miriam Visser: Public Finance Management aspects);
- an education data and monitoring specialist (Nigerian)
- A VFM specialist (David Hoole).

The team has relevant experience working in Nigeria. The team leader will have overall responsibility for delivery of the outputs of this review and be responsible for the division of tasks. Furthermore, The IMEP Project Director, Anneke Slob, will participate in part of the MTR and will be responsible for Quality Assurance.

DFID

During the first week of the review, DFID's Head of Profession for Education (Jo Bourne) will accompany the team for some of its mission. She will also brief the review team on DFID's current and future education priorities.

DFID's Senior Education Adviser (Barbara Payne) based in Abuja, the Education Adviser in DFID's Kano office (Murtala Mohammed) and the ESSPIN project officer based in Abuja (Roseline Onyemachi), will act as resource persons to the MTR team. IMEP will organise the logistics for all participants of the reviews. They will consult DFID on structure of review mission, who to meet, timing of meetings and who is involved with meetings. The key contact in DFID will be Roseline Onyemachi, with support from the DFID Human Development Administrative team.

MTR REPORTING

The review team will provide:

- A DFID ARIES Mid-Term Review spread-sheet for ESSPIN.
- A short Power-point presentation for feeding back to ESSPIN programme management and staff, key Nigerian partners and stakeholders and DFID at the end of the mission.
- A draft MTR report (within 10 days of the completion of the three week mission by 17th June).
- A full MTR report (within 10 days of receipt of the consolidated comments on the draft report from DFID and others)

DURATION AND TIMING

The review will take place in Nigeria from Monday 16th to Friday 3rd June 2011.

The tasks, their duration and timing of the team are as follows:-

Name	Category	No of Days for Preparation	No of days in the field	No of days for follow up	Total
Steve Packer	ESSPIN Subject leader	4	17	5	26
Catherine Gaynor	Cross sectoral M&E Expert (10 yrs +)	2	17	2	21
Joseph McCormack	Cross sectoral M&E Expert (10 yrs +)	2	17	2	21
David Hoole	VFM Expert	2	6	0	8
Miriam Visser	Cross sectoral M&E Expert (10 yrs +)	2	17	2	21
Daisi Feyisetan	Senior Nigerian Consultant	2	17	2	21
Total					118
TBC(Support to David Hoole to define VFM benchmarks	Cross sectoral M&E Expert (5-10yrs)	2.5	0	0	2.5

Background reading for the review will be supplied to the consultants the week of 9th May. The review will be based on information gathered through the following materials:-

- ESSPIN Programme Memorandum.
- ESSPIN Inception reports and Position papers (May 2009, with updates in 2010 where applicable)
- ESSPIN Programme and State Logframe, (Feb 2011)
- ESSPIN two year programme work plans and PSA investment budget plans (latest copies.
- ESSPIN Quarterly Reports:

Draft State Education MTSS, Education budgets and / or State Education Sector performance Report (where available) should be provided to the review team during field visits by ESSPIN State team leaders to demonstrate linkages between ESSPIN and the reform of State systems.

Additional Background Information

ESSPIN is one of a suite of State Level Programmes (SLPs) including SAVI (Strengthening Accountability and Voice Initiative), SPARC (State Programme for Accountability, Responsiveness and Capability) and PATHS2 (Partnership for Transforming Health Systems 2).

ESSPIN since 2008 focused on 5 states (Kwara, Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano and Lagos) and in 2010 has initiated activities in EnuguState.

The four main areas of support provided by ESSPIN are:

- *Strengthened Federal stewardship of basic education:* Although State and Local Governments are mainly responsible for primary and junior secondary education, the Federal Government has a key part to play in creating a vision, setting the policy framework, distributing resources and providing quality assurance for the education sector. ESSPIN will help the Federal Government reform inspection services, establish a decentralised national education management information service, and improve resource flows from the Universal Basic Education Commission to States.
- *Improved planning, financing and management of education services at State and Local Government:* Helping States make better use of their own resources to plan, manage, deliver and monitor services is at the heart of ESSPIN. We will help States plan on the basis of better management information, reform their inspection services, improve the training and deployment of teachers and get better value for money from procurement of buildings and materials.
- *Improved resourcing and management of primary and junior secondary schools:* Two thirds of ESSPIN's resources will provide technical assistance to Government. The remainder will help underpin the transformation of government systems by providing resources to show what a reformed education system can do and creating incentives for further reform. This will include support for water and sanitation facilities, provision of educational materials, some infrastructure improvements and innovative ways of getting operating resources directly to schools and communities.
- *Better managed, more responsive and accountable basic education services, through stronger demand from communities and civil society:* ESSPIN will also work with communities, civil society, the media and political representatives to share information, agree service standards and build up demand for better services. In particular, ESSPIN will help School Based Management Committees to have a bigger influence in school management and improvement.

A final element of the support provided through ESSPIN is that it should facilitate replication of successful reforms in non lead states. ESSPIN have established a Communications and Knowledge Management team to lead on this area of work.

ANNEX B

ESSPIN Mid-Term Review Methodology

TORs

The TORs for the mission are reproduced in **Annex A**. They require attention to questions pertaining to the relevance, effectiveness (results, value for money, effective coordination and management performance), efficiency (and economy), impact, sustainability and lessons and recommendations. In addition, under Scope of Work, questions are listed on access, equity and quality, replication, teacher development, communication and knowledge, monitoring and evaluation within ESSPIN and ways of maximising joined up SLP working.

Timing

The MTR took place over seven weeks. ESSPIN documentation (**Annex D**), much of it prepared for the MTR by ESSPIN Abuja and the six State teams, was a primary source of evidence. An initial review of this material took place in the week beginning 9 May. A three week field mission to Nigeriawas conducted from 15 May to 3 June. After some discussion with DFID, a period of up to three weeks was allowed to develop the MTR Draft Report after the field mission.

The Review was timely in relation to a number of ESSPIN and DFID planning imperatives but ill-timed in relation to the political cycle in Nigeria and the lack of availability of survey material and data to assess progress against 2010 and 2011 milestones.

MTR Team

The team was planned to consist of six people: an education adviser (lead); a social development specialist; an education economist; a primary education specialist; an education data and monitoring specialist; and a VFM specialist. In the event the VFM specialist was unable to take part in the mission. It was decided that the education economist would also take on the VFM aspects of the MTR.

Methodology and Workplan:

Ininterpreting its TORs, the MTR team, in consultation with IMEP, agreed the following Workplan:

Each of ESSPIN's six focus States should be visited to ensure coverage and attention to different contexts. Two sub-teams would visit three States each, for two to three days in each State: one team for Kaduna, Jigawa and Kano; the other team for Enugu, Lagos and Kwara.

In each State, an attempt would be made to meet with as many stakeholders as possible (schools, communities, LGEAS, SUBEBs, ministries of education, and CSOs) but with priority meetings to be devoted to the ESSPIN State teams (see **Annex C**).

Requests for information from each State would be sought before, during and – as necessary - after each visit. Discussions would be held with SLPs in each State on political engagement and the political economy of education.

Matrices and questionnaires were developed to facilitate consisted gathering of data and information against this rubric, adjusted as necessary for different ESSPIN stakeholders.

A specific methodology would be developed for VFM analysis to include examination of expenditure data, efficiency indicators and comparators to the extent possible.
The team would not prepare separate State visit reports.

Given the scope and the complexity of ESSPIN and the very severe constraints on the time allocated for the MTR, it was decided to focus primarily during State level visits on progress against Outputs 2-4 in the ESSPIN Logframe and to seek evidence of: the relevance of ESSPIN activities in the context of each State; the results that had been achieved and the degree to which activities and sub-outputs had been delivered in a well coordinated manner; early evidence of impact; and the extent to which measures of sustainability were being built into ESSPIN's programme.

Debriefing sessions were held with DFID and with the ESSPIN management team in Abuja. These provided necessary context and made clear the expectations which each party had for the MTR report.

MTR logistics were managed and guided by the International Monitoring and Evaluation Project (IMEP).

Constraints

ESSPIN is a complex, multi-layered Programme in a Federal State. A comprehensive Mid Term Review would have required considerably more time than was allocated.

The implication of the focus on the six States was that meetings with Federal level stakeholders were of lesser intensity

Late changes to the size of the MTR team and to the allocation of tasks (i.e. new roles for the economist) meant that the Northern States Team had an education adviser (lead), social development specialist, and an education economist focusing on both Planning and Budgeting and VFM for two of the three Northern States. The VFM analysis was done in coordination with the VFM expert of the MTR of DFID's other SLP in the North: Partnership for Transforming Health Systems (PATHS2)). The Southern States had a primary education specialist and an education data and monitoring specialist. This unforeseen imbalance necessarily resulted in a more limited coverage of some issues in the Southern States.

ANNEX C

ESSPIN Mid-Term Review Schedule of Activities

		Week 1 : 16-22 May						
		Mon 16 th	Tues 17 th	Wed 18 th	Thurs 19 th	Fri 20 th	Sat 21 st	Sun 22 nd
Am	<p>IMEP ESSPIN MTR Team PLANNING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Meeting (09.00-12.00) IMEP Offices • DFID Briefing (14.00.15.00) DFID Office • Planning Meeting con (15.00-17.50) IMEP Office 	<p>IMEP ESSPIN MTR Team BRIEFING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IMEP Briefing (with Paths2) (08.30 - 0930) IMEP Offices • Meeting with ESSPIN teams (10.00) ESSPIN Offices 	<p>IMEP ESSPIN MTR Team FEDERAL/IDPS</p> <p>NEMIS – 9.00am (ESSPIN office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UBEC – 10.00? (tbc) NIEPA – 11.00am. 	<p>STATE VISITS ENUGU TEAM 1 (JM/MV/DF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flight to Enugu (arrival 11.00) • Meeting with ESSPIN Enugu staff (12.00) • Meeting with SLPs (12.00) 	<p>STATE VISITS ENUGU TEAM 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Udi LGA (10.100) • Central Primary School, (CPS), Ngwo Uno and Premier Primary School (PPS), Udi (11.30 – 12.30) 	<p>STATE VISITS ENUGU TEAM 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESSPIN State team (0900-12.00) 	<p>STATE VISITS LAGOS TEAM 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel to Lagos (flight) 	
								Pm
<p>• Meeting with ESSPIN teams (con).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF (tba) • World Bank (tba) Bank). <p>STATE VISITS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEAM 2 (SP/CG) to Kaduna (by road) 15.00¹⁰ • Meeting with ESSPIN team if time permits (tba) 	<p>ENUGU TEAM 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Courtesy call MoE and SUBEB Management (1400) • State counterparts - School Improvement - Institutional Development(14.15 	<p>ENUGU TEAM 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with Christian Education Secretariats Officials (14.00) • Meeting with CSOs (15.00) <p>KADUNA TEAM 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting on reform at State College of Education (TBC) • State Team Leaders from Kaduna SLPs(1500) 	<p>STATE VISITS ENUGU TEAM 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tba 	<p>STATE VISITS JIGAW TEAM 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel to Jigawa by road. 			

¹⁰ If security situation deteriorates in Kaduna then the state visit will be abandoned and efforts will be made to bring key project staff and selected key counterpart representatives to Abuja.

- State counterparts - Education Quality and School Improvement. (1500)
- State counterparts - Community and

				Learners Participation (1545) KADUNA TEAM 2 • Commissioner (15.15) • State Ministry of Education (15.30)		STATE VISITS KADUNA TEAM 2 • Travel to Kano by road (stay overnight).	
	Week 2 : 23-29 May						
	Mon 23rd	Tues 24th	Wed 25th	Thurs 26th	Fri 27th	Sat 28th	Sun 29th
Am	<u>Team 1</u> Meeting with ESSPIN Lagos team (See detailed programme below)		<u>Team 1:</u> • Meetings with other projects/Dev agencies in Lagos state.	<u>Team 1:</u> • Travel to Kwara (Overland flight 7.15am) • Brief meeting with ESSPIN Kwara team		<u>Team 1:</u> • De briefing meetings with counterparts (if available). • De briefing meetings with ESSPIN Kwara staff.	<u>Team 1:</u> Travel to Abuja
	<u>Team 2</u> Meeting with ESSPIN Jigawa team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team 1 visit to one or two LGAs in Lagos and Team 2 visit to one or two LGAs in Jigawa. (LGEA, pilot school, SBMC, local CSOs)	<u>Team 2:</u> • Meetings with other projects/Devl agencies in Jigawa state.	<u>Team 2</u> – Meeting with ESSPIN Kano team	<u>Team 1 (all day):</u> Visit to one or two LGAs in Kwara <u>Team 2 (all day):</u> Visit to one or two LGAs in Kano. (LGEA, pilot school, SBMC, local CSOs)	<u>Team 2:</u> • De briefing meetings with counterparts (if available). • De briefing meetings with ESSPIN Kano staff.	<u>Team 2:</u> Travel to Abuja
Pm	<u>Team 1</u> Meeting with ESSPIN (Lagos) state counterpart agencies		<u>Team 1:</u> • De-brief meeting with ESSPIN Jigawa team	<u>Team 1:</u> Meeting with ESSPIN Kwara counterparts			
	<u>Team 2</u> Meeting with ESSPIN (Jigawa) state counterpart agencies		<u>Team 2:</u> • De-brief meeting with ESSPIN Lagos team Travel to Kano	<u>Team 2:</u> Meeting with ESSPIN Kano counterparts			

		Week 3 : 30 May-5 June						
		Mon 30 th (public holiday)	Tues 31 st	Wed 1 st June	Thurs 2 nd	Fri 3 rd	Sat 4 th	Sun 5 th
Am		IMEP team working on reading and results analysis.	Additional meetings with ESSPIN technical staff. Additional meetings with development partners and other federal/national agencies.	IMEP team prepares material for presentation of early findings	• 9.00-12.00 : Review team meeting with ESSPIN senior technical and management staff – sharing early findings and obtaining feedback.	• 11.00am: IMEP presents draft findings to DFID (and govt reps)	Review team departs	
	Pm				Team working			

Team 1: Joe McCormack (JM); DaisiFeyisetan (DF); Miriam Visser (MV)

Team 2 : Steve Packer (SP) and Cathy Gaynor (CG) ; (Other?)

ANNEX D

ESSPIN Mid-Term Review Documentation

ESSPIN May 2011 Papers for the ESSPIN Mid-Term Review:

- *Background Paper* Report Number ESSPIN 037
- *State and Local Government Support to School Improvement; Output 2 Results and Future Strategy Paper* ESSPIN Report 038
- *School Improvement Output 3 Results and Future Strategy Paper* ESSPIN Report 039
- *Community Engagement in School Improvement and Learner Participation in Basic Education Output 4 Results and Future Strategy Paper* ESSPIN Report 040
- *Output 1 Progress and Forward Planning Paper* Report Number 042
- *Programme Forward Planning Paper (Outputs 2-4)* Report Number 041
- *Monitoring and Evaluation Results and Forward Planning Paper* Report Number 043
- *Communications and Knowledge Management Results and Future Planning Paper* Report Number 044
- *Non-State Providers of Education Strategy Paper* Report Number ESSPIN 045
- *Girl Education and Gender Strategy Paper* Report Number 046
- *Islamiyya, Qur'anic, Tsangaya Education (IQTE) Strategy Paper* Report Number ESSPIN 047
- *Value for Money Strategy Paper* Report Number 048
- *Political Engagement Strategy Paper* Report Number 049
- *Early Impact of Community Engagement Paper* Report Number 050
- *Evidence of Impact in Six ESSPIN States*
- *ESSPIN Partnerships* Report Number 051
- *Response to Recommendations of the 2010 OPR*

ESSPIN May 2011 Presentations for MTR:

- *Major ESSPIN Achievements*
- *ESSPIN Background*
- *Lessons Learned 1 and 2*
- *Output 1*
- *Community Replication*
- *Is ESSPIN Approach Replicable More Widely?*
- *Monitoring and Evaluation*
- *School Improvement*
- *Planning Budgeting and Management*
- *Value for Money*

ESSPIN 2011 (on Disk) Presentational Materials:

Briefing Notes:

- *Strategic Planning and Medium Term Sector Strategy*
- *Public Financial Management*
- *Organisational Development and Management*
- *School Improvement and Teacher Professional Development*
- *Quality Assurance*
- *Community Engagement and School Governance*
- *Access and Equity*
- *IQTE*

Transforming Basic Education (brochure)

Better Schools Better Nigeria (brochure on ESSPIN films)

Case Studies (18 one page notes from the ESSPIN States)

Six Brochures (by State) *on Impact*

"Experiences" (five topic specific studies)

Photograph collections by State

ESSPIN presentation in images

School Based Management Committees (four paged booklet)

State School Improvement Team (booklet)

ESSPIN Financial information (on Disk):

- ESSPIN May 2011 *Results Spreadsheets:*
 - Whole Programme Results* (using the 33 results sheet)
 - Year 1 ESSPIN Results*
 - Year 2 ESSPIN Results*
 - Year 3 ESSPIN Results to February 2011*
- ESSPIN June 2011 *Expenditure by State and by Output* (prepared on request of MTR)
- ESSPIN undated *Unit costs* (for school improvement items)
- *February 2011 Staff Costs Attributed by Year and by State*
- Deloitte, ESSPIN Audit Review, June 2010
- Deloitte, ESSPIN Management Letter, June 2010
- Sample invoice to DFID, May 2011

Other ESSPIN programme documents:

- Team Structure 2011 ESSPIN.org
- ESSPIN (on disk) Quarterly Reports 1st to 11th
- ESSPIN Logframe (May 2010, December 2010, February 2011)
- ESSPIN February 2011 *Log frame Indicator Handbook*
- ESSPIN March 2011 *Review of Value for Money Strategy* (Allsop and Phillipson)
- ESSPIN 2010 Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) *Annual Review Final Report*
- ESSPIN August 2009 Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) *Inception Review* (with 14 ESSPIN papers)
- ESSPIN 2011 ESSPIN Work streams and Key Achievements
- ESSPIN 2011 Workplans: Results Sheets for Years 3 and 4. Federal and by State
- ESSPIN 2009 Programme Level Work Plans (Communication and Knowledge and M and E)
- ESSPIN undated State Level Monthly Activity Workplans
- Shalini Bahuguna, *Engendering ESSPIN: Gender and Inclusion* ESSPIN 16th September 2009
- Sue Phillips (March 2009) *Assessment for ESSPIN management of the social development capacity and professional development needs of Access and Equity State-based Specialists*
- ESSPIN Phase 2 (undated) Annexes to the Programme Memorandum Social Appraisal Annex
- ESSPIN Child Protection and Participation for CGP Step-down to SBMCs Output 4
- ESSPIN undated On-site Quality assurance mentoring visit -- Summary Monitoring Form
- ESSPIN undated External Evaluation of Schools Quality Assurance Readers Report Form
- ESSPIN undated Quality Assurance Evaluation Report
- ESSPIN undated School External Evaluation Survey
- ESSPIN December 2010 *Report on MLA Testing in the 6 ESSPIN States*. Jack Holbrook
- ESSPIN January 2011 *Study of Teacher Management and Deployment Interim Report*
- ESSPIN October 2009 *Teaching and Learning: Baseline Survey Report A* J Davison
- ESSPIN 2010 (folders) HT and CT Modules
- ESSPIN 2011 (on disk) *Assessments of the Professional Working Knowledge of Teachers in Nigeria: Implications for Teacher Development, Policy and Implementation:*
- ESSPIN 2009 An outline of DFID - funded SESP activities for the Midterm Review of SESP
- ESSPIN May 2009 *Monitoring and Evaluation Framework* – Position Paper
- ESSPIN undated UBEC-ESSPIN Partnership Work Plan for SBMC Replication
- ESSPIN undated State level monitoring framework – first thoughts
- ESSPIN undated Review of M&E systems
- ESSPIN undated *Key Facts for Public Schools in ESSPIN States* (source 2009-10, Annual School Census)

Documentation from Federal level

- ESSPIN 2009 Federal Level Workplans 2009-2010
- ESSPIN 2011 Federal Level Workplan for Years 3 and 4
- Federal Ministry of Education, December 2007. *Nigeria Education Management Information System Policy*
- Federal Ministry of Education 2007 *National Strategy for Teacher Quality and Development*
- Federal Ministry of Education, April 2009. *Implementation Guidelines for the Nigeria Education Management Information System Policy*
- Federal Ministry of Education 2009 *Road Map for the Nigerian Education Sector*

- Federal Ministry of Education, 2010 *One Year Strategy for the Development of the Education Sector May 2010-April 2011*
- Federal Ministry of Education September 2010 *Quality Assurance Instrument for Basic and Secondary Education in Nigeria*
- Federal Ministry of Education September 2010 *Education Quality Assurance Handbook for Nigeria Revised Version*
- Federal Ministry of Education May 2011 *Report of the Presidential Task Team on Education*
- Federal Ministry of Education et al *Nigeria DHS EdData Survey2010 Education Data for Decision-making*
- UBEC, April 2005. *The Compulsory, Free Universal Basic Education Act, 2004 and Other Related Matters*

Documentation from the State Level

ESSPIN documentation published in each pilot State

- ESSPIN 2009-2011 *TDNA Reports*
- ESSPIN 2011 (on disk) *MLA Headlines*
- ESSPIN 2010 (on disk) *Annual Education Sector Performance Reports*
- ESSPIN Quarterly reports (sample)
- Medium Term Sector Strategy (MTSS) 2010-2012 (except for Enugu)
- Medium Term Sector Strategy (MTSS) 2011-2013

Lagos

- Lagos State Ministry of Education, December 2010 *Annual Education Sector Performance Report 2010*
- ESSPIN Lagos Inception Report (2008)
- ESSPIN Lagos Workplan (2011)
- ESSPIN Lagos Education Sector Plan (2009-2010)
- Lagos School Census Report 2009-2010
- ESSPIN Lagos Monitoring Learning Achievement Report (2010)
- ESSPIN Lagos-List of ESSPIN Pilot School (2010)
- ESSPIN Lagos Sample School Development Plan (2011)
- ESSPIN Lagos Report on Head Teacher Shadowing(2009)
- ESSPIN Lagos Community Engagement & Learner Participation-Summary (2010)
- ESSPIN Lagos Policy Guidelines for State Task Team on School Based Management(2009)
- ESSPIN Lagos-Research into School Based Management Committees (2006)
- ESSPIN Lagos- Research into Private Schools in Lagos(2011)
- ESSPIN Commissioned Report-Regulation of Private Schools in Lagos (2011)
- ESSPIN Commissioned Report of a Survey of Private Schools in Lagos (2009)
- ESSPIN Format for School Self Evaluation
- ESSPIN Evaluating Head Teacher Performance (2010)
- ESSPIN Lagos MTSS 2010-2012
- ESSPIN Lagos MTSS 2011-2013
- ESSPIN Lagos SUBEB Workplans (2010)
- ESSPIN Lagos SUBEB Financial Management Review(2010)
- ESSPIN Lagos Quality Assurance Evaluation Report (2010)

Enugu

- ESSPIN School Based Management Research-Enugu State (2011)
- ESSPIN Organizational Capacity Assessment for CSO in Enugu (2011)
- ESSPIN List of Nominated Mission Schools for Challenge Fund-Enugu (2011)
- ESSPIN Report of Two Day Seminar on Political Economy and Engagement Strategy (2011)
- ESSPIN Output 2, 3, 4: Activities and Results Record (2011);
- ESSPIN Accounting System-undated;
- ESSPIN Enugu SUBEB-Strategic Plan-2011-2013 (2011);
- ESSPIN Enugu State Ministry of Education-Draft Strategic Plan-2011-2013 (2011);
- ESSPIN Enugu State Education Technical Steering Committee-Terms of Reference (undated);

- ESSPIN Enugu State Ministry of Education: Call for Expression of Interest for the establishment of the State School Improvement Team (2011);
- ESSPIN Enugu State: Terms of Reference for the State School Improvement Team;

Jigawa

- ESSPIN undated Map showing the 27 LGAs and the nine ESSPIN pilot LGAs
- ESSPIN 2011 Presentation to the MTR
- ESSPIN 2011 ESSPIN Pilot Schools: Enrolment data
- ESSPIN 2011 Commendation letter from SUBEB
- ESSPIN 2011:
 - Costs of Annual School Censuses 2009 and 2010*
 - Items and Costs of Interventions by School*
 - Costs of MTSS Interventions 2009 and 2010*
 - Costs of Modular Training – Head teachers and Classroom Teachers*
 - School Intervention Data Sheet*
 - Girls Intervention Pilot Scheme Data Sheet*
 - IQTE Plot Scheme Data Sheet*
 - Challenge Intervention Schools*
 - Extract from Jigawa State Approved Budget 2011*
- ESSPIN 2010 Guidance Note on the Preparation of Medium Term Sector Strategy
- ESSPIN 2010/11 Sample Quarterly Reports (June 2010; September 2010 and March 2011)
- ESSPIN 2010 An Assessment of the Professional Working Knowledge of Teachers in Nigeria: Implications for Teacher Development, Policy and Implementation Jigawa State
- ESSPIN 2010 Jigawa State Work Plan July 2010-June 2011
- ESSPIN May 2010 Establishment of School Health Clubs in Primary and Junior Secondary Schools in Jigawa State Darl Hab Nig Limited Kaduna
- ESSPIN 2010 Guidelines for Tsangaya Cluster Pilot Jigawa
- ESSPIN December 2010 Report on Monitoring Learning Achievement (MLA) – Jigawa (summary)
- ESSPIN December 2010 Report of Follow Up/Monitoring on 22 School Health Clubs (SHCs) Established in Jigawa under Phase 1 ESSPIN Water Supply Project Muhammad Kabir Yakubu
- ESSPIN 2009-2010 Materials on SSIT:
 - Advertisement for Recruitment of State School Improvement Team (SSIT)*
 - Jigawa State SSIT Recruitment Process*
 - Jigawa State SSIT Recruitment Process Written Test*
 - SSIT Interview Sheet*
 - Letter of Appointment*
 - TOR for Jigawa State Team*
 - Written Test Marking Scheme*
- ESSPIN undated Sample Quality Assurance Reports (from the Jigawa State Educational Inspectorate and Monitoring Unit)
- ESSPIN undated Transforming Basic Education in Jigawa
- ESSPIN undated Report of the Human Resources Management and Development Review Exercise in Jigawa State Universal Basic Education Board
- ESSPIN material on School Grants:
 - Letter to Executive Chairman SUBEB ESSPIN School Grants Scheme 2011: School Banding and Allocation of Funds January 2011*
 - Jigawa State School Improvement Programme: School Small Grants - school sizes and allocations*
 - School Banding and Allocation of Funds*
 - Schools by Size*
 - Jigawa State School Improvement Programme: School Small Grants (presentation)*
 - School Grants List*
 - School Grants Fund Procedures*
 - Allocation by Enrolment Band*

And other assorted tables

- ESSPIN 2011 Forward Planning Consolidation Scenario- Scenario 1
- ESSPIN 2011 Forward Planning Consolidation Scenario- Scenario 2
- ESSPIN 2009`An Assessment of Teacher Education in Jigawa State Allsop and Howard
- ESSPIN undated ESSPIN pilot school's enrolment data (2008/09-2011/11; gender parity index and % increase in enrolment)
- ESSPIN undated Key Facts on Jigawa State Schools
- ESSPIN Quality Assurance Related Papers:
 - QA Training for HTs, SBMCs, TTIs, and CBOs at Nine Zonal Training Centres (Educational Inspectorate and Monitoring Unit)*
 - Quality Assurance Processes for Head Teachers and SBMCs in the Nine Educational Zones Workshop State Educational Inspectorate and Monitoring Unit (SEIMU) Action Plan for 2010/11*
 - Participants: One Day Training on QA Processes November 2010*
- Bano, Masooda Dr (July 2009) IQTE Need Assessment for Jigawa ESSPIN
- ESSPIN Jigawa (undated) Strategic Approach on Challenge Fund Initiative
- ESSPIN Jigawa (Feb 2011) Supporting Community Education in selected Nomadic Settlements Technical Proposal
- ESSPIN Jigawa (undated) Girls Education Pilot: Concept and Implementation Strategy
- ESSPIN Development of Girls Education Pilot Jigawa State Report of visit by Khadijah Fancy 25 March 2011
- ESSPIN Jigawa Output 4 Quarterly Reports for Oct-Dec 2010 and Jan – March 2011
- ESSPIN Jigawa State Specialist Monthly Reports Output 4 October 2010 – April 2011
- ESSPIN Jigawa (undated) Case studies on school based management committees and communities supported by ESSPIN in targeted LGEAs
- ESSPIN (24/08/09) Functional Analysis & Training Needs Assessment of Dept of Social Mobilisation in JIGAWA SUBEB
- ESSPIN (2011) State Task Team on SBMC Concept and Engagements
- Jigawa State (April 2010) School Based Management Committee Policy
- Jigawa State School Based Management Committee Guidebook
- Adediran S; M Bawa M & H. Pinnock (November 2010) SMBC Trainers' Manual

CSO Monitoring and Mentoring Reports Jigawa

- Hadejia Development Circle (March 2011) Civil Society Monitoring and Mentoring Report ESSPIN Jigawa
- Miyetti-Allah Cattle Breeders Association of Nigeria (March 2011) Civil Society Monitoring and Mentoring Report ESSPIN Jigawa
- Gadawur Youth Forum (March 2011) Civil Society Monitoring and Mentoring Report ESSPIN Jigawa
- Hadejia Development Circle (March 2011) Civil Society Monitoring and Mentoring Report ESSPIN Jigawa
- FOMWAN (March 2011) Civil Society Monitoring and Mentoring Report ESSPIN Jigawa
- Adolescent Health & Information Projects (March 2011) Civil Society Monitoring and Mentoring Report ESSPIN Jigawa
- Nigeria Union of Teachers (March 2011) Civil Society Monitoring and Mentoring Report ESSPIN Jigawa
- Kamala Community Health Development Initiatives (March 2011) Civil Society Monitoring and Mentoring Report ESSPIN Jigawa
- Rural Education Foundation (March 2011) Civil Society Monitoring and Mentoring Report ESSPIN Jigawa
- ESSPIN Jigawa Draft Terms of Reference for Jigawa State Task Team for SBMCs

Documentation State Government of Jigawa

- Functional Review of Jigawa MoEST, Final draft, February 2011
- Jigawa State of Nigeria July 2008 A Law to Establish Universal Basic Education Board -2008
- Jigawa State November 2008 State Education Sector Strategic Plan (SESP) 2009-2018
- Jigawa State Ministry of Education, Science and Technology undated Strategic Plan 2010-2012
- Jigawa State Ministry of Education, Science and Technology June 2010 Annual School Census
- Jigawa State Ministry of Education, Science and Technology undated Strategic Plan 2011-2013 First Draft

Kaduna

- ESSPIN June 2011 *Activities and Results by Output Tables*
- ESSPIN March 2011 Extract from *ESSPIN 9th Quarterly Report September 2010*
- ESSPIN June 2010 *Kaduna State Government State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB) Report on the Functions Review*
- ESSPIN September 2010 *Assessment of Professional Working Knowledge of Teachers in Kaduna* David Johnson
- ESSPIN 1 December 2010 *Memorandum of Understanding between Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) and SUBEB Kaduna*
- ESSPIN, April 2011 *Challenge Fund Proposal*
- ESSPIN 7 April 2011 *Record of ESSPIN Kaduna Training/Development Workshops since January 2009 with Person Training Days (PTDS) Breakdown*
- ESSPIN, May 2011. *ESSPIN Inputs into Gazara PS, Makarfi LGEA*
- ESSPIN undated *Kaduna State Government Ministry of Education Report on the Functions Review*
- ESSPIN undated *Implemented IQTE activities* (summary)
- ESSPIN undated *Kaduna State Primary Schools Literacy and Numeracy Benchmark*
- ESSPIN Undated *Transforming Basic Education in Kaduna*
- ESSPIN, undated *A diagrammatic representation of School Improvement and Community Involvement*
- ESSPIN undated *Kaduna Challenge Fund Schools in Makarfi and Kachia – Enrolment Numbers 2008-9/2009-10/2010-11*
- ESSPIN undated *Summary of Infrastructure Works in ESSPIN Pilot LGEAs*
- ESSPIN undated *Kaduna: Numbers of Public Primary and JS Schools by LGA at 2009/10 with enrolment data*
- ESSPIN May 2011 *Makarfi Information Sheet*
- Kaduna SLP, January 2011 *BCIA Workplan as at end January 2011*
- DFID/SLPs December 2010 *Report on a Two Day Session to Discuss Political Economy and Political Engagement Strategy*
- Kaduna SUBEB Overview of the Modalities Adopted to Revive the SBMCs in the ESSPIN LGEAs and attempts to apply SBMC in the Non-ESSPIN LGEAs in Kaduna State, paper presented by Shuaib M. Dabo, Direct Social Mobilisation (Kaduna State) on May 17, 2011
- Kaduna SUBEB (2011) Ranks and Schedule of Duties Dept of Social Mobilisation & Public Relations
- Kaduna SUBEB Social Mobilisation Dept (undated) Organogram
- Kaduna SUBEB (undated) Harmonised LGEA Social Mobilisation & Knowledge Management Structure
- ESSPIN Kaduna (Jan 2011) SBMC Mentoring Visit Report by Fantsuam Foundation
- ESSPIN Kaduna (March 2011) SBMC Mentoring Visit Report by Lifeline Education Resource Development Centre
- ESSPIN Kaduna (Feb 2011) SBMC Mentoring Visit Report by Youth in Support of Community Development
- ESSPIN & UK Aid (undated) SBMC Guidebook Kaduna State

Documentation State Government of Kaduna

- Kaduna State undated Chart to show Kaduna State Approved Public Service Reform Framework (Organisational/Reform/Corporate Planning)
- Kaduna State College of Education Gidan Waya Institutional Plan 2011-2014 Draft
- Kaduna State March 2008 Education Sector Analysis
- Kaduna State July 2008 Kaduna Education Sector Plan (ESP)
- Kaduna State October 2009 Education Sector Medium-Term Sector Strategy (MTSS) 2010-2012
- Kaduna State Government February 2010 Development Cooperation Framework between Kaduna State Government and Department for International Development and United Nations System in Nigeria and World Bank
- Kaduna State Government September 2010 Education Strategy 2011-2013 MTSS
- Kaduna State Government December 2010. Kaduna State Government, United Nations, World Bank and UK Department for International Development Cooperation Framework (Results Framework)
- Kaduna Ministry of Education June 2010 Annual School Census Report 2009-2010
- Kaduna State Ministry of Education undated Annual Education Sector Report 2009-2010
- Kaduna State Government, undated *Changing the Machinery of Government Pamphlet*
- Kaduna SSIT undated Sample of handwritten comments on school based tasks (two schools)
- Lere LGEA April 2011 Draft and Incomplete Work Plan for the School Services Directorate (a non-ESSPIN LGEA)
- Ministry of Education May 2011 Leading Sector Wide Education Reform in Kaduna State – a report on progress, milestones and issues in relation to the Ministry's reform and development programme. Draft
- Ministry of Education Budget/Revised Budget Information Education Sector 2008-2010

- Ministry of Education 2011 State Approved Budget Summary
- Ministry of Education, 2011 Working documents on structure of Planning, Research and Statistics; School Services, Physical and Project Monitoring; Social Mobilization; Internal Audit; Human Resource Management; and Planning Research and Statistics
- SUBEB, 2011 List of Beneficiary Schools under the Direct Funding to Schools (DFS) Programme Initiated and Supported by the Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) Kaduna Office to the 7 (Seven) Pilot LGEAs in Kaduna State
- SUBEB 2011 A Brief Report on the Reform Programme of Kaduna State Universal Basic Education Board
- LGEAs School Services (Advisory Services Unit) Role Descriptions for Head of Department, School Support Officer and District Support Officer

Kano

- ESSPIN undated ESSPIN Kano PSA Spend 2011-06-05
- ESSPIN undated ESSPIN CCIT IE Spend (July 2010 – April 2011)
- ESSPIN undated Output 2 Domestication of Strategic Work Plans - 2010
- ESSPIN undated Consultants Visits to ESSPIN Kano Office for the Year 2010
- ESSPIN undated Key Facts on Kano State Schools 2009/2010 Annual School Census
- ESSPIN, undated School Based Management Committee Handbook Kano State
- ESSPIN undated Replication Evidence Data
- ESSPIN January 2011 Functional Review of Kano MoE
- ESSPIN 2010 Corporate Planning Kano SUBEB February – November 2010
- ESSPIN June 2010 ESSPIN Briefing for the Honourable High Commissioner
- ESSPIN 2010 Executive Summary from IQTE Institutions Census in Kano State
- ESSPIN December 2010 Kano State Universal Basic Education Board Financial Systems Review Ernest Obasa
- ESSPIN, February 2011. Kano State Tsangaya Pilot: Year 1 Term 1 Student Assessment Report.
- ESSPIN April 2011 Integrated School Development: Building of Support Services as an Evidence Based Approach to Planning and Budgeting of Support to Schools Second draft
- ESSPIN April 2011 Supply Capacity Assessment: Junior Secondary Schools in Kano State Draft Report Laura McInerney
- ESSPIN May 2011 Presentation Education at the Crossroads ... ESSPIN in Kano State
- ESSPIN May 2011 An Assessment of the Professional Working Knowledge of Teachers in Nigeria: Implications for Teacher Development, Policy and Implementation
- ESSPIN Four examples of Quality Assurance Evaluation Reports
- ESSPIN undated The Impact of State and Local Government Support to School Improvement
- ESSPIN/World Bank undated Kano Conditional Cash Transfer Program for Girls' Education. Draft Baseline Report
- ESSPIN April 2011 Sample of School Based Task Record (Module 3)
- ESSPIN undated Sample of handwritten Summaries of Action Plans in on LGEA
- Organogram of SUBEB and LGEA
- MoE Kano State, Education Strategic Plan 2009-2018, April 2008
- Kano SLP April 2011 Kano SLP Coordination: Education Sector Big Common Impact Area
- DFID/SLPs December 2010 Report on a Two Day Session to Discuss Political Economy and Political Engagement Strategy
- DFID/SLPs Costs of Meeting Selected Benchmarks in the Education Sector (coming out of work on education BCIA in Kano)
- Mott MacDonald May 2011 Customer Satisfaction Questionnaire (sample)
- ESSPIN May 2011 *Kano Key Numbers as at 31 March 2011 (revised 06 May 2011)*
- ESSPIN May 2011 *ESSPIN Water Supply Status Reports Kano Phase II*
- ESSPIN undated *Kano ESSPIN Workplan May-July 2011*
- ESSPIN undated *Kano Budget Forecast May –July 2011 (by activity)*
- ESSPIN undated *Kano State Workplan Results Sheet for Years 3 and 4*

Documentation State Government of Kano

- LGEA undated Sample Organogram
- Ministry of Education, Kano State April 2008 Education Strategic Plan 2009-2018
- Ministry of Education undated Budget Breakdowns 2008-2011
- Ministry of Education undated Kano State (Approved) Estimates 2011 Capital Expenditure (sample)
- Ministry of Education, Kano State June 2010 Annual School Census Results 2009-2010
- Ministry of Education December 2010 Medium Term Education Sector Strategy 2011-2013
- Ministry of Education August 2009 Medium Term Education Sector Strategy 2010-2012

- Ministry of Education, Kano State December 2010 Annual Education Sector Performance Report
- Ministry of Education February 2011 Education Sector Steering Committee Minutes
- Ministry of Education 2010-2011 School Census Form for Private Schools
- Ministry of Education 2010-2011 School Census Form for Pre-primary and Primary Education Public Schools
- Note on Fagge Special Primary School (for MTR)
- SSIT May 2011 CTI SSIT School Visit Lesson Observation Report
- SUBEB June 2010 Strategic Plan for the Period 2010-2012
- SUBEB undated Organogram (including by Department)
- Extract from Jigawa State Approved Budget 2011

CSO Mentoring Reports Kano

- ESSPIN A&E Specialist Report on Mentoring Visits 1 & 2
- Magajin Mallam Education Consultancy Services Circle 1 Report (Jan 2011) and Circle 2 Report (Feb 2011)
- Citizens Council for Public Education (March 2011)
- FEDERATION OF MUSLIM WOMEN ASSOCIATIONS IN NIGERIA Mentoring Visit Reports (Dec 2010) and (March 2011)
- AMINU KANO CENTRE FOR DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH AND TRAINING Mentoring Visit Report (Feb 2011)
- Samarib Ventures Ltd. Mentoring Visit Report (March 2011)
- Turaki Educational Consultancy Services Mentoring Visit Report (Feb 2011)

Kwara

- ESSPIN Education Sector Analysis-Kwara State-(2008)
- ESSPIN Education Strategic Plan 2009-2018-Kwara State (2010)
- ESSPIN Functional Review of Kwara MoEST (2011)
- ESSPIN Strategic Plan-Kwara SUBEB-2010-2013 (2010)
- ESSPIN Kwara State College of Education College Handbook 2010-2013
- ESSPIN Monitoring of Learning Achievement MLA Survey-Kwara (2010)
- An Assessment of the Development Needs of Teachers in Nigeria-Kwara State(2008)
- Teacher Professional Standards Framework-Assessors Log (2011)
- Monitoring Learning Achievement-Kwara(2011)
- Kwara State College of Basic Education Oro-Institutional Plan 2011-2014 (2011)
- Kwara State College of Education Oro-Policy on the Design, Delivery and Monitoring of a Quality Teacher Education Curriculum (2009)

DFID

- DFID, October 2007 Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) Phase II Programme Memorandum Final Version (with technical annexes)
- DFID, May 2008 Capacity for Universal Basic Education (CUBE) Project
- Project Completion Review
- DFID, November 2009 SESP MTR Issues Paper DFID Summary Response
- The SESP Mid-Term Review (MTR)
- DFID 2011 Learning in DFID supported countries:
- DFID 2011 Operational Plan 2011-2015DFID Nigeria (with annexes including Girls' Education Strategy)
- DFID UNICEF 2010 Girls' Education Programme Phase 2
- 2010 Annual Review
- DFID UNICEF undated DGEP 2 Implementation in Bauchi, Katsina and Sokoto States, Progress Made Towards Outcomes 2008-2010
- DFID UNICEF undated Girls' Education Project (GEP 2)One Page Summary on Aims, Background and Headline Results
- DFID ESSPIN ARIES 2010

AID Agencies

- UNESCO, 2011 Education for All Global Monitoring Report Paris UNESCO
- World Bank 2011 Making Schools Work Washington World Bank

- World Bank 2011 Project Appraisal on a Proposed Credit in the Amount of SDR 43,3 million (US\$65 million) to the Federal Republic of Nigeria for a State Education Sector Project

IMEP

- ESSPIN MTR June 2011 *Preliminary Findings* (Presentation for ESSPIN Abuja)
- ESSPIN MTR June 2011 *Preliminary Findings* (Presentation for DFID Nigeria)
- IMEP April 2011, *The Monitoring and Evaluation of the Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPI)* First Draft IMEP Design Mission 27 March – 7 April
- IMEP undated *Objectives and Guiding Principles*
- IMPEP, 14 March 2011. *Presentation on Nigeria IMEP: Value for Money*. David Hoole. OPM

Others

- David Hoole, March 2011. *Reinventing Value for Money: New Wine in an Old Bottle?* OPM
- David Hoole, March 2011. *Analytical Framework for Assessing VFM* OPM

ANNEX E

ESSPIN Logframe February 2011

(See attached PDF file).

ANNEX F

ESSPIN – 33 Results Indicators

Table 1: Results Indicators

(* = data not yet available)

No	Results indicators	Cumulative to date	Target for programme
	<i>Access and Equity</i>		
1	Number of additional learners accessing basic education owing to ESSPIN activities (awaiting 2010 ASC)	*	223,000
2	Number of “at risk” female learners who are recipients of CCTs ¹¹	3,000	12,000
	<i>School improvement</i>		
3	Person days of teacher training supported/no of competent teachers ¹²	298,992 days	21,133 teachers
4	Person days of head teacher training supported/no of competent teachers	58,292 days	3,260 HTs
5	Person days of training for State/LGEA officers supporting school improvement	84,700	1,990
6	Number of schools supported to use school development plans	1,010	7,680
7	Number of schools graded satisfactory or better under the reformed QA inspection process (not yet possible to measure)	*	5,250
8	Number of private schools engaging in school improvement activities (not yet possible to measure)	*	400
	<i>Water, sanitation and infrastructure</i>		
9	Number of learners accessing water from new W&S units	99,050	303,100
10	Number of girls with access to new separate toilets	45,280	138,560

¹¹ Initially, numbers of recipients are used as an input measure and for calculation of unit costs. The programme target is expressed as no of at-risk female learners who are retained in schools.

¹² For results 3, 4, and 5, person days of training are recorded as an input measure and for calculation of unit costs. The programme target is expressed as an output measure: no of competent teachers/head teachers/officials. The output measure can't be used until surveys are conducted measuring progress against baseline

No	<i>Results indicators</i>	Cumulative to date	Target for programme
11	Number of learners benefitting from improved classrooms	1,000	40,320
12	Number of learners benefitting from school health clubs	7,000	303,100
	<i>Direct funding of schools</i>		
13	Number of learners in schools which receive direct funding from government	0	3,104,500
	<i>Community voice and empowerment</i>		
14	Number of community members trained to participate in SBMCs	19,788	102,000
15	Number of communities where women and children perceive SBMC decisions to be reflecting their concerns (no data until 2012 Community Survey)	*	3,840
16	No of schools providing relevant information to parents and guardians (no data until the 2012 Community Survey)	*	7,380
17	Number of CSOs working with government in engaging with communities	40	60
18	Number of schools where community demand was responded to with provision of resources (no data until 2012)	*	6,150
	<i>Consolidation and Replication of Education Reform</i>		
19	Number of States whose budget utilisation rate exceeds 90%	0	6
20	Amounts saved through reductions in payrolls and other financial management measures (£) (not yet possible to measure)	*	*
21	Number of States accessing UBE-IF funding	2	10
22	Number of States with MTSS linked to realistic budgets	6	10
23	Number of States conducting regular M&E and publishing AESRs	6	10
24	Number of States publishing Annual School Census by August	6	20
25	Number of States producing outcome-based QA reports on schools	6	12
26	Number of States which follow national SBMC policy	6	20

No	<i>Results indicators</i>	Cumulative to date	Target for programme
27	Number of States conducting assessments of teacher competence	6	10
28	Number of States conducting periodic assessments of students' learning	6	10
29	Number of States with reorganised education management structures and systems	6	10
30	Number of States practising inclusive policies towards non-state providers of education	0	6
31	Number of States with established in-service teacher training capability	6	10
32	Number of States with improved teacher career structures	0	2
33	Number of teacher education colleges complying with Federal QA guidelines	0	2

ANNEX G

The 33 Results Areas – An MTR Working Note

The ESSPIN Programme Forward Planning paper for Outputs 2-4 proposes a set of 33 results indicators.

Each indicator has a programme target. Annex 1 to the paper explains how each target has been determined.

There are a number of problems with this list

- There is no obvious rationale that underpins the choice of the 33 indicators
- There is however a partial rationale for how each individual target figure is calculated.
- But the rationale is uneven. Some targets appear to be restricted to direct ESSPIN deliverables while others build in a degree of wider replication the assumptions for which are not always made clear.
- For example, the number of additional learners accessing basic education is set at a quarter of a million children but impacting on just 10% of schools in Kano and Kaduna (where need is greatest). Why? And this has nothing to say about new initiatives on access within the programme.
- Some results appear to factor in wider replication. For example, the number of schools supported to develop SDPs is put at 50% in ESSPIN States but this does not relate at all clearly to the log frame indicators. There are other examples of this type.
- The annex talks of impact schools – but it is not clear how the figure of 6370 schools is reached (and the difference between the Northern and Southern State calculation). Primary and JSS?
- The six fold categorisation of the 33 results doesn't make a great deal of sense if school improvement is the main driver. For example, why separate out water, sanitation and infrastructure and direct funding to schools from school improvement? Perhaps this is just loose grouping of topics. .
- Each result and target needs to be interrogated fairly carefully. There is a mix of straightforward deliverables to do with training right through to purpose level outcomes. Here are some initial points by result.

33 RESULTS	OUTPUT
1 The results statement refers to additional learners but this is not the rationale in the annex which is based on schools supported. Additional children benefitting from education is getting close to being a goal level indicator	Not an output
2 This a total figure which I would expect DFID to find derisory relative to the scale of its investment. If this just means delivering a CCT programme for an agreed number of girls then say so. It seems to ignore work under BCIA's too which focus on girls retention.	Not represented clearly in Logframe
3 This is a close but different from the Purpose P3 indicator	Purpose level P3 (but should be an output)
4 Corresponds to Output 3.3	3
5 This is a straight deliverable – training activities delivered with a school improvement focus	3
6 This refers to the <u>use</u> of SDPs as distinct from schools with SDPs in the Logframe	3
7 As noted not yet possible to measure	3
8 This seems a very low target. This cannot be found in the log frame	3
9 Not sure why the assumption isn't much higher if budgetary provision made	3
10 Same as 9	3
11 Same as above – need to check assumption against MTSS proposals	3 (although currently in 2)
12 Assumptions need to be clearer	3
13 It is not clear from this how long direct funding from ESSPIN will be provided through Direct Grants and Challenge Funds. Nor of funds into non public schools. Assumptions not made clear	3
14 This is a straight training deliverable	4
15 This is a very qualitative and rather general judgement. It is not clear why it should not be calculated by impact schools and then an additional % based on roll out	4
16 Odd. What does relevant mean? The Logframe indicator seems much more precise No clear relationship with Logframe indicators (4.4?)	4
17 Where does the target number of 60 from? Bears no relationship to Output 4.3 figures	4
18 This is the same as 4.5. The target figures appears to be an average of the State level figures in the log frame	4
19 This links to Output 1.1 and 2.1 but is conceived differently. It assumes no impact beyond	1 and 2

the six states but Output 1.1 might suggest otherwise.	
20 A tough call – not yet possible to measure	1 and 2
21 This is ill defined. Does it mean over a period of time? If so what? And given that is matching funds will reflect a full release of a partial one?	1 and 2
22 Close to 2.1 in the Logframe but expanded	2
23 Not in log frame	2
24 Not specifically in the log frame but worthwhile. Why 14 additional States	2
25 Similar to 2.3 but less exact	2 in current log frame (but should be 3)
26 Much broader than log frame indicators	1 and 4
27 This is not captured in the log frame Not sure how state level figures derived	3
28 Perhaps regular rather than periodic	3
29 Reorganisation is not a virtue in itself Imprecise	1 and 2
30 Intended to cover new initiatives perhaps. What is an inclusive policy towards a non state provide; surely this should be more about an inclusive education policy	2
31 Capability is loose concept	2
32 Why Jigawa and Kwara?	2
33 A rather limited engagement target for Colleges of Education	2?

At present this list does not meet the rubric in the VFM study conducted for ESSPIN that it is necessary to be clear as to what is wanted. The study recommended that there should be a short list of 'key' efficiency indicators – "Headline Results" indicators –to be tracked in greater detail so that such detailed interrogation may be pre-empted. I tend to agree.

The VFM study has very little to say about the 33 indicators themselves.

If the argument is accepted that the results as formulated need more work (and/or reduced) are the retrospective cumulative and unit costs of any great value?

Interestingly the VFM study states that ... *the extent to which VFM in programmes already under way can be improved is more limited, and must be achieved by more marginal, mid-course, changes.*

ANNEX H

The MTSS Process in Jigawa and Kano

Jigawa

Effectiveness of the MTSS

The overall effectiveness of the MTSS in Jigawa is considered good. After a difficult first round with no effective results (outcome), lessons learnt were captured in the second MTSS which can be considered as highly successful.

The first MTSS 2010 – 2012 made an estimate of the required capital expenditures for the whole education sector. ESSPIN moderated participatory workshops in which the sector priorities were listed and subsequently, the investments were costed at a total of NN 20.5 billion. The costing was done in a bottom-up process. This turned out to be a major drawback of the process. Prioritisation was insufficiently rigorous and the related costs of the proposed investment of NN 20.5 billion was much more than the available sector ceiling set by the Ministry of Economic Planning and Finance. The approved sector budget for 2010 was not more than NN 20.0 bln in total of which 40% (NN 7.4 billion) for capital expenditures. In addition, the activity descriptions in the MTSS do not correspond to the activities listed in the approved budget. Organisationally, the whole process was challenged by initial resistance to change. In conclusion, the first MTSS put things in motion but cannot be considered a success in terms of results. The indicator cannot be calculated.

The process to develop the second MTSS 2011 – 2013 was much more effective. The scope of the MTSS was extended by including the recurrent costs implications of the proposed investments. Other recurrent costs (mainly personnel and overhead costs) were taken up as a given based on the actual recurrent costs of the year before. The total MTSS budget estimate for 2011 was set at NN 19 billion out of which NN 3.4 billion for capital expenditures. These capital investments costed by activity were copied almost one to one in the approved budget estimate. The approved capital budget was even a bit higher with a total of NN 3.6 billion is due to some minor variations and extra added activities. The MTR estimates the indicator to be around 95 percent¹³ which is more or less in line with the ESSPIN's team own estimate. This high percentage can be seen as a major achievement in a relative short time frame. The stakeholders had learnt from the previous round and could also benefit from the experiences of the SPARC project. During the first MTSS, the SPARC team was settling down in Jigawa and busy with setting-up its programme. In the second year, the Ministry of Finance, together with SPARC support, had developed uniform guidelines for effective coordination of the MTSS process which directed the Education MTSS.

The alignment of the MTSS to the annual budget estimate is in itself of little value if the actual releases show large variations to the approved budget. This information is not captured in the Logframe but is introduced in the results framework as indicator 19 "Number of States whose budget utilisation rate exceeds 90 percent". It is suggested to add this indicator to the revised Logframe.

Fertile grounds for sector development did already exist in Jigawa, prior to the arrival of ESSPIN. Budget allocations to Education increased from 5.5 billion in 2006 to 17.5 billion in 2009 (education share % of total budget?). Performance data show that Jigawa has a relative good track record on budget utilisation which is much better than neighbouring KanoState. Most funds have been released including an extra capital boost in

¹³This is a best estimate. There were some changes in the activities which are not reflected in the formula. Due to the unavailability of approved recurrent expenditure data, the formula used for this indicator cannot be accurately calculated.

2007 approved by the State Governor who selected the education sector as one of his main priority areas for the development of Jigawa State. The budget utilization ratios below provide a baseline for future years as ESSPIN's contribution is not yet reflected in these years.

Table 1 - Jigawa - MoE Budget Utilisation Rates

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Recurrent	97%	60%	96%	NA
Capital	230%	83%	52%	NA
Total	163%	74%	74%	NA

Sustainability

The sustainability of results is considered weak. The MTSS process is not yet institutionalised and due to some changes in the Ministry the momentum for reform is not as strong as it has been before. More ownership from the Ministry and additional technical support is needed before results can be sustained. This is unlikely to come quickly. Last year, four key drivers supporting the ESSPIN Programme have left the Ministry. The Commissioner of Education, who had been a major supporter of ESSPIN, became the Federal Minister of Education. The PS, the Directors of Planning Research and Statistics (PRS) and School Services (SS) all retired. This exodus created a knowledge gap in the Ministry at a time that the MTSS process had not been institutionalised yet¹⁴. This means that the work done on conceptual thinking on strategic planning needs to be replicated. Politically, this is a difficult process and the ESSPIN team is challenged to keep the Ministry in a leading position. Unfortunately, ESSPIN activities are not seen as an integral part of the Ministry's functioning which implies a high risk for sustainability if not altered. External support remains needed to produce the third MTSS. This was already foreseen to a certain degree, but the events cause that the required support might be more than originally anticipated. According to the ESSPIN team and witnessed by the MTR, the relationship with SUBEB is much better. However, the buy-in of the Ministry is essential to guarantee sustainability of results.

Potential impact

Given the concerns about sustainability and the uncertainty about future directions, it is difficult to comment on potential impact of the education MTSS at this stage. There are some indications that the Direct School Funding might be rolled out State wide in the next annual budget. This will be decided in September but the evidence from the pilot schools has created enthusiasm and discussions are ongoing on further roll-out. One of the wider potential impacts comes from the Ministry of Water and Ministry of Agriculture who are also in the process to introduce a MTSS as a tool for improved strategic planning and budgeting.

Conclusions and Recommendations

ESSPIN has contributed to the establishment of an effective MTSS. Using the MTSS, prioritised spending has started, positively contributing to the overall objectives of the sector. This can be considered a major result, especially given the limited time used. However, serious concerns exist on the sustainability of results. Additional technical support is needed for to work on the third MTSS. But more importantly, it is recommended to secure a firm commitment from the Ministry underlining its leadership role and responsibilities in the second phase of ESSPIN in Jigawa.

¹⁴The former Director of Planning joined the ESSPIN State Team after his retirement and has been helpful to assist its successor to understand the concept of MTSS.

Kano

Effectiveness

The effectiveness of the MTSS in Kano is difficult to determine. ESSPIN has made good progress to introduce the concept of activity-based budgeting in a relatively short time, but there is no hard evidence showing how successful the MTSS has been in driving the approved budget. The low degree of budget utilisation is worrying and affecting impact.

In KanoState, ESSPIN provided similar support to the MoE and the SUBEB to prepare a MTSS for 2010-2012 and 2011-2013. The second MTSS has been signed and approved as the official planning framework for the Ministry. Unlike in Jigawa, the ESSPIN team has not traced to which degree the MTSSs have been driving the approved budgets of the subsequent years. Sample evidence shows that some activities in the approved budget are fully aligned, while other activities have been adjusted. More work needs to be done to establish the degree to which the MTSS has been driving the annual budget (no measurement on indicator 2.1). There are however positive examples in the approved 2011 budget. New budget lines have been added indicating the willingness to leverage funds and to prioritise spending on the work that ESSPIN has done in the area of IQTE and conditional cash transfers.

There are however serious concerns about the implementation of the approved budget. Before the start of ESSPIN, the budget utilisation rate was above 90 percent. Since 2009 to date, there have been serious shortfalls and delays in budget realization. Systematically overestimated sector resource envelopes are a big contributor to the low performance rates. In addition, UBEC funds have not been released due to missing counterpart funding leaving capital investments for primary education to an absolute minimum. Also in other subsectors investments were minimal.

Table 2 - Kano MoE Budget Utilisation Rates

	2007	2008	2009*	2010*
Recurrent	91%	99%	88%	87%
Capital	47%	83%	8%	16%
Total	85%	94%	47%	60%

* Own estimates, based on extrapolation of provisional data available for January to September.

In this kind of environment, planning in itself can be improved, but its effectiveness does not go beyond an artificial exercise what is reflected in the score for potential impact.

Sustainability

The sustainability of the planning process is considered good. There is high level commitment to the work that ESSPIN has been done. And even though at this point of time, the change of government creates an uncertain environment, it seems unlikely that the MTSS process will be affected by this. Even though the results in terms of prioritized spending are inadequately demonstrated, staff from the Directorate of Planning, Research and Statistics is very dedicated towards the new working method. The Director disseminated lessons-learnt from ESSPIN training to his Deputy Director and 10 headed staff so that institutional memory can be built.

Potential Impact

Impact is at risk. Without an improvement in the establishment of realistic sector ceilings and consequently reliable budget releases, there will be no impact felt at service delivery level from prioritized spending. The release of UBEC funding is essential for primary education. Future directions of the new Government will sway the potential impact of the education MTSS.

The first priority therefore needs to be to provide the MoE with a realistic sector ceiling. This is where ESSPIN meets SPARC in terms of common objectives. SPARC has indicated that having a realistic budget is a top priority but also an extremely difficult one due to political interferences. It is illustrative that the initial education budget for 2011 (NN 109 billion), was set slightly lower than the 2010 budget (NN 110 billion) but ended up to be as high as NN 123 billion. One of the measures discussed between MoF and SPARC is to introduce two separate envelopes; one for recurrent costs and one for capital investments.

Wider potential impacts are expected from the introduction of a MTSS as a tool for improved strategic planning and budgeting in other line ministries.

Conclusions and Recommendations

ESSPIN has been successful in introducing activity-based costed planning in Kano. That in itself can be seen as an important achievement, although better monitoring is required from the ESSPIN office to determine and guide the Ministry on the actual uptake of the identified priorities in the approved budget which could not be verified by the MTR. The link between ESSPIN and SPARC to work together in KanoState has been established and should be further intensified towards joint efforts in political engagement on the realisation of better budget performance rates and prioritised spending.