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Executive Summary

Mid-Term Evaluation of the Integrated School Performance Improvement, Review and Engagement (INSPIRE) project (covering the period from project start in April 2015 to November 2016).

Link was awarded a grant by the Scottish Government in 2015 for the INSPIRE project, working in partnership with the national Directorate of Inspection and Advisory Services (DIAS) and with practice-based training in Mchinji and Dedza Districts. This project builds on Link’s existing work with DIAS and in Dedza District, while this is the first time that Link has worked in Mchinji District.

The overall aims of the INSPIRE project are to improve the performance of Malawian schools and the impact of the Malawian Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) and District Education Offices (DEO) on school performance, by improving integrated planning, multi-stakeholder accountability and the provision of effective support.

PROGRESS TOWARDS TARGETS AND INDICATORS

In terms of progress toward targets and indicators, the INSPIRE project has met or is on track to meet eight out of nine logframe milestones (target March 2017) for which data is available at the mid-point of the project. The one indicator which is off-track (see p.15) relates to a change in the delivery approach, which has been agreed with both the donor and key partners, and the target date for achievement has been moved to Year 3.

The additionality of key output indicators (training on the electronic school report card, schools integrated information systems database, and school improvement toolkit; and participation in school improvement meetings) is high and these benefits are unlikely to have been achieved without Link intervention.

Wider benefits to other stakeholders, including school staff, communities and learners, are evident despite the early stage of implementation and the long-term nature of behaviour change.

MANAGEMENT CONTENT & DELIVERY

The management, content and delivery of the INSPIRE project has been effective, reflecting a flexible and responsive approach with stakeholders. A number of caveats are noted. However, these have not affected the overall project performance in terms of targets achieved.

Of particular significance, is the effective approach to partnership working, including a high level of consultation with key stakeholders at national and district levels, which has helped to match the project to the needs of stakeholders and led to the development of a targeted and innovative approach to the National Education Standards (NES) and advisory process which does not duplicate other efforts.

Over a period of 18 months Link has built a strong working relationship with the District Education Manager (DEM) and her team in Mchinji, leading to a high level of participation of government staff in project delivery. The DEM took the initiative to deliver some project activities in non-project schools within the District without additional financial support, demonstrating her strong approval of the intervention, as well as a high level of ownership of the activities. It is noted that a greater sense of ownership of project activities needs to be built at the community and school levels in order
to fully embed the benefits, but there is a good level of local support and ownership at this stage of the project.

PROGRESS TOWARD OVERALL AIMS & OBJECTIVES

The findings suggest that significant progress has been made in the establishment of an integrated system of school planning from school to district and national levels. For example, at school level, following the intervention, 85% of (head)teachers strongly agreed that their school has an effective improvement plan, compared to just 23% before the intervention.

Multi-stakeholder accountability is built in at each level of the process. There is a strong sense from community members that parents are taking a more informed and active role in the school. 75% of (head)teachers and 86% of community members strongly agreed that the local community is effectively involved in school management after the intervention, compared to 23% and 25% respectively before the intervention, and just 16% of the control group.

There is evidence that a consolidated system of monitoring and support for schools has been established. Both (head)teachers and community members see a significant improvement in the quality of school management as a result of the intervention, with 85% of community members and 76% of (head)teachers strongly agreeing that the quality of school management is good, compared to 14% and 18% before the intervention, and 16% of the control group.

There is also evidence for a range of significant wider benefits being experienced by participant schools as a result of the application of NES and the enhanced advisory support (including governance, teaching practice, community engagement and learner performance). This is a very encouraging result given the relatively early phase in implementation of the INSPIRE model. These benefits remain to be confirmed in the official education statistics, but there was consistent support for this view across a range of stakeholders within Mchinji. All community members and 95% of teachers felt that learners had benefitted from the project in the last year. Improved academic performance was noted by a large number of teachers and parents. Although non-participant schools were not included in the Mid-Term Evaluation, it is likely that they also experienced some benefits as the DEM took the initiative to deliver some project activities across all schools in the district.

The additionality of these wider benefits is less easily assessed. However, feedback with DIAS officials, inspectors, and Primary Education Advisers suggests that additionality is also high in this regard.

The report includes a number of lessons and recommendations to inform future project delivery.
Introduction

Background to the project

The aim of the Integrated School Performance Improvement, Review and Engagement (INSPIRE) project is to improve the performance of Malawian schools and the impact of the Malawian Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) and District Education Offices (DEO) on school performance, by improving integrated planning, multi-stakeholder accountability and the provision of effective support.

The project aims to support the Malawi Ministry of Education Science and Technology to develop and demonstrate a consolidated district school monitoring and support system clarifying the rights and responsibilities of all stakeholders.

This project, informed by learning from Link Malawi’s district projects in Dedza and Mulanje, will be the first to target all schools within Mchinji District, providing data to enable integrated planning at school, district and national levels. Integrated planning will lead to better targeting of scarce resources and more effective interventions to support schools, resulting in an improvement to the quality of education which schools deliver and improved learner outcomes.

Innovations include:

- A school report card system enabling access to a wide range of school performance data to inform school planning;
- Development of a Schools Integrated Information System (SIIS) database to store inspection and advisory data, and an application for mobile data entry; and
- Dissemination of the National Education Standards in the local language, Chichewa.

Evaluation Aims and Objectives

AIM

To carry out a mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the INSPIRE Project to inform future project delivery, provide evidence of project benefits and learn lessons for the delivery of related projects.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the MTE reflect the relatively early stage of the project, with a focus on ensuring the overall direction remains relevant, management & monitoring arrangements are working well, and measuring achievement of targets to date.

As such, specific MTE objectives include:

1) An assessment of process efficiency (administrative, managerial, technical);
2) Review of monitoring data and arrangements;
3) Qualitative assessment of the continuing strategic fit and rationale for the project; and
4) Qualitative and quantitative achievements in terms of outputs and immediate benefits against the main intervention objectives.

It is noted that at this stage the evaluation is not seeking to identify in detail the project outcomes, impacts, and wider benefits. This will be the focus of the full term evaluation.

The table below sets out a provisional set of evaluation questions that the evaluation will seek to answer (Table 1).
Table 0: Mid-Term Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did the project cost to date?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs should take into account all public sector costs and permit, where possible, a split between Link Community Development Malawi (Link Malawi) and other costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress Towards Aims and Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project on track to achieve its overall aims and objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they still relevant considering the changing context and needs of beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic and Policy Context</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project still fit with the Link Malawi strategy and policy context? What is the need for the project in this context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is project management appropriate and effective to date?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can improvements be made in the management of the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are partnership arrangements satisfactory? What alterations are needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are appropriate performance indicators in place, including baseline measures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content and Delivery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the content and delivery appropriate and effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the target groups being reached?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the scale of the project still appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any early lessons to be learned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress Towards Targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the targets being achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is monitoring information being accurately and effectively collected, analysed, disseminated and responded to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A qualitative assessment of whether the project is on track to achieve the intended outcomes for beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A qualitative assessment of whether the project is on track to achieve the intended impacts for beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning and Best Practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has been learnt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What best practice has been exemplified?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPECIFIC AREAS OF FOCUS DURING MTE

The MTE has a number of additional tasks as follows:

1) An additional purpose of the MTE is to ensure the project monitoring arrangements will facilitate later evaluation tasks. As such, an important aim of MTE is to review monitoring indicators, and where feasible, ensure appropriate range of performance measures are in place covering the baseline (retrospectively if necessary), as well as mid-term and evaluation periods.

2) To review the likely monitoring evaluation requirements of the full term evaluation (FTE) and to set-up any arrangements that will be needed to ensure the desired evidence is available to the FTE.
3) To gather detailed data to measure and evaluate the School Management Simulation Training (SMST) intervention

**Methodology**

**Evaluation Design**

The Link team in Malawi and Edinburgh led the development and delivery of the MTE with technical support from Alastair MacPherson, an evaluation expert from Additional Research. The evaluation was structured as a participatory process, with beneficiaries fully involved in the investigative process, and engaging with key stakeholders at international, national, district, zone and school levels.

The main ways in which stakeholders were engaged include the following:

1. Opportunities to shape the evaluation approach: Link Malawi requested feedback from the Directorate of Inspection and Advisory Services (DIAS) and the District Education Manager (DEM) in Mchinji and Dedza;
2. Opportunity to provide evidence as part of the evaluation process through individual interviews and surveys;
3. Opportunity to provide feedback on draft evaluation findings: Link Malawi shared draft findings with from DIAS and the District Education Office (DEO) in Mchinji and Dedza; and
4. Access to evaluation findings through for example, dissemination of reports or presentations: Link Malawi will share the key findings with all stakeholders and make the full Mid-Term Evaluation report available on request.

**Project Theory of Change**

Our approach to the evaluation was informed by the INSPIRE project theory of change (see Appendix 1), which pointed to the main benefits expected from the project and the main ways in which change was intended to be brought about. As such the Theory of Change / logic model informed the focus of the evaluation questions used in, for example, stakeholder interviews.

**Evaluation Methods**

**INCEPTION MEETING & DISCUSSION**

The evaluation commenced with an inception meeting between Link International and Link Malawi MTE team members to:

1. Agree and finalise the detailed aims, objectives and approach of the evaluation;
2. Access background documents relating to the project;
3. Confirm stakeholders for consultation and access contact details for stakeholders; and
4. Finalise logistical arrangements for fieldwork support.

**DESK REVIEW OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

A detailed review was made of background documentation relating to the project including project plans and approval papers; monitoring data (permitting, as far as possible, the profiling of activities, outputs and beneficiaries); relevant strategy/policy documentation; and available socio-economic baseline statistics providing the context of the project.

These documents included:
Fieldwork

INTRODUCTION

The approach used a combination of methods, reflecting the MTE aims and objectives, the range of stakeholder groups, and the resources available. The main methods included:

- Face-to-face, in-depth, semi-structured interviews with selected key stakeholders;
- Interviewer-led questionnaire surveys with individuals including selected officials and stakeholders not included within face-to-face consultations or case studies;
- Case study research, looking in-depth at a small number of cases.

The main groups addressed by each method are outlined in Appendix 2.

STAKEHOLDER AND CASE STUDY CONSULTATIONS

Consultations were held with stakeholder representatives in order to assess the evaluation questions and to provide the most up-to-date picture of issues affecting project performance. Consultations were also held with representatives of the case study schools.

The consultations were conducted by face-to-face, semi-structured interview. Topic guides to support the consultations were developed in advance of fieldwork (see Appendix 3).

BENEFICIARY SURVEYS

This section sets out our approach to gathering evidence of benefits via a sample survey of project beneficiaries.

Survey Sample

A statistically representative sample survey was undertaken of all project beneficiaries. Our approach considered the following issues:

- **Survey Population:** this consisted of all headteachers and one nominated parent representative from all schools assisted under the project to date (90 schools; 2 interviews per school).
- **Sampling Frame:** this comprised a list of all beneficiary schools with the necessary information to draw a sample and to contact the target respondents (i.e. contact details of key school stakeholders including headteachers and parents). This data was held by the Link project office. A set of random numbers was used to select schools from the sampling frame. The headteacher of each selected school was contacted and a nominated parent representative was also selected for interview.
- **Sampling Accuracy:** we adhered to the commonly accepted accuracy level where results are significant ‘at the 95% confidence level’.
- **Sample Precision:** For the evaluation, we proposed a level of +/- 5% sampling error. The final achieved level was determined by response rate to the survey and response rates to individual questions.
For the sampled schools, a 100% response rate was achieved, and a sample size slightly larger than required was achieved (76 responses for each sub-group; 152 responses in total). This provides an overall margin of error of +/- 4.46% at the 95% confidence level.

The survey took around 30 minutes to complete for the typical respondent.

In addition, a small purposive sample of a comparison group was conducted (non-beneficiary schools), consisting of three schools. It is noted that the control group schools are located in the project target district of Mchinji. The selected schools have not yet participated in the project activities, but will do so in Year 3 of the project. They are supported by advisors who have undergone training as part of the INSPIRE project.

A more rigorous experimental/quantitative approach to control groups was considered a disproportionate use of the limited internal resource available for the MTE, and of limited value given the wide range of variables impacting on the outcomes in schools within the target districts.

**Questionnaire Development, Administration and Piloting**

The questionnaire development process included input from a range of Link team members and external advice and included consideration of the following issues (a copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix 4):

- Question content;
- Question wording;
- Question type;
- Questionnaire layout; and
- Delivery method.

It is noted that the survey included a range of questions to supplement baseline data captured previously.

The method used to deliver the survey was a key issue and the choice was a balance between response quality, ability to establish an accurate sample and cost. Consequently, we undertook a face-to-face interviewer-led survey, making use of tablet computers and an offline survey application.

The survey was administered by a small in-house team, following training in the survey content and method of administration. The training established agreed quality standards, aimed at ensuring administration to high professional standards in terms of completion of all relevant question areas.

Following the development phase, a short pilot was undertaken of the survey questionnaire and method of administration before finalisation.

**Limitations**

Random sampling of participants for the surveys was carried out at school level and the parent representatives were selected by the headteachers of the sampled schools. The selected parents were the chair of the School Management Committee or Parent-Teacher Association and would be expected to have higher levels of knowledge and involvement in school management activities and processes than the average parent.
In a small number of cases, questions about the impact of specific project interventions elicited responses about wider issues at the school which were unrelated to the project activities. This was particularly evident when parents were asked about negative outcomes of the interventions.

CASE STUDY RESEARCH

A further phase of the research was undertaken with three case studies of school interventions. Case studies were used to gain an in-depth understanding of selected cases, providing an understanding of why, for whom and under what circumstances the project achieves its objectives. The case studies aimed to assist Link to:

- Illustrate the project benefits in a narrative form, drawing on carefully selected projects;
- Explore the various points of view of the different stakeholders;
- Examine differences in implementation in different circumstances; and
- Better understand the nature of the processes producing benefits.

The selection of cases was an important step for generalising and answering the evaluation questions. Cases were selected on the basis of discussion with the MTE team and reflected consideration of the factors below:

- Contrasting cases: what happens at the extremes? What explains these differences?
- The best cases: what explains the effectiveness of a project?
- The worst cases: why does a project not function?
- Sub-sets: how can the different types of schools be compared?
- Representative cases: among the examples chosen to represent significant variations, what happens and why?
- Typical cases: on a typical project, what happens and why?
- Particular cases: in these specific circumstances, what happens and why?

The cases are not statistically representative and should be taken as illustrative of a range of issues encountered by participating schools.

ETHICAL ISSUES

The research was undertaken in accord with the principle that participation is voluntary, there is informed consent for participation, and that no harm is caused to participants.

Research participants were made aware of why the research was happening, what would happen with the data and who it would be shared with. The following information was provided to participants:

- The purpose of the research and what it entails;
- Who is undertaking and financing the research including the identity of the researcher;
- An outline of any reasonably foreseeable risks, embarrassment or discomfort;
- A description of the likely impact of the study;
- A description of how the respondent was selected for the study;
- A statement that participation was voluntary and that the respondent was free to withdraw at any time or to decline any particular question;
- Details as to how the findings will be disseminated;
- A description of what confidentiality or anonymity applies; and
- An offer to answer any questions.
Analysis & Triangulation

The analysis step included review of the quantitative and qualitative data collected during the fieldwork phase in order to answer the evaluation questions.

The introduction to the findings sections outline the main evaluation questions which are addressed by that section.

Information from a range of stakeholders and other sources is brought together (triangulated) to provide a range of perspectives on the evaluation questions. Quantitative data was analysed using the Qualtrics survey tool.

Findings

Administrative, Managerial & Technical Efficiency

This section examines the following evaluation questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What did the project cost to date?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs should take into account all public sector costs and permit, where possible, a split between Link and other costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is project management appropriate and effective to date?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can improvements be made in the management of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are partnership arrangements satisfactory? What alterations are needed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are appropriate performance indicators in place, including baseline measures?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content and Delivery</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the content and delivery appropriate and effective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the target groups being reached?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the scale of the project still appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any early lessons to be learned?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT INPUTS

Project inputs are detailed in the table below and total £600,000 over the three-year period of the project. At the time of the MTE, £255,000 had been received from the Scottish Government International Development Fund (IDF). There have been significant fluctuations in the GBP – Malawi kwacha (MWK) exchange rate during the project lifetime, ranging from £1 = MWK 650 to £1 = MWK 1067. As a result, the project budget to date has not been fully utilised. By January 2017 there was a total underspend of approximately £40k as a result of the exchange rate fluctuations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: PROJECT BUDGET</th>
<th>Year One: 2015-16</th>
<th>Year 2: 2016-17</th>
<th>Year 3: 2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Budget</td>
<td>£140,000</td>
<td>£230,000</td>
<td>£230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding from IDF</td>
<td>£140,000</td>
<td>£230,000</td>
<td>£230,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to funding from Scottish Government, the Malawi Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) contributed to the project by providing subsidised office space for Link in
Lilongwe and Dedza, and by making staff from the Directorate of Inspection and Advisory Services (DIAS) available to carry out training and project activities at national and district levels. Primary Education Advisors (PEA) at district level spent on average 10-20% of their time on INSPIRE project activities, rising to 70% during peak activity periods, such as during School Review. At national level, DIAS officers who are assigned to the project spend around 40% of their time on it. This reflects the strong relevance of the project to the work of DIAS.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Management: Effectiveness and Potential Improvements

Managing risks: There is a comprehensive risk register for the project, which is reviewed periodically by Link Malawi and Link International. Risks realised and mitigation undertaken are reported to Scottish Government every six months. To date only two unanticipated risks have arisen, and these have been addressed within the project.

Managing scheduling conflicts: Link’s approach of working through existing structures and government staff means that project activities can be delayed if these employees are unavailable. This is a particular challenge with the Primary Education Advisors, who are key partners at District level for INSPIRE, as they are also in high demand for other NGO projects. During 2015-2016, the USAID-funded National Reading Programme has been particularly demanding of PEAs’ time. This was identified as a risk during project design, and Link staff have addressed this by working flexibly to rearrange project activities to suit PEAs’ availability and partnering with other District Education staff when required. For example, training has been delivered to both PEAs and their colleagues Assistant Centre Coordinators (ACCOs) to increase the capacity within the district to deliver activities both during and beyond the project lifetime.

Flexibility within the Link Malawi team was also required to ensure project activities continued without significant delay during the extended illness of the Dedza Project Manager, one of the unanticipated risks.

Partnerships

Link Malawi provides monthly reports to Link International with an update on progress on project activities and a note of any challenges which need to be addressed. Link International and Link Malawi track expenditure against budget on a monthly basis to ensure activities are delivered on time and within budget.

The partnership between Link Malawi and DIAS is very strong, with DIAS being involved at every stage of project design and delivery.

“INSPIRE did not come from Link. It came from our relationship. We designed together. If we want to sustain ownership, we require continuing of the partnership between DIAS and Link, so when partners see partnership they shouldn’t hesitate to fund it.” Mr Agabu, Director DIAS

However, the constraints of the project budget meant that it was not possible to include a wide range of DIAS representatives to observe every activity. This created some frustration within the DIAS central team as they are keen to maintain a high level of ownership and maximize learning from the project.
It has also been challenging to involve the other MoEST directorates (Basic Education, Secondary Education, Planning, and Teacher Education) effectively in the project. They have had poor attendance at Steering Committee meetings designed to keep them up to date with project developments. However, there have been recent improvements. In January 2017 DIAS committed to ensure quarterly meetings of the Steering Committee are held at MoEST headquarters, where DIAS will provide an update on project progress and receive feedback. All directors attended or sent a representative to a field visit on 18th January to observe project activities and hold a Steering Committee meeting during which they discussed their observations and interactions with stakeholders, challenges facing the project and action points to address these, and coordination of similar and complementary projects. Link Malawi will actively engage Directors in relevant areas of the project e.g. the Director of Planning in the database training, the Director of Secondary Education in School Review in secondary schools in Mchinji.

Link continues to build the strong partnership with the District Education Office in Dedza, which has been in operation for 10 years, and includes co-location of Link and Ministry staff in the District Education Office. A new District Education Manager come into post in 2016 and the Link team in Dedza ensured that she was introduced to Link’s capacity-building approach and fully supports the involvement of district education staff in project activities. The DEM ensures that district staff and zone staff are present during the district project meetings, helps to deliver INSPIRE training, and has overseen the translation of the National Education Standards, the development of which was a former Link project funded by the Scottish Government, into Chichewa.

The INSPIRE project introduced Link’s work to Mchinji District and the Link team in Mchinji have established a close relationship with the District Education Office staff who participate actively in activities. The Mchinji District Council has provided Link with office space on District Council premises, which facilitates coordination with District Education Office staff. The Mchinji DEM expressed appreciation of the extent to which she has been involved in the project design and implementation, for example, suggesting that further training for the PEAs in data collection in order to improve the project delivery. The PEA for Boma zone agreed: “There has been excellent consultation throughout the project.”

The level of ownership of the project by stakeholders was raised as an issue which Link must consider for both the smooth running of the project and its sustainability. Donor-funded projects raise expectations of compensation for participation and in some cases expected compensation, rather than the project outcomes, is the motivation for stakeholders to participate. The Mchinji DEM advises that greater ownership would mitigate this. Interviews with headteachers and PEAs also suggest that greater ownership at school level needs to be established for the interventions to continue after the project’s end. One headteacher commented: “The project is highly dependent, if the donors stopped supporting it would stop. Communities would not continue to come forth”.

However, among district staff there is already evidence that the interventions are becoming embedded: “There’s room for sustainability of the project activities even without support from donor partners” – PEA.

Appropriate performance indicators and baseline measures in logframe and baseline survey

Recognising a gap in the baseline survey, the MTE beneficiary survey included questions about participants’ views and experiences of school improvement and school management both before and after the INSPIRE project interventions. This will be repeated at endline to measure the project impact.
CONTENT AND DELIVERY

The midline survey of 76 (head)teachers and 76 community members indicates that the content and delivery of the interventions is appropriate and effective. After the intervention, 90% of community members and 85% of (head)teachers strongly agree that they participate regularly in school management activities, compared to 31% and 44% before the intervention. 85% of community members and 86% of (head)teachers strongly agree that they can effectively influence school management following the intervention, compared to 21% and 23% before the intervention. While 83% of the control group strongly agree that they participate regularly in school management activities, only 66% strongly agree that they can effectively influence school management.

89% of (head)teachers and 85% of community members strongly agree that they have a good knowledge of school management after the intervention, whereas just 17% of both groups felt that way before the intervention, and 16% of control group members feel the same way.

The target groups to be reached at national, division, district, school and community levels are detailed in Outputs 1, 2 and 5 of the logframe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of effective and well attended (over 50% of members) Steering Committee (SC) meetings that support individual department Technical Working Groups (TWGs)</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress</td>
<td>Meeting agendas and minutes of Steering Committee and TWGs; gender disaggregated attendance registers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in section 3.1.2 above, engagement with stakeholders in the national-level Steering Committee is off-track, and steps are being taken to address this. However, it is not expected that the target of 8 meetings in Year 2 will be reached, and this will have a knock-on effect on the endline target.
### Output Indicator 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- Training attendance forms and evaluations

### Output Indicator 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 (32 PEAs and 4 District staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- Training attendance forms and evaluations

### Output Indicator 2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (1 DIAS Headquarters; 3 Central West Education Division; 12 Mchinji District)</td>
<td>50 (22 Dedza District, 28 Mchinji District)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- Training attendance forms and evaluations

Indicator 2.1 is off-track because of a change in plans for this component of the project. Reflection on the availability, effectiveness and value for money of different types of ICT equipment led to the decision to pilot the use of mobile devices instead of our solar connect system that used laptops. The decision-making process and need to develop software for the mobile devices has led to delays in ICT training, but this is expected to take place early in Year 3.

Indicator 2.2 is on track. 32 PEAs and 4 district staff in Mchinji and Dedza have been trained to use the Electronic School Report Card (ESRC) database and tools. The Mchinji DEM supports this, saying “All trainings were completed with high level of participation i.e. every PEA and or ACCO [Assistant Centre Coordinator] has been trained in this project.” The PEA for Boma zone support this, saying “Link Malawi took a vibrant approach which is very practical and easy to get - we are now experts in the use on Education Standards.” Training is planned for nine Division staff members before April 2017, to reach the target of 45 people trained.

Indicator 2.3 has been exceeded. This is as a result of the decision to involve Assistant Centre Coordinators (ACCOs) in delivering School Review due to the lack of availability of the PEAs. As PEAs are chronically overstretched, the training of ACCOs will improve the capacity of the Districts to deliver School Review and associated activities in future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of participants (disaggregated) who attend SPAM, zone conference and district conference</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5500 (50 per 110 schools) at SPAMs; 330 (3 per 110 schools) at zone conference; 78 (6 per 13 zones) at District Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10850 (50 per 217 schools) at SPAMs; 651 (3 per 117 schools) at zone conference; 156 (12 per 13 zones) at District Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress

Attendance data for SPAM, zone conference and district conference

The number of participants at school level (SPAMs or community meetings) and zone level are slightly below milestone targets because the selected zones contained 94 schools rather than 110 which was the estimate at the start of the project. Considered in the context of fewer schools, the targets for indicator 5.4 have been achieved. The district conferences will take place by the end of Year 2 and the target is expected to be met.

The high levels of participation of target groups are supported by the midline survey in which 96% of respondents said that they or a member of their community had participated in School Review; 85% in School Management Simulation Training; 94% in community meetings to discuss the School Report Card; and 94% in School Improvement Planning meeting.
However, from the perspective of PEAs and headteachers who were interviewed in greater depth, the low participation of the community in project activities is an ongoing challenge and may limit the effectiveness of the project.

Despite high levels of participation overall, Link became aware of the low participation of some marginalised groups, such as children and parents who have a disability, belong to a minority religion, speak a minority language, or are extremely poor. To improve knowledge of the National Education Standards, Link will translate them into the local language Chichewa as part of the INSPIRE project. In addition, Link has secured funding from the Open Society Foundation to conduct research into excluded individuals and groups, and to find ways to improve their participation in INSPIRE project activities.

DELIVERY CHALLENGES

The majority (86% of community members and 67% of (head) teachers) felt that there were no negative results from the project. The remainder identified “a little” negative impact. Examples concerned low participation, challenges with delivery of the intervention, and inability to follow up on the recommendations. Some respondents also mentioned negative issues with the school which were not a consequence of the project itself.

In a small number of cases there were some challenges with the delivery of the intervention by government officials, who are key project partners. Some (head) teachers reported that advisors acted in ways which were critical, blaming and discouraging, rather than in the supportive and co-operative manner intended by the School Review approach to school improvement.

“Some officials were shouting instead of advising” Teacher

“There were frightening comments/remarks from some officials” Teacher

“Officials undertaking these duties should be ready to reason and calmly resolve negative practices they come across” Teacher
“Some observations made by the advisory team during school review were incorrect, for example they indicated that teachers were not punctual yet we had arrived on time. Reviewers need to triangulate well the information they collect.” Teacher

The District Education Manager for Mchinji District noted that some Primary Education Advisors have had challenges with collecting and recording the right data. This indicates that PEAs would benefit from further support while they gain practical experience using the tools.

There is also a need to ensure that advisors continue to support schools to improve, and do not see the School Review as an end in itself.

“We were only told the area for improvement, but we are not fully supported on how to do this” Community Member

These challenges can be addressed by further training for advisors, both on the School Review process, and on the roles and responsibilities of advisors as specified in the DIAS Handbook, Advisory Guidelines and Manual. DIAS staff at national and district level have access to training packs which were developed by Link to facilitate this training.

Link Malawi noted that traditional leadership plays a strong role in determining the quality of school governance. For a district where traditional leadership is deeply entrenched, stable leadership translates into active committees and better community engagement. Conversely, when community leadership is weak, implementing improved school governance and performance can be challenging. Case Study 2 explores how School Review and the INSPIRE project can help to overcome this challenge.

SCALE

The project is currently focused on the target districts of Mchinji and Dedza. This provides a strong foundation in which to test the interventions and demonstrate their effectiveness to the Ministry of Education. To fully utilise the potential of the materials and training developed under INSPIRE, it is necessary to scale this up to every district in Malawi. According to Link’s model of working, this should be done by Ministry of Education staff who have been extensively involved in the INSPIRE project. There is strong political commitment for this to happen within DIAS and the wider MoEST, but the lack of available budget is a significant obstacle, particularly since budget support was significantly reduced by international donors following the “cashgate” corruption scandal.

Participants in the project note that there may be some challenges with scaling up the project. These mostly concerned the potential for low participation by community members, which is seen as a universal challenge, and lack of funding from the government to both the District Education Office and the schools themselves: “Funding constraints will mean no fuel for monitoring, to do School Reviews, photocopy of tools” PEA, Mkanda zone. However, the initiative by the Mchinji DEM to carry out School Review in non-project schools and the case study example below where community engagement significantly increased, demonstrates that with sufficient local political will and constructive feedback, these activities can be accomplished without additional external funding.

Review and Monitoring of Data & Arrangements

This section examines the following evaluation questions:

Progress Towards Targets
Are the targets being achieved?

Is monitoring information being accurately and effectively collected, analysed, disseminated and responded to?

INTRODUCTION

Progress against INSPIRE project indicators and targets is set out in a series of reports to the Scottish Government covering project Years 1 and 2, the most recent available at the time of writing being the mid-year report for Year 2 (2016-17).

PROGRESS AGAINST TARGETS

A summary of progress against logframe targets is appended (Appendix 5). Targets achieved or exceeded are highlighted in green and those below target are highlighted orange. For a number of indicators there was no milestone 1 (March 2016) because the relevant project activities were scheduled to take place later in the project. At the time of this evaluation, it is not expected that all milestone 2 indicators (March 2017) would be fully achieved. Of the nine milestones for which data was available at the MTE, three had been achieved or succeeded, and five were partially achieved with the expectation of being fully achieved by the target date.

MONITORING

Feedback from the Scottish Government noted that progress is being tracked effectively: “The Report illustrates progress in a clear manner, showing progress across Headlines and Outputs with an appropriate level of accompanying explanation. Gender is disaggregated throughout”.

The Scottish Government also suggested improvements to monitoring and reporting which will be integrated into future reporting:

“For a project that involves a substantial training component there could have been more information about the trainers themselves – for example their gender and general information about their suitability for the particular training programmes. It would also be helpful if the grant holder could include the specific milestones they are reporting against next to the progress report itself.”

DISSEMINATION

The baseline report and the draft MTE report were presented to the Mchinji District Council monitoring and evaluation committee and the INSPIRE Steering Committee, the Link Malawi and Link International boards, and the Link Programme Committee. The MTE will be shared with foundations and donor groups who have expressed an interest in understanding the impact of Link’s work in Malawi, including DFID Malawi, UNESCO, Dubai Cares, Mastercard Foundation, Open Society Foundation, and Hewlett.

Strategic Fit and Rationale

This section examines the following evaluation questions:
Strategic and Policy Context

Does the project still fit with the Link strategy and policy context? What is the need for the project in this context?

LINK STRATEGY

Link’s approach is to work within the Malawi education system to build capacity and meet national policy goals. The project is designed to meet the needs identified by MoEST through our key partner DIAS. All project activities and training have been designed and delivered in close partnership with DIAS, and this is confirmed in interviews with DIAS staff:

“With Link you are always working within MoEST. Your deliverables, vision and sustainability is within Ministry needs. Other NGOs present end report with recommendations for scaling up and then they leave. With INSPIRE scaling up is already within project. Capacity-building is already within system for inspectors and advisors. Community participation for supporting teaching and learning is enhanced. Tools and instruments are developed within MoEST to meet MoEST needs.”

Director DIAS

MALAWI GOVERNMENT POLICY

This project builds on Link’s partnership with the Malawi Government and is designed to work with MoEST to enhance the effectiveness of national programmes, including the National Education Sector Plan (NESP) 2008-2017, Primary School Improvement Programme and National Girls’ Education Strategy.

Two implementation plans were developed by the Government of Malawi to achieve the policy targets of the NESP. The more recent Education Sector Implementation Plan II (ESIP II) provides an updated roadmap for the objectives of the sector.

The ESIP II acknowledges that the system is not delivering the services as required and expected and underlines the fact that despite improvements in access, the biggest challenge for the country is an unacceptably low level of academic performance and learning (Global Partnership for Education, 2016).

This project addresses the internal efficiency of the primary and secondary education structure (section 3.1.3 ESIP II) through fully integrated planning and multi-stakeholder accountability with the aim of improving access to quality education, reducing repetition and drop-out rates and achieving higher learner performance (measured by Standard 4 literacy and numeracy levels, section 3.1.1 ESIP II).

MoEST aims to double Form 1 enrolment during ESIP II, and add an equal number across Forms 2-4 (a total of 320,000 additional secondary school places). MoEST recognises that increased enrolment must be accompanied by an improvement in quality including the application of 3.2.3 ESIP II which aims to improve school management of finances and teaching and learning materials.

This project supports the range of actors from community to central government level to fully engage in school management and support included in the National Strategy for Community Participation in Primary School Management and 3.1.4 of ESIP II.
This project will monitor the performance of ALL schools (primary, secondary and private) in Mchinji District, with the aim of supporting MoEST to meet its obligations to provide quality schooling to all children and to achieve inclusive education.

Project stakeholders at district level identified a number of ways in which the INSPIRE project interfaces with and supports other national and local projects, such as the USAID funded National Reading Programme (NRP): “INSPIRE activities are promoting the achievement of NRP goals” (DEM, Mchinji) and the DFID funded Keeping Girls in School (KGIS) programme: “KGIS is also working to keep girls in school so that they do better at the end of the day. You and they have the same outcomes.” - Parent

INSPIRE supports the implementation of the National Education Standards (NES) which are to be used by every school in the country. Primary Education Advisors reflected positively on their increased knowledge of the NES as a result of the project:

“[without INSPIRE] we couldn’t have known how to link the SIP [School Improvement Plan] with the NES” PEA

“It ties with other initiatives in many ways like school improvement planning process and implementation of plans which are based on NES” PEA

“The project relates well with the situation on the ground and helps to achieve the NES requirements” PEA

Link Malawi and DIAS are also working closely to ensure similar projects are aligned with and complementary to DIAS’ objectives and the INSPIRE project. For example, the ABLE project run by VSO also aims to support digital inspection data. Joint planning meetings between Link, VSO and DIAS ensure that the project activities are complementary and avoid duplication.

SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT POLICY

This project is consistent with and supports Scottish Government international development policy. This is achieved by building on previous work funded by the Scottish Government which positively influenced MoEST policy, and demonstrated a commitment to address the severe educational difficulties being encountered in Malawi.

It directly relates to International Development Fund (IDF) programme indicators 3.4 by supporting self-evaluation and inspection processes, and 3.7 by tracking accountability, evaluating decentralisation and supporting local management.

The project supports the Scottish Government’s International Development Strategy 2016 priority to “focus Scotland’s expertise to provide a distinctive development contribution, maximise impact, promote democratic values, and enable skills and capacity strengthening in-country” by drawing on Scottish expertise in school inspection & advisory services, IT and data management to build capacity in the Malawian Ministry of Education, Science and Technology.
The project is consistent with Strand 4.3 of the Scotland Malawi Cooperation Agreement (Scottish Government, 2005) which focuses on “Quality and schools inspection ... access and availability of quality education with particular reference to remote and rural communities”.

**SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS**

The potential strategic fit and contribution of the project to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), is high: i.e. SDG 4.1 “*By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes*” - UN, 2016.

**Progress Towards Overall Aims and Objectives**

This section examines the following evaluation questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress Towards Aims and Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project on track to achieve its overall aims and objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they still relevant considering the changing context and needs of beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A qualitative assessment of whether the project is on track to achieve the intended outcomes for beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A qualitative assessment of whether the project is on track to achieve the intended impacts for beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTRODUCTION**

Above (p.12) project progress against a number specific outputs was identified. This section considers progress towards the overall aims and objectives of the INSPIRE project and the wider benefits attributable to the project, including integrated planning, multi-stakeholder accountability and a consolidated district school monitoring and support system, as well as improvements to school and learner performance.

The section draws on a range of evidence from stakeholder consultation, as well as surveys of key groups including teachers, headteachers and community members.

**INTEGRATED PLANNING**

The Director of the Inspection and Advisory Services sees a clear link between the database of school performance (Schools Integrated Information System) and improved planning at national level: “*INSPIRE will develop a data collection and banking system to aid information for DIAS to analyse to make meaningful decisions to improve learning outcomes... DIAS will collect data, analyse, and produce reports to show what’s happening at school level, and to see how they need to improve.*” Director DIAS

At district level the Mchinji DEM is pleased that each stakeholder knows their roles, and that “*PEAs make reports of what they have observed [during School Review] and feed these to the DEM.*”

At school level, following the intervention, 85% of (head)teachers strongly agreed that their school has an effective improvement plan, compared to just 23% before the intervention. From the
perspective of community members, there was an even bigger increase from 21% strongly agreeing before the intervention to 88% afterwards. None of the control group strongly agreed that their school had an effective improvement plan: 83% somewhat agreed and 16% somewhat disagreed.

“[Teachers are] able to openly tell stakeholders the ways of improving the school” - Teacher

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER ACCOUNTABILITY

There is a strong sense from community members that parents are taking a more informed and active role in the school, including developing and implementing the School Improvement Plan; ensuring their children are prepared and attend school; holding committee positions and participating in meetings; and engaging with the teachers when they are not happy with the education being delivered. 75% of (head)teachers and 86% of community members strongly agreed that the local community is effectively involved in school management after the intervention, compared to 23% and 25% respectively before the intervention, and just 16% of the control group.
“[Parents are] taking part in development activities. For example, they came in large numbers when the heavy rains destroyed one of our blocks” Community member

“They are able to come with complaints when there is a need” Community member

“[parents are] taking part in decision making at school level and they feel that they are part of the school” Community member

“Communities have been empowered using SIG [School Improvement Grant] to maintain the school blocks” PEA

“INSPIRE provides a platform for everyone to participate in school improvement.” PEA

The roles and responsibilities of different school stakeholders have been clarified, so responsibility and accountability for school performance are more fairly distributed:

“[As a result of] better use of SIP [School Improvement Plan]....parents have been less burdened by the school” Community member

“They [teachers] know that they have the role to play in ensuring that learners perform well at school” Community member

“They [learners] are taking roles and responsibilities in school development” Teachers

“Advisory visits encourage good linkage between the school and the community because they highlight issues for each party to play. This reduces blame games.” Headteacher

Without the project, “the community could not have the knowledge of the performance of their school” PEA Ludzi zone.

“It showed us why working together to promote the school is necessary because we have our different roles” Parent
The Mchinji DEM anticipates that in future “communities [will be] managing their own schools efficiently and effectively”, although she believes there is still “inadequate coordination between schools and their communities.” This means continued support to fully embed the School Review process is necessary in conjunction with other interventions to mobilise community support such as a Social and Behaviour Change Campaign, radio shows, text reminders and poster campaigns may prove useful.

CONSOLIDATED SYSTEMS OF SCHOOL MONITORING AND SUPPORT

The structured systems of School Review, Community Meetings and School Improvement Planning have provided opportunities for school staff to make improvements in school management and education quality based on evidence of the school’s strengths and weaknesses.

“We are involved in management roles at this school because of the School Review” Teacher

“Teachers have gained confidence by using the National Education Standards” Teacher

“Punctuality is good now because the school has a Time Book” Teacher

Two of the case study schools noted that the structured and impartial nature of School Review empowered community stakeholders to deliver more effectively on their roles within the school, and enabled them to overcome divisions within the community which had previously been an obstacle to school improvement.

Both community members and (head)teachers noted that teachers were better able to deliver quality education as a result of knowledge of the National Education Standards and feedback from advisors during School Review, which is regarded as welcome continuous professional development. All teachers referred to improvements in their own knowledge, skills and teaching practice.

 “[we] acquired knowledge on effective teaching and learning” Teacher

“Teaching standards have improved” Teacher

“Teachers have realized their weakness in handling of lessons” Community member

“[Teachers] are using teaching and learning materials during lessons effectively” Community member

“Teachers have gained knowledge and skills because they were highlighted on Standards and their requirements” Community member

“Teachers have now full knowledge on how to teach with respect to the National Education Standards requirements” Teacher

“[We are] teaching with good knowledge because of the National Education Standard requirements” Teacher

Link Malawi staff noted that training Inspectors and Advisors to enter data into the SIIS database at national and district levels enhanced their understanding of the importance of gathering accurate and complete data during the School Review process. Where data was lacking, they encountered problems with filling in the database and producing a School Report Card.
It is noted that schools and advisors frequently chose to develop action plans to address the recommendations from School Review. While these are separate to School Improvement Plans (SIPs) which are part of the existing School Improvement Cycle, the action plans feed in to the SIPs. The processes for following up on School Review should be closely monitored to ensure that they build capacity within the existing system, rather than creating a parallel system which is likely to have less influence on systemic change, with implications for sustainability. Link Malawi will utilise the close relationships with District and National staff to emphasise this and adopt a ‘working model’ approach so that stakeholders can provide feedback to modify existing systems and tools, instead of developing separate ones.

Outcomes

The intended outcome of the INSPIRE project is that schools in Mchinji deliver high quality, relevant education to all learners.

Community members and (head)teachers identified an improvement in the education provision at their schools:

“Learners are receiving quality education” Teacher

“Parents are happy that learners are getting good education” Community member

“their [parents’] dreams of children passing with good grades is being achieved” Community member

Benefits which contributed to better quality education included: child-friendly environment (especially to address girls’ needs) and positive disciplinary measures; more effective, motivated and committed teachers; improved learner attendance, punctuality and motivation to learn; and better relationships between teachers, learners and parents.

“Learners appear more eager to learn” Community member

“[there is] unity amongst teachers and learners” Teacher

“Learners are receiving good support from the teachers who were previously busy with drinking beer” Community member

“Teachers are now spending their time in class. Before they were spending some time just sitting outside” Community member

“Learners are ably asking questions freely because teachers are spending time in class with the learners” Community member

“Parents have the trust and courage of sending children to school because of the teachers who are hardworking” Community member

“[Teachers] are preparing for their lessons because they are afraid of what happened last time when the PEAs came to visit them surprisingly” Community member

There is a “higher quality of education because of good relationship between the school and the community” Headteacher
A number of schools are also showing progress towards addressing the specific needs of different groups, such as girls and students with disabilities, so the education they provide benefits all learners:

“Learners are treated equally regardless of their gender or physical challenges” Teacher

“We now have systems to deal with learners’ welfare. For example a girl learner who was impregnated has come back to school after delivery” Teacher

“Adolescent girls have a washing room now” Teacher

“They who dropped out due to pregnancies have joined again because of the mother group which was awakened by the School Review” Community member

In addition, both (head)teachers and community members see a significant improvement in the quality of school management as a result of the intervention, with 85% of community members and 76% of (head)teachers strongly agreeing that the quality of school management is good, compared to 14% and 18% before the intervention, and 16% of the control group.

**Impacts**

The intended impact is that there will be improved learner outcomes in Mchinji district.

All community members and 95% of teachers felt that learners had benefitted from the project in the last year. Improved academic performance was noted by a large number of teachers and parents:

“If we check in learners’ exercise books, they are showing improvement” Community member

“The pass rate has improved this year is as a result of the review which helped teachers to prepare well” Community member

“A good number of children were selected to national secondary schools” Teacher
“Many learners are being promoted to higher classes” Teacher

“Parents are now happy to send their children to school because of good performance in Standard 8 exams” Teacher

The Mchinji DEM believes that there will be improvements in learners’ performance, their ability to read and write, and the pass rate of the PSLCE. This view is supported by the PEA for Boma zone and two headteachers. “I can see an improvement in school enrolment, retention, learner achievement, good and quality school management by all stakeholders and administration” - PEA.

The qualitative evidence suggests that there will be an improvement in learner outcomes as measured by exam results at the endline evaluation.

Relevance

Following extensive research into the latest technology development and advice from experienced practitioners in the field, the Link team decided in Year 2 to modify one of the project activities. It was decided to purchase tablet devices and develop an app to facilitate the collection of school performance data, rather than to provide laptops and solar power as per the original proposal. This has delayed implementation of this activity, but significantly improved the relevance and sustainability of the equipment and skills which are being developed.

The training provided to date has been considered relevant and useful to beneficiaries. The PEA for Boma zone commented “The trainings were very appropriate and the quality of facilitation was very good. We acquired skills and knowledge that other PEAs and ACCOs in some districts do not have.”

Strong appreciation of the project impact to date, and demands for repeated School Reviews and the inclusion of more stakeholders in the process suggests that the intervention remains relevant to community members’ and (head)teachers’ needs.

“The project should continue owing to its outcomes” Community member

“School Review should be done regularly so as to encourage stakeholders” Teacher

“More members should be taken for trainings of this type for effective school management” Teacher

“Monitoring of activities at school encourages us” Teacher

“This should be done regularly to strengthen cooperation between teachers and the community” Teacher

“Visits should continue because teachers are now working hard in class” Community member

Community members and (head)teachers anticipate that the benefits will continue to be felt throughout the next year of the project.

“Teaching and learning will improve and the school shall have better results” Teacher
“The pass rate shall improve with more learners being selected to secondary schools” Community member

“The school will meet the National Education Standards” Community member

“Parents will continue working together with teachers to make sure that learning is taking place” Community member

The DEM in Mchinji was so impressed with the performance data produced through School Review that she initiated the process in schools which were not yet participating in the project. That this was done solely at the initiative of the DEM and without financial support from Link or other sources indicates that there is a high level of appreciation for the School Review process.

In contrast, 100% of the control group stated that they found holding school improvement planning meetings slightly, moderately or very challenging, demonstrating a clear need for support within the district. Control group participants identified low levels of community engagement in schools, lack of interest in education from parents and children, and a lack of trust in the School Improvement Planning and School Improvement Grant processes. Control group participants suggested that school improvement planning could be improved if schools “involve parents and the entire community in identifying problems affecting the school and solutions to the problems” and if communities, though the school governing bodies, have increased awareness of “the importance of education, and how to actively participate in school management activities”.

The School Management Simulation Training (SMST) was identified as having had a significant impact on stakeholders’ knowledge and skills, with all teachers and community members seeing it as important or very important in enabling them to support school improvement. The DEM also asked to have the SMST repeated so that advisors and District Education Office staff could gain a greater understanding of its lessons. Further detail on the impact of the SMST is available in a separate evaluation report.

Case Study Summaries

Case Study 1

BACKGROUND

The first school is located in the north of Mchinji District, 46km from the boma (main town). This government primary school was established in 1979 to serve a community of 42 villages. Current enrolment is 1,095 comprising 466 boys and 531 girls. The school has nine teachers (including the headteacher) and eight classrooms, with several classes being conducted in the open. It has a history of poor PSLCE results and there was poor engagement with the community, evidenced in their failure to provide adequate sanitation for learners, poor punctuality and attendance of learners.

SCHOOL REVIEW AND ADVISORY SUPPORT

In May 2016 the PEA for the zone and two colleagues carried out a School Review to assess the school’s performance against six of the National Education Standards (NES). The school met minimum standards for only one of the NES, placing it in the largest performance category in the
district where 29 out of 76 schools achieved the same result, but ahead of the 15 schools which failed to meet minimum standards on all six NES.

Prior to School Review, the school had received advisory visits by the PEA, one in March and the other in May. Before School Review, the community was not engaged by the PEA during these visits. Where an agreed action touched on community roles, it was expected that the headteacher would engage the parents for that purpose. The School Review involved direct interaction between the PEA and community members, and was therefore the most clearly structured and focused interaction that the school has had with the advisory services. According to one parent, “there hasn’t been such an engaging meeting as long as I can remember”.

Following School Review, the school management team and the community conducted a planning meeting to strategize on a way forward in view of the findings of the School Review and came up with a number of initiatives. In October the PEA visited again to advise the school on the implementation of its plan of action to address the shortcomings identified during School Review. Six months after School Review took place, Link Malawi staff observed that several initiatives from the action plan were well underway.

CHANGE AND ATTRIBUTION

**Learner Safety**

Parents observed that following the School Review the safety of learners was being given better attention than before. At the community meeting parents had agreed that learners must be strictly advised and arranged to move in groups to and from school. Parents were also requested to monitor and report children who abscond from classes by loitering in the village in between home and school. Arrangements are that parents must note down their names and report them to a Mother Group representative and to the child’s parent. In addition, the school has made modalities for introducing boarding facilities within the village for learners who commute over long distances. Parents agreed that the initiatives have started to pay off and have contributed to the lowering of pregnancies and drop-outs due to early marriage amongst girls. Over the current school year no pregnancy and no drop-out due to marriage has been registered. This compares to one pregnancy and one marriage-related drop-out last school year (2014/15) and 8 pregnancies in the previous year (2013/14). Both parents and the headteacher attributed the success to the initiatives that were made at the community meeting following the School Review. However, it is noted that the significant reduction in drop-outs connected to pregnancy and early marriage occurred before School Review took place, and the continuing low rate this year may not be a direct result of School Review alone.

**Assessment**

Parents and the headteacher agreed that assessment was one major area in which the school had greatly benefitted from the School Review. A PTA member testifies that she was able to “notice a difference in the frequency of tests and exercises”. In clarifying the change the headteacher explained that the school had introduced fresh measures for administering learner assessments. Teachers were assessing learners weekly, fortnightly or monthly, as appropriate to the size of the class, and displaying the results on the school board. However, an unintended negative consequence of this was that learners who performed poorly disliked having their performance made public and tore down the assessment results once they were displayed on the school board. In addition, the
school had started conducting quizzes and debates on a fortnightly basis. These they said also help to gauge the extent to which learners have grasped a particular topic.

**Learner attendance and punctuality**

When the school underwent School Review it was observed that learners did not attend school regularly and did not observe punctuality. This contributed to the school’s failure to meet minimum standards for NES 5 ‘Students’ Behaviour and Involvement in School Life’. Both parents and staff testified that this was another area in which noticeable improvement was being felt. Parents indicated that due to the monitoring mechanisms they had put in place fewer learners were to be found loitering in the village in between school and home unlike before. In addition, fewer learners were absent due to the emphasis that parents must not assign too much work to children in the morning. In his estimate the headteacher indicated that out of the enrolment of around “1,000 at least 900 learners turn up every day on average unlike an average of 700 before the School Review.”

On their part learners admitted that there was less motivation to attend school regularly before the School Review because “you did not lose much anyway because teachers were not teaching that much... at times we only had 3 lessons the whole day.” They observed that when they miss a day this time around it translated into plenty of work to catch up on so everyone is keen to attend school regularly.

Similarly positive sentiments were made about punctuality by the learners. They indicated that ever since parents agreed not to give too much work to children in the morning they are able to start off for school early. They also felt that expectations on them are clearer. Before the School Review the school only said learners are to come in the morning, but now there are rules which stipulate that they must arrive between 6.30 and 7.00am.

In pointing out what has changed staff, parents and learners consistently referred to the School Review and the community meeting that took place soon after. All of the areas where change has been noted directly relate to a performance area under one of the six NES which was assessed during the School Review.

**Case Study 2**

**BACKGROUND**

The second school is a rural school located 7km after Kamwendo Trading Centre along the Kamwendo – Mchinji road. It is an old school originally founded by the Catholic Church in 1936 using a makeshift grass and pole structure in the initial years. The school’s catchment area comprises a mixture of business persons operating at the local Trading Centre and the local community. The enrolment was 1,258 learners of whom 654 were boys and 604 were girls. Over the school year, this dropped slightly and this is attributed to food insecurity in the area. There were 12 teachers including the headteacher against that enrolment, effectively giving a ratio of 1 teacher to almost 100 learners. There is very poor community engagement with the school as a result of protracted chieftaincy wrangles. The catchment area is a battle ground for rival claimants to the position of Group Village Headman. The rivalry makes it difficult for any of the chiefs to champion development work because their subjects are afraid to openly associate with one claimant or the other. This has created a largely indifferent community.

**SCHOOL REVIEW AND ADVISORY SUPPORT**
School Review took place in May 2016. The school did not meet minimum standards in any of the six NES which were used during the Review. This puts the school in the lowest-performing category along with 15 other schools in the district.

Prior to School Review, the PEA conducted support visits once per term, most recently in February and March. These were much less structured and documented in comparison to School Review. Indeed the only evident sign remaining about the visits are the PEA’s entry in the visitor’s book. The headteacher has no clear recollection about any way forward from those past visits, although he could clearly remember that similar shortcomings were noted on both visits.

Soon after School Review the school had called a community meeting to plan the way ahead. The initial meeting did not attract many parents as had been the case on so many other occasions. Only some members of the SMC and PTA and several village chiefs turned up. At the suggestion of the PEA, this team took it upon themselves to approach the Group Village Headmen and present the findings of the School Review as well as the recommendation that parents must take a more active role. A subsequent community meeting was called with the full involvement of the chiefs. The meeting attracted 88 women, 47 men, 62 boys and 45 girls. This group discussed the key issues in the School Review Feedback Report and made plans to address the recommendations. The PEA undertook six follow-up visits between June and September to support the school to develop an action plan and to check on implementation of the plan. By November 2016 all 11 recommendations had been achieved or partially achieved, and the community had organised themselves to make additional improvements.

CHANGE AND ATTRIBUTION

Improvement Planning

The headteacher singled out the structured nature of the INSPIRE School Review exercise as being the source of the biggest benefit. This is owing to the fact that a detailed Feedback Report was provided and the school was able to focus on its shortfalls.

Documentation

The second benefit that the headteacher was able to relate to the project was documentation. At the time of School Review the school did not have several key documents and this was pointed out as a significant weakness by the headteacher himself. According to both the headteacher and the parent leader, the school has made improvements in keeping better records because of the School Review exercise. The headteacher indicates that it was difficult for him to exhaust the list of required documentation for his office because “that was only communicated by word of mouth from the EMIS people but we did not have a clear listing of what to keep.” During the School Review exercise it became clear to the school which documents were essential for a school administration to function properly.

Community engagement

The most significant benefit from the school’s participation in the INSPIRE project relates to the issue of community participation. According to both the parents and the headteacher, the school has had difficulty in benefiting from good community participation due to chieftaincy wrangles. Parents felt that the community meeting which took place after School Review had been a useful way of mobilizing them to rally around the school without becoming involved in the chieftaincy dispute.
They also felt that the attendance of a desk officer from the District Education Office at the community meeting had signalled to chiefs that the issues at the school were a very serious matter, and encouraged them to support the community to improve the school, instead of using it as a bargaining chip in the power dispute.

Sanitation

Lack of clean, safe toilets and very poor sanitation had been noted as a serious failure during School Review. This was already a known issue at the school - in 2015 the school had been censured by the Ministry of Health and threatened with closure due to poor sanitation – however, no action had been taken to address it. Following School Review and the Community Meeting, five additional toilets were constructed in the space of three months at the initiative of the community members.

Case Study 3

BACKGROUND

The third school, located 10km from Mchinji boma along the Mkanda road, is unique as it has a slightly different background from the average primary school in Mchinji. The school was initially founded as a home for homeless or orphaned children in 2002 at the height of the HIV & AIDS pandemic which caused widespread orphan-hood in Malawi. Primary and secondary education services were then added on to complete the package of child care. A number of individual and corporate donors have at one point or another contributed to the establishment. They include World Vision, the European Union, the Rotarians, Save the Children and the Salvation Army.

In 2014 government formally adopted the institution and began to deploy qualified teachers. This was done to make sure the children in the home are getting a quality education and also to support the institution to open its doors to children from the surrounding community. The process of regularization also saw the constitution of a School Management Committee (SMC) and a Parent - Teacher Association (PTA) in 2015. Unlike other regular schools, the SMC operates alongside another management body, i.e. the trusteeship of the founding church leaders chaired by the resident cleric.

SCHOOL REVIEW AND ADVISORY SUPPORT

The school participated in School Review in June 2016, and was the only school in the district to meet the minimum standards in all six NES which were used. It was also the only one which satisfied the minimum standards for NES 12 ‘Accurate and Constructive Use of Assessment’ in the zone and was one of only four who did so in the whole district.

Prior to School Review the school was visited only once by the Primary Education Adviser. This was in 2014, soon after the school was enlisted for government support.

The school had embarked on a number of initiatives to improve performance starting in 2014 when it was enlisted as a government grant-aided school. In the previous two years the school formulated school rules and regulations, but also founded two critical learner clubs to engender better leaner behaviour and enhance participation in school life. The clubs were a Mental Health Club and a Guidance and Counselling Club. The practices certainly contributed to the school’s performance in NES 5 ‘Students’ Behaviour and Involvement in School Life’. Only nine schools achieved the minimum standard for this NES. School Review enables PEA’s and the DEM to identify good practice
which leads to the achievement of minimum standards and encourage this to be shared between schools to facilitate peer learning around effective school improvement.

CHANGE AND ATTRIBUTION

A structured process for school improvement

Teachers felt that they had gained momentum from participating in the INSPIRE project and this reinforced the school improvement initiatives they had introduced in 2014. Through the School Review the teachers say that they understood in detail how the NES requirements turn out to be the same behaviours that they had been trying to engender amongst learners. The main benefit was that the NES stipulate these behaviours and outline them clearly from level to level. The teachers therefore felt that their efforts have become more streamlined because they have a kind of manual as well as yardstick against which to measure their work through the NES requirements. The teachers’ reflection on their own practice against the NES suggests that this school would be a good candidate to pilot a process of self-evaluation against the NES which DIAS intends to introduce in 2017.

The headteacher and teachers also noted since the School Review that they were more successful in convincing the church leadership of the need to enforce school rules rather than hope that prayer and biblical instruction would bring about a conducive environment for learning.

Shared responsibility and community engagement

School Management Committee members indicate that discussion with the PEAs during the School Review opened up their eyes to issues that they had never thought they were responsible for. Six months after School Review, the SMC was implementing a programme for ongoing school supervision, having learnt through the School Review that this too was their responsibility. In the first term alone the school had been supervised 3 times by SMC members. The visits include checking on the library to ensure that resources are being cared for. They also monitor classes and chat with the staff to hear them out on how they can further help. The fact that the trustees of the institution were initially sceptical and resistant about letting the community in on managing the school makes this change quite poignant.

According to parent leaders the School Management Simulation Training provided through INSPIRE has been a key game changer in helping them understand their roles. They indicate that they started to appreciate that they and not the clerical establishment have greater responsibility for ensuring that the quality of education meets or exceeds minimum requirements in the National Education Standards. The simulation training also addressed the issue of adequate consultation when undertaking decisions. This is an area in which parents had already noted they had a weakness because their headteacher tended “to make too many unilateral decisions.”

The committee members indicated that although they received orientation on their roles soon after being constituted in 2015, and some members participated training sessions run by the government and NGOs, the simulation training under INSPIRE was the only training that directly addressed “what is happening on a daily basis in our work” and helped them “to find their place” in the managing of the school.
Specific Areas of Focus During the MTE

Ensure Monitoring Arrangements Will Facilitate Later Evaluation

The INSPIRE baseline was focused on the logframe indicators and did not capture data about beneficiaries’ behaviour and perceptions which can be used to assess the wider aims of the project. The evaluation therefore asked beneficiaries to reflect on their experiences and knowledge both before and after the intervention. This made it possible to assess whether the intervention had brought about change at the midline point, and will enable a comparison between baseline, midline and endline.

Evaluation of School Management Simulation Training (SMST) Intervention

Data was gathered for baseline and midline points of the project by asking beneficiaries to reflect on their experiences and knowledge both before and after the intervention. A separate evaluation report of the SMST has been produced.

Conclusions, Lessons and Recommendations

Conclusions

PROGRESS TOWARDS TARGETS AND INDICATORS

In terms of progress toward targets and indicators, the INSPIRE project has met or is on track to meet eight out of nine logframe milestones (target March 2017) for which data is available at the mid-point of the project. The one indicator which is off-track (see p.15) relates to a change in the delivery approach, which has been agreed with both the donor and key partners, and the target date for achievement has been moved to Year 3.

The additionality of key output indicators (training on the electronic school report card, schools integrated information systems database, and school improvement toolkit; and participation in school improvement meetings) is high and these benefits are unlikely to have been achieved without Link intervention.

Wider benefits to other stakeholders, including school staff, communities and learners, are evident despite the early stage of implementation and the long-term nature of behaviour change.

MANAGEMENT CONTENT & DELIVERY

The management, content and delivery of the INSPIRE project has been effective, reflecting a flexible and responsive approach with stakeholders. A number of caveats are noted. However, these have not affected the overall project performance in terms of targets achieved.

Of particular significance, is the effective approach to partnership working, including a high level of consultation with key stakeholders at national and district levels, which has helped to match the project to the needs of stakeholders and led to the development of a targeted and innovative approach to the standards and advisory process which does not duplicate other efforts.
Over a period of 18 months Link has built a strong working relationship with the District Education Manager (DEM) and her team in Mchinji, leading to a high level of participation of government staff in project delivery. The DEM took the initiative to deliver some project activities in non-project schools within the District without additional financial support, demonstrating her strong approval of the intervention, as well as a high level of ownership of the activities. It is noted that a greater sense of ownership of project activities needs to be built at the community and school levels in order to fully embed the benefits, but there is a good level of local support and ownership at this stage of the project.

**PROGRESS TOWARD OVERALL AIMS & OBJECTIVES**

The findings suggest that significant progress has been made in the establishment of an **integrated system of school planning** from school to district and national levels. For example, at school level, following the intervention, 85% of (head)teachers strongly agreed that their school has an effective improvement plan, compared to just 23% before the intervention.

**Multi-stakeholder accountability** is built in at each level of the process. There is a strong sense from community members that parents are taking a more informed and active role in the school. 75% of (head)teachers and 86% of community members strongly agreed that the local community is effectively involved in school management after the intervention, compared to 23% and 25% respectively before the intervention, and just 16% of the control group.

There is evidence that a **consolidated system of monitoring and support** for schools has been established. Both (head)teachers and community members see a significant improvement in the quality of school management as a result of the intervention, with 85% of community members and 76% of (head)teachers strongly agreeing that the quality of school management is good, compared to 14% and 18% before the intervention, and 16% of the control group.

There is also evidence for a range of significant **wider benefits** being experienced by participant schools as a result of the application of standards and the enhanced advisory support (including governance, teaching practice, community engagement and learner performance). This is very encouraging result given the relatively early phase in implementation of the INSPIRE model. These benefits remain to be confirmed in the official education statistics, but there was consistent support for the view across a range of stakeholders within Mchinji. All community members and 95% of teachers felt that learners had benefitted from the project in the last year. Improved academic performance was noted by a large number of teachers and parents. Although non-participant schools were not included in the Mid-Term Evaluation, it is likely that they also experienced some benefits as the DEM took the initiative to deliver some project activities across all schools in the district.

The additionality of these wider benefits is less easily assessed. However, feedback with DIAS officials, inspectors, and Primary Education Advisers suggests that additionality is also high in this regard.

**Lessons and Recommendations**

**PROGRESS TOWARD TARGETS AND INDICATORS**

It is recommended that Link reflects on the achievement of target indicators at the end of Year 2 (March 2017) in order to assess whether activities remain on track or if further adjustment is necessary to implementation and/or timelines.
A number of lessons identified from the assessment of management, content and delivery include:

- The value of making use of existing networks and relationships to secure support for project development and delivery;
- The importance of meaningful partnership working in fostering strategic, targeted, effective and sustainable solutions;
- The impact of stakeholders’ ownership of project activities on successful and sustainable delivery;
- The ability to deliver project activities within the resource constrained circumstances in which DEM offices are operating, without making special provisions for the pilot district, so that sustainability is highly likely and scaling is realistic.

It is recommended that Link continues working to transfer ownership of project activities to stakeholders and beneficiaries in order to secure full commitment to project activities and to sustaining these beyond the life of the project itself. In particular, Link should work with the INSPIRE Steering Committee to ensure they emphasise that the engagement of government officers at district and national level is expected because this is a government project, rather than an external NGO project, and to coordinate the activities of various projects within the Ministry of Education so that synchronised work plans are agreed and adhered to.

**PROGRESS TOWARD OVERALL AIMS & OBJECTIVES**

It is recommended that Link and MoEST reflect on how the development of action plans following School Review feeds into and supports the existing School Improvement cycle and School Improvement Planning in particular.

The need for further investment in training and resources to ensure successful and sustained national rollout of the INSPIRE model highlights an opportunity for NGOs and donor partners to continue to support the Government of Malawi in this policy area, in order to ensure the gains from the INSPIRE project, and the momentum behind the process, is not lost.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: INSPIRE Project Theory of Change
## Appendix 2: MTE Method and Associated Research Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Target Research Group/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Face-to-face, in-depth, semi-structured interviews | - Senior MoEST/DIAS representatives at national and regional level;  
- PEAS/District Education Manager trained in School Review Toolkit (Various levels) (total 3 PEAs + DEM in Mchinji). |
| 2. Interviewer-led Surveys with small groups and individuals | - Simulation Tool Training Participants (c20 groups of 4), consisting of:  
  o Headteachers;  
  o Teachers;  
  o School Management Committee members;  
  o Parent Teacher Association members;  
- Other Participating School Stakeholders (c20-40 Dedza & c90 Mchinji schools at MTE point), consisting of:  
  o Teachers;  
  o School Management Committee members; and  
  o Parent Teacher Association members. |
| 3. Case Studies | Selected participating schools – 3 in total |
| 4. Control Group | Selected non-participating schools – 3 in Mchinji |
Appendix 3: Interview Topic Guide

Key Informant Topic Guide

Introduction: About the Project, Purpose of the Interview, Assurance of Anonymity
Adapt Questions as Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/s:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main contact Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Key Informant Role and Involvement

1.1 Can you tell me briefly about your role and responsibilities?

1.2 What do you see as the main aims of the Inspire project?

1.3 Please outline the main ways you have been involved in the Inspire project?

2. Project Roll-out

2.1 What have been the major challenges faced in delivery the project? How were these challenges overcome?

2.2 What do you think the main challenges will be in rolling out the programme across the country and what will the likely timescales be?

2.3 Is there anything to suggest the experience in the two pilot districts will be different from other districts across the country (nature of challenges)?

2.4 (IF RELEVANT) How will you ensure that the project is rolled out nationally and that the standards of the project are maintained, developed, and results monitored?

3. Partners

3.1 Who have been the most important partners in ensuring progress in delivering the project (national, district, school and community level)?

3.2 To what extent have you been consulted/involved in the development and delivery of the project? Examples?

3.3 Thinking about where you have had most success with partners, what are the reasons for this? (e.g. established relationship, trust).

3.4 Where you face challenges with partners, what are the problems? Are there other partners who could contribute more?
3.5 Does the project tie-in with other initiatives? In what way? Benefits of this?

4. Benefits

4.1 What do you think have been the main benefits so far of the project for each of the main stakeholder groups i.e. Schools; Learners; Communities? Examples?

4.2 What benefits do you expect to see in the future? Are there foreseeable issues that might affect achievement of these longer term or wider benefits?

5. Management Challenges

5.1 What aspects of project delivery have proved particularly effective- what has worked well?

5.2 What were the main management and delivery challenges? What was done to overcome them? (e.g. School capacity, stakeholder participation?)

5.3 Can improvements be made in the management of the project? What lessons can be learned? What could you, or other partners, do differently?

5.4 (IF RELEVANT) What advice or support have you had to meet the requirements of the project? Can you provide examples?

5.5 Have there been any significant barriers to effective development and uptake of / participation in School Review, School Report Cards, Community Meetings, and the School Management Simulation Training Tool (national, DIAS, District, School, Community level)?

6. The ‘Big Picture’, Unintended Effects and Sustainability

6.1 What would be different if the current project approach hadn’t existed (Time, Quality, Scale)? How would your job differ?

6.2 Have there been any unintended / unanticipated /negative outcomes that you have observed?

6.3 What do you think are the 3 main benefits that the current project has achieved? Do you think these benefits will persist?

6.4 Do you have any final comments you would like to make?

Thank you and close
Appendix 4: Questionnaires

INSPIRE MTE Questionnaire – Participating Schools

Q1 (INSTRUCTION ONLY) I would be very grateful for your participation in a short survey to provide feedback on your recent experience of working to review and improve your school. The survey focuses on schools that have participated in the INSPIRE project for school improvement and forms part of a wider evaluation aimed at providing Link Malawi and Link International with information to further develop their support for schools like yours. Your views are important to help us understand how effective Link has been. Participation in the survey is voluntary and findings from the survey will not be attributed to individuals. For further information on any aspect of this research, you can contact the Link Office using the following details (PROVIDE CONTACT DETAILS). In the interview we refer to the ‘School Review Cycle’. By this we mean the following activities: School Reviews; the development of School Feedback Reports and School Report Cards; School Management Simulation Training; Community Meetings to Discuss the School Report Cards; and School Improvement Planning. Together we refer to all of these activities as the ‘School Review Cycle’. We also ask some questions at the end of the survey specifically about the School Management Simulation Training. Do you have any questions / are you happy to begin…? CONFIRM UNDERSTANDING AND ASK FOR ANY FURTHER CLARIFICATION REQUIRED AS NECESSARY.

Q2 What is your position at this school…? TICK ALL THAT APPLY
- Headteacher (1)
- Teacher (2)
- Member of School Management Committee (3)
- Member of Parent Teacher Association (4)
- Other (please specify) (5) ____________________

Q3 Have you, or any other members of your school community, participated in any of the following ‘School Review Cycle’ activities…? TICK ALL THAT APPLY
- School Review (1)
- Developing School Report Cards (6)
- School Management Simulation Training (2)
- Community Meeting to Discuss to School Report Card (3)
- Viewing / Reading a School Report Card (not at a community meeting) (4)
- School Improvement Planning Meeting (5)

Q4 Thinking about before your school participated in the ‘School Review Cycle’, to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "I participated regularly in school management activities". Would you say that you… READ OUT OPTIONS
- Strongly agree (34)
- Somewhat agree (35)
- Neither agree nor disagree (36)
- Somewhat disagree (37)
- Strongly disagree (38)
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Q5 Thinking about after your school participated in the 'School Review Cycle', to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "I participate regularly in school management activities". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS
- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q6 Thinking about before your school participated in the 'School Review Cycle', to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "I could effectively influence school management activities". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS
- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q7 Thinking about after your school participated in the 'School Review Cycle', to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "I can effectively influence school management activities". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS
- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q8 Thinking about before your school participated in the 'School Review Cycle', to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "The quality of school management was good". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS
- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q9 Thinking about after your school participated in the 'School Review Cycle', to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "The quality of school management is good". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS
- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)
Q10 Thinking about before your school participated in the 'School Review Cycle', to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "The local community was effectively involved in school management". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS
- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q11 Thinking about after your school participated in the 'School Review Cycle', to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "The local community is effectively involved in school management". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS
- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q12 Thinking about before your school participated in the 'School Review Cycle', to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "I had a good knowledge of school management activities". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS
- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q13 Thinking about after your school participated in the 'School Review Cycle', to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "I have a good knowledge of school management activities". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS
- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q14 Thinking about before your school participated in the 'School Review Cycle', to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "This school had an effective improvement plan". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS
- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)
Q15 Thinking about after your school participated in the 'School Review Cycle', to what extent do you agree with the following statement: "This school has an effective improvement plan". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS

- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q16 How much have the following groups benefited from the School Review Cycle in the last year...? READ OUT ANSWER OPTIONS FOR EACH GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>A little (5)</th>
<th>None at all (6)</th>
<th>Don’t know (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Management Committees (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community Groups or Individuals (please specify) (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify) (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17 What are the top 3 benefits for Teachers in the last year, as a result of the School Review Cycle...? WRITE ANSWERS

- Benefit 1 (1)
- Benefit 2 (2)
- Benefit 3 (3)

Q18 What are the top 3 benefits for Learners in the last year, as a result of the School Review Cycle...? WRITE ANSWERS

- Benefit 1 (1)
- Benefit 2 (2)
- Benefit 3 (3)
Q19 What are the top 3 benefits for Parents in the last year, as a result of the School Review Cycle...? WRITE ANSWERS

   Benefit 1 (1)
   Benefit 2 (2)
   Benefit 3 (3)

Q20 How much will the following groups benefit as a result of the School Review Cycle, in the next 1-3 years...? READ OUT ANSWER OPTIONS FOR EACH GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>A little (5)</th>
<th>None at all (6)</th>
<th>Don’t know (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management Committees (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Teachers (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community Groups or Individuals (please specify) (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify) (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q21 What are the top 3 benefits you expect to see in the next 1-3 years within the school...? WRITE ANSWERS

   Benefit 1 (1)
   Benefit 2 (2)
   Benefit 3 (3)

Q22 Have there been any negative outcomes from the School Review Cycle...? READ ANSWER OPTIONS

   ○ A lot (4)
   ○ A little (5)
   ○ None at all (6)
   ○ Don’t know (7)
Display This Question:
If Have there been any negative outcomes from the School Review Cycle...? READ ANSWER
OPTIONS A lot Is Selected
Or Have there been any negative outcomes from the School Review Cycle...? READ ANSWER
OPTIONS A little Is Selected

Q23 What are the negative outcomes that you have observed, from the School Review Cycle...? WRITE ANSWER

Q24 Do you have any suggestions for improvements in the School Review Cycle...? WRITE ANSWER

Q25 (INSTRUCTION ONLY) READ: "The next few questions are about the School Management Simulation Training..."

Q26 Thinking about how you support school improvement, how important is the School Management Simulation Training...? READ ANSWER OPTIONS
- Very important (20)
- Important (21)
- Not at all important (22)
- Don't know (23)

Q27 What were the main ways that School Management Simulation Training has assisted how you support school improvement in the last year...? PROBE FOR ANSWERS AS REQUIRED

Q28 How satisfied are you with the School Management Simulation Training...? READ ANSWER OPTIONS
- Very satisfied (4)
- Satisfied (5)
- Not satisfied (6)
- Don't Know (7)

Q29 What are the main reasons for selecting your answer to the previous question...? PROBE FOR ANSWERS AS REQUIRED

Q30 Have you experienced any challenges in using what you learned during the School Management Simulation Training in the last year...? READ ANSWER OPTIONS
- A lot (4)
- A few (5)
- None at all (6)
- Don't know (7)
Display This Question:
If Have you experienced any challenges in using what you learned during the School Management Simulation... A lot Is Selected
Or Have you experienced any challenges in using what you learned during the School Management Simulation... A few Is Selected

Q31 What kind of challenges did you experience...? PROBE FOR ANSWERS AS REQUIRED

Q32 Have there been any negative outcomes from the School Management Simulation Training...? READ ANSWER OPTIONS
☐ A lot (11)
☐ A few (12)
☐ None at all (13)
☐ Don't know (14)

Display This Question:
If Have there been any negative outcomes from the School Management Simulation Training...? READ ANSWER OPTIONS
Or Have there been any negative outcomes from the School Management Simulation Training...? READ ANSWER OPTIONS

Q33 What are the negative outcomes that you have observed School Management Simulation Training...? PROBE FOR ANSWERS AS REQUIRED

Q34 Do you have any suggestions for improvements in the School Management Simulation Training...? PROBE FOR ANSWERS AS REQUIRED

Q35 Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the role of School Management Simulation Training and the School Review Cycle in school improvement...? PROBE FOR ANSWERS AS REQUIRED

Q36 (INSTRUCTION ONLY) END OF SURVEY THANK PARTICIPANT THE NEXT QUESTIONS ARE TO BE COMPLETED BY THE FIELD WORKER BEFORE SUBMITTING THE SURVEY

Q37 When did the School Review take place? (dd/mm/yyyy)

Q38 When did the School School Management Simulation Training take place? (dd/mm/yyyy)

Q39 When did the Community Meeting to Discuss the School Report Card take place? (dd/mm/yyyy)

Q40 When did the School Improvement Planning Meeting take place? (dd/mm/yyyy)
Q41 (INSTRUCTION ONLY) END OF SURVEY WELL DONE! PLEASE ENTER ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FROM NOTES BEFORE SUBMITTING COMPLETED RESPONSES
INSPIRE MTE Questionnaire – Control Group

Q1 (INSTRUCTION ONLY) I would be very grateful for your participation in a short survey to provide feedback on your recent experience of working to review and improve your school. The survey forms part of a wider evaluation aimed at providing Link Malawi and Link International with information to further develop their support for schools like yours. Your views are important to help us understand how effective Link has been. Participation in the survey is voluntary and findings from the survey will not be attributed to individuals. For further information on any aspect of this research, you can contact the Link Office using the following details (PROVIDE CONTACT DETAILS). In the interview we refer to the 'School Review Cycle'. By this we mean the following activities: School Reviews; the development of School Feedback Reports and School Report Cards; School Management Simulation Training; Community Meetings to Discuss the School Report Cards; and School Improvement Planning. Together we refer to all of these activities as the 'School Review Cycle'. Do you have any questions / are you happy to begin...? CONFIRM UNDERSTANDING AND ASK FOR ANY FURTHER CLARIFICATION REQUIRED AS NECESSARY

Q2 What is your position at this school...? TICK ALL THAT APPLY

☐ Headteacher (1)
☐ Teacher (2)
☐ Member of School Management Committee (3)
☐ Member of Parent Teacher Association (4)
☐ Other (please specify) (5) ____________________

Q3 Have you, or any other members of your school community, participated in any of the following 'School Review Cycle' activities...? TICK ALL THAT APPLY

☐ School Reviews (1)
☐ Developing School Report Cards (6)
☐ School Management Training (2)
☐ Community Meetings to Discuss School Report Card (3)
☐ Viewing / Reading a School Report Card (not at a community meeting) (4)
☐ School Improvement Planning Meetings (5)

Q4 To what extent do you agree with the following statement: "I participate regularly in school management activities". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS

☐ Strongly agree (10)
☐ Somewhat agree (11)
☐ Neither agree nor disagree (12)
☐ Somewhat disagree (13)
☐ Strongly disagree (14)
Q5 To what extent do you agree with the following statement: "I can effectively influence school management activities". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS

- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q6 To what extent do you agree with the following statement: "The quality of school management is good". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS

- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q7 To what extent do you agree with the following statement: "The local community is effectively involved in school management". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS

- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q8 To what extent do you agree with the following statement: "I have a good knowledge of school management activities". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS

- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)

Q9 To what extent do you agree with the following statement: "This school has an effective improvement plan". Would you say that you... READ OUT OPTIONS

- Strongly agree (10)
- Somewhat agree (11)
- Neither agree nor disagree (12)
- Somewhat disagree (13)
- Strongly disagree (14)
Q10 Do you experience any challenges in undertaking the following 'School Review Cycle' activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Extremely challenging (11)</th>
<th>Very challenging (12)</th>
<th>Moderately challenging (13)</th>
<th>Slightly challenging (14)</th>
<th>Not challenging at all (15)</th>
<th>Not Applicable (16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking School Reviews (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing School Report Cards (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management Training (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Community Meetings to Discuss to School Report Cards (6)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding School Improvement Planning Meetings (8)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11 What kind of challenges do you experience in undertaking 'School Review Cycle' activities...?PROBE FOR ANSWERS AS REQUIRED
Q12 How much have the following groups benefited from School Review Cycle activities in the last year...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>A little (5)</th>
<th>None at all (6)</th>
<th>Don't know (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Management Committees (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents (6)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners (7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community Groups or Individuals (please specify) (8)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify) (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13 How much will the following groups benefit as a result of School Review Cycle activities, in the next 1-3 years...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>A little (5)</th>
<th>None at all (6)</th>
<th>Don't know (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management Committees (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Teachers (6)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents (7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners (8)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community Groups or Individuals (please specify) (9)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify) (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14 Do you have any suggestions for improvements in school planning...? WRITE ANSWER

Q15 (INSTRUCTION ONLY) END OF SURVEY PLEASE ENTER ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FROM NOTES BEFORE SUBMITTING COMPLETED RESPONSES
## Appendix 5: Progress Against Logframe Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logframe Date</th>
<th>Impact Indicator 1</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Milestone 1 (Mar 2016)</th>
<th>Milestone 2 (Mar 2017)</th>
<th>Target (Mar 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPACT</strong></td>
<td>Improved learner outcomes in Mchinji District</td>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Milestone 1 (Mar 2016)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Milestone 2 (Mar 2017)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target (Mar 2018)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of learners, disaggregated by gender (and other, e.g. Special Education Needs, Orphans, ultra-poor, if available) passing the Primary School Leaving Certificate of Education PSLCE; Number and % of learners (disaggregated) repeating Standard 1 and 5. Nb the baseline figures are for Malawi as a whole; the project baseline will capture district level figures and milestones will be revised accordingly.</td>
<td>Planned PSLCE pass rate 67.2%. Repetition Std 1 25% boys, 24% girls; Std 5 18% boys, 17% girls.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Sector Performance Report 2013-14; Education Sector Improvement Plan II 2013/14-2017/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Indicator 2</td>
<td>Number and % of learners (disaggregated) passing the Malawi School Certificate of Education (MSCE); Number and % of learners (disaggregated) repeating Form 4 (Education Sector Improvement Plan p.59). Nb the baseline figures are for Malawi as a whole; the project baseline will capture district level figures.</td>
<td>Planned MSCE pass rates male 61%, female 46%; Repetition at Form 4 9.3%.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Management Information System (EMIS) 2014 Report; Education Sector Improvement Plan II 2013/14-2017/18; Education Sector Performance Report 2013/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Indicator 3</td>
<td>Number and % of schools which show an improvement in the grades (below the pass grade) achieved by learners in core.</td>
<td>Planned 0 10 (5%); 20 (10%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OUTCOME

#### Outcome Indicator 1

**Baseline**
- Planned: NA

**Milestone 1 (Mar 2016)**
- Achieved: NA

**Milestone 2 (Mar 2017)**
- Target (Mar 2018):
  - 10%
  - 30%

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- Inspection reports, SPR data, mid-term project evaluation; final evaluation

**Schools in Mchinji deliver high quality relevant education to all learners.**

Number and % of primary and secondary schools which ‘Meets minimum standards’ in a core set of National Education Standards (NES): 1, 5, 10, 12, 16 and 22.

- **Planned**: NA
- **Achieved**: 1 school (1.3% of those surveyed) meets minimum standards in all 6 of the core NES.

#### Outcome Indicator 2

**Baseline**
- Planned: NA

**Milestone 1 (Mar 2016)**
- Achieved: NA

**Milestone 2 (Mar 2017)**
- Target (Mar 2018):
  - 5%
  - 10%

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- Project Baseline; inspection reports, SPR data, mid-term project evaluation; final evaluation

**Number and % of primary and secondary sampled schools which increase performance in MSCE and PSLCE**

#### OUTPUT 1

#### Output Indicator 1.1

**Baseline**
- Planned: NA

**Milestone 1 (Mar 2016)**
- Achieved: 1

**Milestone 2 (Mar 2017)**
- Target (Mar 2018):
  - 1

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- Memorandum of Understanding developed between four departments with agreed roles and responsibilities.
## Output Indicator 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of effective and well attended (over 50% of members) Steering Committee (SC) meetings that support individual department Technical Working Groups (TWGs)</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
Meeting agendas and minutes of Steering Committee and TWGs; gender disaggregated attendance registers

## Output Indicator 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System for sharing accurate school performance data at community, school, zone, district, and central (MoEST) levels is operational</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
Training attendance forms and evaluations

## Output Indicator 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of people (MoEST, Mchinji District, Dedza District, Central West Division staff) trained to use Electronic School Report Card (ESRC) database and tools</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (13 PEAs and 2 District staff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
Training attendance forms and evaluations

## Output Indicator 2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of people (MoEST, Mchinji District, Dedza District, Central West Division staff) trained to use Malawi School Improvement and Support Toolkit (MSIST)</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (1 DIAS Headquarters; 3 Central West Education Division; 12 Mchinji District)</td>
<td>28 (13 PEAs, 13 ACCOs and 2 DEO staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
Training attendance forms and evaluations
## OUTPUT 3
### Output Indicator 3.1
- **ESRC produced for every school in Mchinji**
  - **Baseline**: Planned: 0, Milestone 1 (Mar 2016): NA, Milestone 2 (Mar 2017): 110
  - **Target (Mar 2018)**: 217
  - **Achieved**: 78

  **Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
  - School records, mid-term review

### Output Indicator 3.2
- **Number of and relevance of data sources used for the ESRC in each school**
  - **Baseline**: Planned: 0, Milestone 1 (Mar 2016): NA
  - **Milestone 2 (Mar 2017)**: 4
  - **Target (Mar 2018)**: 4
  - **Achieved**: 9 (Master timetable, School Improvement Plan, Minutes of staff meetings, School log book, teachers' lesson plans and schemes of work, teachers' timebook, learners' attendance register, learner admission book, Visitors' book, class assessment records)

  **Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
  - School records, mid-term review

## OUTPUT 4
### Output Indicator 4.1
- **Baseline**: Planned: NA, Milestone 1 (Mar 2016): NA
  - **Milestone 2 (Mar 2017)**: 60%
  - **Target (Mar 2018)**: 80%
## Mid-Term Evaluation
### INSPIRE Project

### OUTPUT 5

#### Output Indicator 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of SIPs which are effective, relevant and realistic according to MoEST guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**

- MoEST records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicator 4.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**

- School records, PEA records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicator 4.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**

- School Improvement Plans, Inspection Reports, Advisory Reports, SIIS database

#### Output Indicator 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and % of schools which achieve at least 3 (out of a maximum of 6) SIP targets for the year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**

- SIP analysis template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and % of PEAs reporting that communities are contributing to ZIP monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**

- PEA questionnaire from Link M&E Framework.
## Output Indicator 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of District Education Plan (DEP) targets for the year achieved by the District.</td>
<td>Planned: 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be reported at year end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- District Education Plan report to MoEST

## Output Indicator 5.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants (disaggregated) who attend SPAM, zone conference and district conference</td>
<td>Planned: 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5500 (50 per 110 schools) at SPAMs; 330 (3 per 110 schools) at zone conference; 78 (6 per 13 zones) at District Conference</td>
<td>10850 (50 per 217 schools) at SPAMs; 651 (3 per 117 schools) at zone conference; 156 (12 per 13 zones) at District Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5418 (2122 men, 2187 women, 80 boys and 299 girls) attended community planning meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- Attendance data for SPAM, zone conference and district conference

## OUTPUT 6

### Output Indicator 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully integrated (central-division-district-school) improvement plans developed, led by MoEST</td>
<td>Planned: 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be reported at year end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- Number of zonal education plans (ZEPs) produced using ESRC data and SIPs (Mchinji)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of District Education Plans (DEPs) produced using ESRC data and ZEPs (Mchinji)</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be reported at year end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- DEPs, ZEPs, ESRC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of reports and plans by MoEST which directly refer to data from school and district level</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be reported at year end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- School records, PEA records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools piloting innovative school improvement interventions (Dedza)</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be reported at year end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source(s) for substantiating indicator progress**
- MoEST records