

School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis** 

# THE SECOND PHASE OF THE EDUCATIONAL REFORM FOR KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY PROJECT (ERFKE II) **Component One: School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP)**

Monitoring & Evaluation of School and Directorate Development Program (SDDP) – 2013

**Interim Report – Data Analysis** 

**Prepared by** Head of Division of Monitoring & Evaluation Farouq Bani Hamad

**Statistical Analysis Division Member of Monitoring & Evaluation** Samer Mahmoud "Al-Haj Ahmad"

**Supervision Managing Director of Planning & Educational Research** Dr. Mohammad Abu Ghazleh & **Director of Educational Research & Development** Dr. Myasser Al-Habashneh

**Translation Division of Translation & Educational Publications** Ilham Sadeq Sa'eda Al-Sayyed

Mahmoud Suhailah

June 30, 2013



| Indicators  | Standards  | Baseline<br>2009      | Target<br>2015  | June 2012<br>Group 1  | June 2012<br>Group 2&3  | June<br>2012<br>Group<br>4 | June 2013<br>Group 1   | June 2013<br>Group 2   | June 2013<br>Group 3  | June 2013<br>Group 4  | June, 2013<br>Average  |  |
|---|--|-----------------------|---|---|---|----------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Mean score (1 0): Inc   | reased effective na  | rticination of        | the local commu   | nity directorates of  | education and N   | /inistrv's (               | <sup>7</sup> enter in school   | development  | nrocesses   | ·   |  |  |
| Mean score (1.0): Inc<br>1.1 Qualitatively:<br>Degree to which<br>schools are<br>implementing<br>improvement<br>plans | reased effective pa<br>Percentage of<br>activities<br>implemented as<br>per plan | rticipation of<br>N/A | the local commu<br>All schools in<br>Jordan<br>implement<br>their<br>Improvement<br>Plans as per<br>schedule to a<br>high degree<br>(4.0/5.0) as<br>per the rubrics | <ul> <li>mity, directorates of<br/>Degree<br/>application rate<br/>by school<br/>development<br/>teams is 4.14 out<br/>of 5.0, equivalent<br/>to 83% the<br/>percentage rate<br/>for the application<br/>of the plans.</li> <li>Boys schools<br/>scored a higher<br/>degree of the<br/>application rate<br/>where the average<br/>reached to 4.29<br/>which is the<br/>higher than grade<br/>attained by girls<br/>schools and<br/>mixed schools,<br/>which were 4.00<br/>The highest<br/>degree plans</li> </ul> | <b>education and N</b><br>School<br>development<br>team<br>members: An<br>average score<br>of <b>4.3</b> of 5.0<br>which equals<br><b>86%</b> of<br>implementatio<br>n of plan.<br>Girls/mixed<br>schools scored<br>higher ( <b>4.75</b> )<br>than boys<br>schools ( <b>3.62</b> ).<br>Supervisors:<br>average score<br>of ( <b>3.5</b> )<br>particularly<br>low in Al-<br>Qaser ( <b>1.0</b> ) | Ainistry's (               | Center in school<br>Degree of<br>application<br>rate by school<br>development<br>teams is 3.2<br>out of 5.0<br>which is<br>equivalent to<br>64% the<br>percentage<br>rate for the<br>application of<br>the plans.<br>Girls and<br>mixed schools<br>scored higher<br>score than<br>average in<br>terms of the<br>application of<br>3.5 which is<br>higher than the<br>degree of | development<br>Degree of<br>application<br>rate by<br>school<br>developme<br>nt teams is<br>3.9 out of<br>5.0 which<br>is<br>equivalent<br>to 78% the<br>percentage<br>rate for the<br>application<br>of the<br>plans.<br>Girls and<br>mixed<br>schools<br>scored<br>higher<br>score than<br>average in<br>terms of<br>the | Degree of<br>application<br>rate by school<br>development<br>teams is 4.0<br>out of 5.0<br>which is<br>equivalent to<br>%80the<br>percentage<br>rate for the<br>application of<br>the plans.<br>Girls and<br>mixed schools<br>scored higher<br>score than<br>average in<br>terms of the<br>application of<br>4.3 which is<br>higher than<br>the degree of | Degree of<br>application rate by<br>school<br>development<br>teams is 390 out of<br>5.0 which is<br>equivalent to %78<br>the percentage<br>rate for the<br>application of the<br>plans.<br>Girls and mixed<br>schools scored<br>higher score than<br>average in terms<br>of the application<br>of 40 which is<br>higher than the<br>degree of boys'<br>schools which<br>was 3.8 | Degree of<br>application rate<br>by school<br>development<br>teams is 3.7 out<br>of 5.0 which is<br>equivalent to<br>%74 the<br>percentage rate<br>for the<br>application of<br>the plans<br>Girls and mixed<br>schools scored<br>higher score<br>than average in<br>terms of the<br>application of<br>4.0 which is<br>higher than the<br>degree of boys'<br>schools which |  |
|   |  |                       |   | implementation<br>was scored by<br>directorates<br>according to<br>supervisors was<br>3.43 and was and<br>the lowest degree<br>was in<br>Directorate of<br>Education in the<br>North-Eastern<br>Badia, reaching to<br>1.0   |   |                            | boys' schools<br>which was 2.8<br>The average<br>degree of<br>application by<br>educational<br>supervisors<br>was 3.0  | application<br>of <b>4.1</b><br>which is<br>higher than<br>the degree<br>of boys'<br>schools<br>which was<br><b>3.8</b><br>The<br>average<br>degree of<br>application<br>by  | The average<br>degree of<br>application by<br>educational<br>supervisors<br>was 4.0   | The average<br>degree of<br>application by<br>educational<br>supervisors was<br>3.5   | was <b>3.5</b><br>The average<br>degree of<br>application by<br>educational<br>supervisors was<br><b>3.7</b>   |  |
|   |  |                       |   |   |   |                            | General<br>application<br>rate<br>(School<br>development<br>team and<br>supervisors)<br>was (3.2).<br>Giza   | educational<br>supervisors<br>was <b>4.5</b><br>General<br>applicatio<br>n rate<br>(School<br>developme<br>nt team<br>and<br>supervisors<br>) was <b>(4.0)</b>   | General<br>application<br>rate<br>(School<br>development<br>team and<br>supervisors)<br>was (4.0)<br>Marka<br>Directorate<br>scored highest<br>rate at (4.7)  | General<br>application rate<br>(School<br>development team<br>and supervisors)<br>was (3.8)   | General<br>application<br>rate<br>(School<br>development<br>team and<br>supervisors) was<br>(3.7)<br>Marka<br>Directorate<br>scored highest<br>degree at (4.9)   |  |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

| Notices  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| Strengths:   |
| • Technical Support provided for schools by directorates |
|  |
| of education   |
|  |

- Availability of the financial grant
- Motivation, collaboration and teamwork
- Availability of educational support

#### Weaknesses:

- Insufficient of the grant provided
- Lack of documentation pertains to achieved accomplishments of plans implementation and their effects on periodical reports submitted to the directorates of education
- Nemours number of projects that are carried by the Ministry and international donors
- Lack of concerned Monitoring personnel from the directorates of education and lack of educational support with school networks and small number of educational supervisors in some of these directorates
- Difficulty of procedures related to the delivery of grants, donations from different parties
- Availability of change resistance culture and lack of motivation to work in programs
- Lack of efficiency of educational councils in school networks in supporting school development plans.
- Unsuitable school environment and facilities due to large number of rented and double-shit schools
- Lack of clarity in roles and responsibilities of the concerned individuals
- Ministry's delay in delivering grants to the first group of the directorates of education

- Increase the number of educational supervisors in the needy directorates
- Reduce field coordinators' work load to help them implement the development plans
- Postpone the transfer of principals and teachers to the end of the scholastic year along with rehabilitation of new members of development teams
- Disperse the allocated financial support for the first group of directorates of education in on time
- Follow up school accomplishments periodically in the field of implementing school development plans along with providing technical support and awareness necessary to implement the development plans
- Facilitate procedures of accepting donations from the local community
- Activate the role of development network councils and

| Indicators  | Standards  | Baseline<br>2009 | Target<br>2015  | June 2012<br>Group 1   | June 2012<br>Group 2&3  | June<br>2012<br>Group<br>4 | June 2013<br>Group 1  | June 2013<br>Group 2  | June 2013<br>Group 3  | June 2013<br>Group 4  | June, 2013<br>Average   |  |
|---|--|------------------|---|--|---|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
|   |  |                  |   |  |   |                            | Directorate<br>scored highest<br>rate at (4.3)<br>and<br>Directorate of<br>Northern<br>Badia which<br>scored the<br>lowest the rate<br>at (1.9)   | Madaba<br>Directorate<br>scored<br>highest<br>rate at<br>(4.9) and<br>Directorate<br>of<br>Northern<br>Mazar &<br>Bani Obied<br>which<br>scored the<br>lowest the<br>rate at 3.6)   | and<br>Directorate of<br>Southern<br>Badia which<br>scored the<br>lowest the rate<br>at (2.7)   | Petra and Salt<br>Directorates<br>scored highest<br>rate at (4.4) and<br>Directorate of<br>Southern Badia<br>which scored the<br>lowest the rate at<br>(3.0)  | and Directorate<br>of Southern<br>Badia which<br>scored the<br>lowest the rate<br>at(4.9)   |  |
| 1.2 Qualitatively;<br>Degree to which<br>Field<br>Directorates are<br>implementing<br>their<br>improvement<br>plans | Percentage of<br>procedures/activ<br>ities<br>implemented as<br>per plan | N/A              | All Field<br>directorates<br>implement<br>their<br>Improvement<br>Plans per<br>schedule to a<br>high degree<br>(4.0/5.0) score<br>as per the<br>rubrics | Degree<br>application rate<br>by directorates'<br>development<br>teams is 3.43 and<br>implementation<br>degrees among<br>the 7 directorates<br>ranged between<br>low at (1.0) and<br>high at (5.0) | Degree<br>application<br>rate by<br>directorates'<br>development<br>teams is 4.56<br>and<br>implementatio<br>n degrees<br>among the 9<br>directorates<br>ranged<br>between low<br>at (4.0) and<br>high at (5.0) |                            | Degree of<br>implementatio<br>n rate by<br><b>Directorate</b><br><b>development</b><br><b>teams</b> is <b>3.1</b><br>Implementatio<br>n degree in the<br>7 directorates<br>ranged<br>between low<br>in North-<br>Eastern Badia<br>and Giza at<br>(2.0) and high<br>in South<br>Ghour at (4.0) | Degree of<br>implement<br>ation rate<br>by<br>Directorat<br>e<br>developme<br>nt teams is<br>4.3<br>Implement<br>ation<br>degree<br>among<br>directorate<br>s ranged<br>between<br>low in<br>North<br>Mazar<br>(3.0) and<br>high in<br>Madaba at<br>(5.0) | Degree of<br>implementatio<br>n rate by<br><b>Directorate</b><br><b>development</b><br><b>teams</b> is <b>3.8</b><br>Implementatio<br>n degree<br>among<br>directorates<br>ranged<br>between low<br>in Marka &<br>South Badia at<br>( <b>3.0</b> ) and high<br>in Rusaifa and<br>Ein Albasha at<br>( <b>5.0</b> ) | Degree of<br>implementation<br>rate by<br><b>Directorate</b><br><b>development</b><br><b>teams</b> is <b>3.5</b><br>Implementation<br>degree among<br>directorates<br>ranged between<br>low in Tafela,<br>Taiba, Ajlun &<br>Qwaisma at (3.0)<br>and high in Petra<br>at (5.0) | Degree of<br>implementation<br>rate by<br><b>Directorate</b><br><b>development</b><br><b>teams</b> is <b>3.6</b><br>Implementation<br>degree among<br>directorates<br>ranged between<br>low in North –<br>Eastern Badia &<br>at <b>(2.0)</b> and high<br>in Madaba, Bani<br>Obeid, Rusiafa<br>& Petra at <b>(5.0)</b> |  |

# **School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP)** The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

| ъT |   | 4. | _ |    |  |
|----|---|----|---|----|--|
| N  | 0 | T1 | С | es |  |

educate parents and local community about the program and enact their role in this program

- Integrating training programs which have common goals by the Ministry
- Educate concerned parties bout roles and responsibility and capacity building of school development teams continuously

#### Strengths:

- Collaboration and the availability of educational support
- Technical support represented in the various professional development programs
- · Financial grant offered by the SDDP

#### Weaknesses:

- The large number of programs with common goals provided by various donors and preoccupation of many supervisors with other programs while others are freed
- Lack of clarity in the roles and responsibilities of many who involved in the implementation of the program and the absence of many sections of the directorates to implement plan activities and the existence of resistance to change culture
- Ministry's delaying in distributing grants allocated to the first group of the directorates of education and insufficient financial grant provided by the project
- The absence of the active role of the councils of educational development
- Geographical spacing of schools and the lack of means of transportation sometimes in some directorates of education
- The small number of supervisors and educational supporters and instability educational leaders
- The existence of specialized plans in sections that must be implemented upon the instructions issued by the Ministry which are difficult to integrate with the development plans of the directorates
- the need for prior approval from the ministry for the implementation of capacity building leading to impede the implementation of some of the activities in the plan, and the ministry's lack of cooperation in the implementation of training workshops that are to address it for approval
- Complicated procedures that relate to the acceptance of grants and donations from the local community
- Lack of motivation and enthusiasm by the directors of

| Indicators  | Standards  | Baseline<br>2009 | Target<br>2015   | June 2012<br>Group 1   | June 2012<br>Group 2&3   | June<br>2012<br>Group<br>4 | June 2013<br>Group 1  | June 2013<br>Group 2  | June 2013<br>Group 3   | June 2013<br>Group 4   | June, 2013<br>Average   |   |
|---|--|------------------|--|--|--|----------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|
|   |  |                  |  |  |  |                            |   |   |  |  |   |   |
|   |  |                  |  |  |  |                            |   |   |  |  |   |   |
|   |  |                  |  |  |  |                            |   |   |  |  |   |   |
|   |  |                  |  |  |  |                            |   |   |  |  |   |   |
|   |  |                  |  |  |  |                            |   |   |  |  |   |   |
|   |  |                  |  |  |  |                            |   |   |  |  |   |   |
|   |  |                  |  |  |  |                            |   |   |  |  |   |   |
| 1.3 Qualitatively;<br>Degree to which<br>education<br>councils at<br>school cluster<br>level are<br>operational | <ul> <li>Councils<br/>formation</li> <li>Members<br/>know their<br/>roles and<br/>responsibilitie<br/>s</li> <li>Three<br/>meeting are<br/>held during<br/>the scholastic<br/>year at least</li> <li>They take<br/>decisions</li> <li>They<br/>implement<br/>them</li> </ul> | N/A              | All School<br>Clusters'<br>Education<br>Councils are<br>operational to<br>a high degree<br>(4.0/5.0) as<br>per the rubrics | Effectiveness<br>degree reached to<br>2.90. The<br>Educational<br>councils in North-<br>Eastern Badia<br>scored to lost<br>degree at <b>1.6</b> but<br>the councils of<br>South Ghour<br>scored the highest<br>degree at 4.6<br>Regarding<br>standards of<br>council formation<br>scored the highest<br>degree and they<br>scored <b>4.0</b> . | Effectiveness<br>rate reached to<br>3.89.<br>Educational<br>councils in<br>Ramtha<br>district scored<br>the lowest<br>degree at <b>2.7</b><br>and the<br>highest was<br>scored by<br>those in<br>Amman/4 at<br><b>4.8</b><br>Regarding<br>criteria,<br>membership<br>matching<br>standards in<br>the formation |                            | Effectiveness<br>rate reached to<br>2.1.<br>The<br>educational<br>councils for<br>schools<br>networks in<br>North-Western<br>Badia, &<br>Mafraq district<br>scored the<br>lowest degree<br>at 1.0 and the<br>highest were<br>scored by Al-<br>Mowqar at<br>3.5. Regarding<br>standards of<br>councils<br>formation<br>standards | Effectivene<br>ss rate<br>reached to<br><b>3.4</b> .<br>The<br>educational<br>councils<br>for schools<br>networks<br>in North<br>Mazar<br>scored the<br>lowest<br>degree at<br><b>2.1</b> and the<br>highest<br>were<br>scored by<br>Madaba at<br><b>4.6</b> .<br>Regarding | Effectiveness<br>rate reached to<br><b>3.0</b> .<br>The<br>educational<br>councils for<br>schools<br>networks in<br>Marka scored<br>the lowest<br>degree at <b>2.2</b><br>and the<br>highest were<br>scored by Al-<br>Qaser at <b>3.6</b> .<br>Regarding<br>standards of<br>councils<br>formation<br>standards<br>scored the | Effectiveness rate<br>reached to 3.4.<br>The educational<br>councils for<br>schools networks<br>in Al-Taiba<br>scored, the lowest<br>degree at 2.7 and<br>the highest were<br>scored by Petra at<br>4.1. Regarding<br>standards of<br>councils<br>formation<br>standards scored<br>the highest degree<br>at 4.9 and the<br>lowest those who<br>implement<br>decisions at 2.4 | Effectiveness<br>rate reached to<br><b>2.9</b><br>The educational<br>councils for<br>schools<br>networks in<br>North-Western<br>Badia & Mafraq<br>scored, the<br>lowest degree at<br><b>1.0</b> and the<br>highest were<br>scored by<br>Madaba at <b>4.6</b> .<br>Regarding<br>standards of<br>councils<br>formation<br>standards<br>scored the | 4 |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

#### Notices

some of directorates of education

#### **Recommendations:**

- The Ministry's center needs to follow up implementation of the program in the districts periodically a long with enacting managers' roles to support the program and the implementation of the principle of accountability
- Documentation of all achievements according to the timetable included the plan and send completion periodic reports to the Ministry
- Standardization of programs provided by various donors and channeled them to support the implementation of development plans
- Clarification the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the directorates and building their capacity continuously
- The Ministry should disburse the allocated financial grants allocated to the directorates in a timely manner and according to the plan implementation requirements
- Taking measures and procedures to insure the activation the roles of development councils
- Increasing the number of supervisors and educational supporter in the needy directorates
- The Ministry should pay more attention to professional development programs prepared by the directorate and avoid delaying its approval to these programs
- Facilitation of the participation of all divisions and the integration of their plans in the development plan of the directorate of education

#### Strengths:

- Most of the standards for membership are applied to councils
- On average two meetings were held in the scholastic year
- Some decision were taken and some were implemented

#### Weaknesses:

- Roles and responsibilities of many members of the councils are ambiguous
- Decisions that had been taken and implemented didn't fit the roles of the council
- Lack of balance in terms gender in the structure of development councils

- Educate members of the educational councils of school networks on their roles and responsibilities
- It is necessary to motivate the councils to make decisions that help schools operate in the implementation of their development plans and work following up their implementation

| Indicators  | Standards   | Baseline<br>2009 | Target<br>2015  | June 2012<br>Group 1   | June 2012<br>Group 2&3  | June<br>2012<br>Group<br>4 | June 2013<br>Group 1  | June 2013<br>Group 2   | June 2013<br>Group 3  | June 2013<br>Group 4  | June, 2013<br>Average   |
|---|---|------------------|---|--|---|----------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
|   |   |                  |   |  | of the councils<br>scored the<br>highest<br>degrees<br>through<br>holding three<br>meetings in<br>the scholastic<br>year  |                            | scored the<br>highest degree<br>at <b>3.1</b> and the<br>lowest those<br>who<br>implement<br>decisions at<br><b>1.7</b>   | standards<br>of councils<br>formation<br>standards<br>scored the<br>highest<br>degree at<br><b>4.0</b> and the<br>lowest<br>those who<br>implement<br>decisions<br>at <b>4.0</b><br>while  | highest degree<br>at 4.3 and the<br>lowest those<br>who<br>implement<br>decisions at<br>2.1   |   | highest degree<br>at 4.0 and the<br>lowest those<br>who implement<br>decisions at 2.2   |
|   |   |                  |   |  |   |                            |   | knowing<br>roles and<br>responsibil<br>ities was<br>2.9  |   |   |   |
| 1.4 Qualitatively;<br>Degree to which<br>Education<br>Development<br>Councils at the<br>level of Field<br>Directorates are<br>operational | <ol> <li>Membership</li> <li>Roles and<br/>responsibilitie<br/>s</li> <li>Meetings held</li> <li>Decision<br/>made</li> <li>Decision<br/>implemented</li> </ol> | N/A              | All Field<br>Directorates'<br>Education<br>Development<br>Councils are<br>operational to<br>a high degree<br>(4.0/5.0) score<br>as per the<br>rubrics | Effectiveness rate<br>of the educational<br>councils was 3.1<br>according to the<br>estimations of<br>directorates<br>development<br>teams and 2.9 for<br>member of the<br>Educational<br>Reform Council | Effectiveness<br>rate of the<br>educational<br>councils by<br>their members<br>was lower<br>than the<br>degree<br>according to<br>the<br>estimations of<br>directorates<br>development<br>teams which<br>was 4.28<br>members and<br>3.5 for<br>directorates<br>development<br>members |                            | Effectiveness<br>rate of<br>educational<br>reform<br>councils of<br>directorates<br>was 2.6<br>according to<br>the<br>estimations of<br>the<br>directorates<br>development<br>teams and 2.2<br>for members<br>of educational<br>reform<br>councils<br>General<br>Average was<br>(2.4)<br>South Ghour<br>scored the<br>highest degree<br>at (3.5) while<br>Mowaqr<br>Directorate<br>scored the<br>lowest degree<br>at<br>(1.5) | Effectivene<br>ss rate of<br>educational<br>reform<br>councils of<br>directorate<br>s was <b>3.6</b><br>according<br>to the<br>estimations<br>of the<br>directorate<br>s<br>developme<br>nt teams<br>and <b>3.8</b> for<br>members<br>of<br>educational<br>reform<br>councils<br>General<br>Average<br>was <b>(3.7)</b><br>Madaba<br>scored the<br>highest<br>degree at<br><b>(4.2)</b> while<br>Mowaqr<br>Directorate | Effectiveness<br>rate of<br>educational<br>reform<br>councils of<br>directorates<br>was <b>3.2</b><br>according to<br>the<br>estimations of<br>the<br>directorates<br>development<br>teams and <b>2.6</b><br>for members<br>of educational<br>reform<br>councils<br>General<br>Average was<br><b>(2.9)</b><br>Russaifah<br>scored the<br>highest degree<br>at <b>(3.7)</b> while<br>Marka<br>Directorate<br>scored the<br>lowest degree<br>at<br><b>(2.2)</b> | Effectiveness rate<br>of educational<br>reform councils of<br>directorates was<br>according to the<br>estimations of the<br>directorates<br>development<br>teams and 3.7 for<br>members of<br>educational<br>reform councils<br>General Average<br>was (3.5)<br>Petra scored the<br>highest degree at<br>(4.1) while Ajlun<br>Directorate scored<br>the lowest degree<br>at (2.3) | Effectiveness<br>rate of<br>educational<br>reform councils<br>of directorates<br>was 3.0<br>according to the<br>estimations of<br>the directorates<br>development<br>teams and 3.1<br>for members of<br>educational<br>reform councils<br>General<br>Average was<br>(3.0)<br>Petra scored the<br>highest degree<br>at (2.4) while<br>Ajlun<br>Directorate<br>scored the<br>lowest degree at<br>.(4.2) |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

#### Notices

• The directorates of education need to restructure ineffective educational councils of the school networks, taking into account the standards for efficiency and the desire of the members and not to appoint them based on their career or social positions along with creating a balance in terms of gender

#### Strengths:

- Most of the standards of membership are applied to councils
- On average two meetings were held in the scholastic year
- Some decision were taken and some implemented
- Weaknesses:
- Roles and responsibilities of many members of the councils are ambiguous
- Decisions that had been taken and implemented didn't fit the roles of the council
- Failure to take effective decisions to serve the activities of the development plan

- Stakeholders in the departments of Education should hold awareness workshops for members of councils of education development of the directorate to familiarize them with their roles and responsibilities
- The directorates of education need to restructure councils of education to create a balance in terms of gender
- The necessity of activating the roles of the councils in order to take effective decisions to assist the directorates in the implementation of their development plan

| Indicators   | Standards   | Baseline<br>2009 | Target<br>2015   | June 2012<br>Group 1  | June 2012<br>Group 2&3   | June<br>2012<br>Group<br>4 | June 2013<br>Group 1  | June 2013<br>Group 2   | June 2013<br>Group 3   | June 2013<br>Group 4  | June, 2013<br>Average  |  |
|--|---|------------------|--|---|--|----------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|
|  |   |                  |  |   |  |                            |   | scored the<br>lowest<br>degree at<br>(3.1)   |  |   |  |  |
| 1.5 Qualitatively;<br>Degree of<br>satisfaction of<br>Field Directorate<br>staff with<br>support from<br>directorates of<br>education to<br>implement Field<br>Directorate<br>Improvement<br>Plans | Supported<br>provided based<br>on the needs of<br>school (see<br>questionnaire<br>item 1.5) | N/A              | High level of<br>satisfaction<br>with the<br>support they<br>receive from<br>the field<br>directorate<br>(4.0/5.0) as<br>per the rubrics | All districts score<br>3.43 on this<br>indicator,<br>"acceptable"<br>with the<br>exception of<br>Mafraq which<br>scored 1.0<br>"marginal" | School<br>principles in<br>all directorates<br>demonstrated<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>degree at 4.0<br>except for<br>South Mazar<br>which scored<br>3.0 (marginal) |                            | Focus Groups<br>School<br>principals and<br>teachers<br>demonstrated<br>degree of<br>satisfaction at<br><b>3.0</b><br>(acceptable).<br>The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was scored by<br>North Ghour<br>at (4.0) and<br>least degree<br>was scored by<br>Jerash at (1.7)<br>(marginal)<br>Males scored<br>(2.9) and<br>females scored<br>(3.0) | Focus<br>Groups<br>School<br>principals<br>and<br>teachers<br>demonstrat<br>ed degree<br>of<br>satisfaction<br>at 3.4<br>(acceptable<br>). The<br>highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was scored<br>by<br>Madaba at<br>(4.0) and<br>least<br>degree was<br>scored by<br>North<br>Mazar at<br>(2.8)<br>(marginal)<br>Males<br>scored<br>(3.1) and<br>females<br>scored<br>(3.8) | Focus<br>Groups<br>School<br>principals and<br>teachers<br>demonstrated<br>degree of<br>satisfaction at<br>(3.5)<br>(acceptable).<br>The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>degree was<br>scored by Al-<br>Quasar at<br>(4.0) and least<br>degree was<br>scored by<br>South Badia<br>at (2.7)<br>(marginal)<br>Males scored<br>(3.4) and<br>females<br>scored (3.6) | Focus Groups<br>School principals<br>and teachers<br>demonstrated<br>degree of<br>satisfaction at<br>(3.6) (acceptable).<br>The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction degree<br>was scored by<br>Qwaiseh at (4.5)<br>and least degree<br>was scored by<br>Tafela at (2.8)<br>(marginal)<br>Males scored<br>(3.6) and females<br>scored (3.5) | Focus Groups<br>School<br>principals and<br>teachers<br>demonstrated<br>degree of<br>satisfaction at<br>(3.3)<br>(acceptable).<br>The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>degree was<br>scored by<br>Qwaiseh at<br>(4.5) and least<br>degree was<br>scored by<br>Jerash at (1.7)<br>(marginal)<br>Males scored<br>(3.3) and<br>females scored<br>(3.4) |  |
|  |   |                  |  |   |  |                            | Questionnair<br><u>e Analysis</u><br>School<br>principals and<br>teachers<br>demonstrated<br>degree of  | Questionn<br>aire<br>Analysis<br>School<br>principals<br>and<br>teachers   | Questionnair<br><u>e Analysis</u><br>School<br>principals and<br>teachers<br>demonstrated<br>degree of   | Questionnaire<br><u>Analysis</u><br>School principals<br>and teachers<br>demonstrated<br>degree of<br>satisfaction at 3.3   | Questionnaire<br>Analysis<br>School<br>principals and<br>teachers<br>demonstrated<br>degree of   |  |
|  |   |                  |  |   |  |                            | satisfaction at<br><b>3.0</b><br>(acceptable).  | demonstrat<br>ed degree<br>of  | satisfaction at<br><b>3.4</b><br>(acceptable).   | (acceptable). The<br>highest degree of<br>satisfaction was  | satisfaction at<br>(3.2)<br>(acceptable).  |  |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

| Notices |
|---------|
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |

#### Strengths:

- The directorates of education provide technical support to schools through professional development programs for teachers and principals
- The directorates of education provide equipment, supplies and maintenance work that schools need

#### Weaknesses:

- The weakness of directorates of education in the field of providing appropriate and effective environment to communicate with schools.
- Lack of justice in the distribution of services among schools and the lack of interest of the directorates of education in boys' schools compared with girls' schools
- Lack of support offered the directorates of education to motivate and stimulate local community to participate in school activities
- Repetitive transfers among the administrative and teaching staff during the scholastic year and the continuous change of supportive educators of networks with a clear weakness in the attribution of educational roles
- Lack of follow-up and guidance offered by the directorates of education pertain to the program and lack of providing continuous feedback on the performance of schools in the implementation of activities related to development plans

- The directorates of education need to raise the level of communication and cooperation with schools and to increase the level of support provided to them
- The directorates of education need to hold periodic workshops which include coordinators of areas and supervisors to educate everyone on their roles and responsibilities
- Adoption and install networks of schools within the geographical area and not to change them during the period of school development.
- The directorates of education need to increase interest in boys' schools and support them in the implementation of the development plan activities along with the provision of equal distribution of services among the school
- The directorates of education need to activate periodic follow-up of schools; especially boy's schools in order to achieve activities of development plans. In addition to

| Indicators | Standards | Baseline<br>2009 | Target<br>2015 | June 2012<br>Group 1 | June 2012<br>Group 2&3 | June<br>2012<br>Group<br>4 | June 2013<br>Group 1   | June 2013<br>Group 2   | June 2013<br>Group 3  | June 2013<br>Group 4  | June, 2013<br>Average   |
|------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|
|            |           |                  |                |                      |                        |                            | The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was scored by<br>North<br>Eastern<br>Badia at<br>(3.4) and least<br>degree was<br>scored by<br>Mwaqar at<br>(2.4)<br>(marginal)<br>Males scored<br>(3.0) and<br>females scored<br>(3.0)  | satisfaction<br>at 3.1<br>(acceptable<br>). The<br>highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was scored<br>by<br>Madaba at<br>(3.4) and<br>least<br>degree<br>scored by<br>South<br>Mazar<br>at (2.8)<br>(marginal)<br>Males<br>scored<br>(2.9) and<br>females<br>scored<br>.(3.3)   | The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was scored by<br><b>Al-Qaser</b> at<br>(3.6) and least<br>degree was<br>scored by<br><b>South Badia</b><br>at (3.0)<br>(marginal)<br>Males scored<br>(3.2) and<br>females<br>scored (3.5).  | scored by <b>Salt</b> at<br><b>3.8</b> ) and least<br>degree was scored<br>by <b>Qwaismeh</b> at<br><b>(2.7)</b> (marginal)<br>Males scored ( <b>(3.2)</b><br>and females<br>scored ( <b>3.4</b> ).   | The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction was<br>scored by <b>Salt</b><br>at (3.8) and<br>least degree was<br>scored by<br><b>Mwaqar</b> at<br>(2.4)<br>(marginal)<br>Males scored<br>(3.1) and<br>females scored<br>(3.3)   |
|            |           |                  |                |                      |                        |                            | The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was on<br>paragraph 3/<br>item D "The<br>directorates of<br>education<br>provide<br>schools<br>principals and<br>teachers with<br>suitable<br>professional<br>development<br>activities in<br>the fields of<br>teaching-<br>learning<br>process<br>related to<br>students'<br>achievement<br>evaluation"<br>and<br>paragraph 5<br>"the<br>directorates | The<br>highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was on<br>paragraph<br>13 – "The<br>directorate<br>supervise s<br>the<br>implement<br>ation of<br>national<br>and<br>internation<br>al exams<br>and keep<br>records of<br>their<br>results" at<br>3.6<br>The least<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was on<br>paragraph<br>10 "the<br>directorat | The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was on<br>paragraph 13<br>– "The<br>directorate<br>supervise s<br>the<br>implementatio<br>n of national<br>and<br>international<br>exams and<br>keep records<br>of their<br>results" at 4.0<br>The least<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was on<br>paragraph 10<br>"the<br>directorate<br>help schools<br>work<br>effectively | The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction was<br>on paragraph 1<br>"The directorate<br>informs schools<br>about changes in<br>curriculum and<br>educational<br>materials that are<br>experimented by<br>Directorate of<br>Curricula and<br>School<br>Textbooks" and<br>paragraph 13<br>"The directorate<br>supervise the<br>implementation<br>of national and<br>international<br>exams and keep<br>records of their<br>results" and<br>paragraph 26<br>"The<br>directorate's staff<br>carry out field | The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction was<br>on paragraph 13<br>– "The<br>directorate<br>supervise s the<br>implementation<br>of national and<br>international<br>exams and keep<br>records of their<br>results" at (3.7)<br>The least degree<br>of satisfaction<br>was on<br>paragraph 10<br>"the<br>directorate<br>help schools<br>work<br>effectively with<br>student with<br>special needs<br>"low-achievers<br>and gifted<br>students |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 Interim Report – Data Analysis

| Notices  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |
| facilitating administrative procedures which contribute to |
| the implementation of the activities of the plan           |

• Stop transferring among principals and teachers during the scholastic year

| Indicators | Standards | Baseline<br>2009 | Target<br>2015 | June 2012<br>Group 1 | June 2012<br>Group 2&3 | June<br>2012<br>Group | June 2013<br>Group 1   | June 2013<br>Group 2  | June 2013<br>Group 3  | June 2013<br>Group 4   | June, 2013<br>Average                                       |  |
|------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--|
|            |           |                  |                |                      |                        |                       | follow up the<br>implementatio<br>n of<br>curriculum by<br>teachers" and<br>paragraph 13<br>"The<br>directorate<br>supervise the<br>implementatio<br>n of national<br>and<br>international<br>exams and<br>keep records<br>of their<br>results" and<br>paragraph 26<br>"The<br>directorate's<br>staff carry out<br>field visits to<br>girls schools<br>to follow up<br>the<br>achievement<br>for the<br>directorate's<br>plans."<br>The<br>satisfaction<br>degree<br>reached to<br>3.4 whereas<br>the least<br>degree was<br>scored on<br>paragraph 11<br>"the<br>directorate<br>help schools<br>work<br>effectively<br>with student<br>with special<br>needs<br>(Human &<br>Physical<br>Resources)<br>which scored<br>2.3 | e help<br>schools<br>work<br>effectively<br>with<br>student<br>with<br>special<br>needs<br>"low-<br>achievers<br>and gifted<br>students<br>(Human<br>&<br>Physical<br>Resources<br>) which<br>scored<br>2.4 | with student<br>with special<br>needs "low-<br>achievers and<br>gifted<br>students<br>(Human &<br>Physical<br>Resources)<br>which scored<br>2.9 | visits to girls<br>schools to follow<br>up the<br>achievement for<br>the directorate's<br>plans." which<br>scored <b>3.6</b> while<br>the least degree of<br>satisfaction was<br>on paragraph 3<br>The directorates<br>of education<br>provide schools<br>principals and<br>teachers with<br>suitable<br>professional<br>development<br>activities in the<br>fields of teaching-<br>learning process<br>related to<br>students'<br>achievement<br>evaluation" in the<br>following aspects:<br>E) Teaching of<br>students with<br>special needs (low<br>achievers and<br>gifted students)<br>and<br>F) Knowledge on<br>Pedagogy and<br>health and<br>psychological<br>education. And<br>paragraph No. 11<br>'the directorate<br>help schools work<br>effectively with<br>student with<br>special needs<br>(Human &<br>Physical<br>Resources) which<br>scored <b>2.6</b> | (Human &<br>Physical<br>Resources)<br>which scored<br>(2.6) |  |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 Interim Report – Data Analysis

| Notices |
|---------|
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |
|         |

| Indicators   | Standards   | Baseline<br>2009 | Target<br>2015   | June 2012<br>Group 1  | June 2012<br>Group 2&3  | June<br>2012 | June 2013<br>Group 1   | June 2013<br>Group 2   | June 2013<br>Group 3   | June 2013<br>Group 4  | June, 2013<br>Average  |   |
|--|---|------------------|--|---|---|--------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| multuris   | Standarus   |                  |  |   |   |              |  |  |  |   |  |   |
| 1.6 Qualitatively;<br>Degree of<br>satisfaction of<br>Field Directorate<br>staff with<br>support from<br>MoE center to<br>implement Field<br>Directorate<br>Improvement<br>Plans | <ul> <li>Standards</li> <li>Support<br/>provide by<br/>MoE to<br/>ensure the<br/>optimal use<br/>and continue<br/>in developing<br/>the database<br/>on common<br/>needs of<br/>schools</li> <li>Support<br/>provided by<br/>educational<br/>supervisors in<br/>MoE center to<br/>help<br/>directorates<br/>implement<br/>their<br/>professional<br/>plan to meet<br/>their need and<br/>the common<br/>needs of<br/>schools</li> </ul> | A N/             | High level of<br>satisfaction<br>(4.0/5.0) as<br>per the rubrics | The degree of<br>satisfaction<br>among<br>directorates<br>differed and it<br>ranged between<br>low in Mafarq at<br>1.0 to high in<br>North-Eastern<br>Badia at 3.75<br>while satisfaction<br>rate was 2.07 and<br>the standard of<br>professional<br>development<br>opportunities<br>scored the highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction. | The degree of<br>satisfaction<br>among<br>directorates<br>differed and it<br>ranged<br>between low<br>in South<br>Mazar at <b>1.4</b><br>to high in<br>Amman/4<br>while<br>satisfaction<br>rate was <b>3.69</b><br>and the<br>standard of<br>professional<br>development<br>opportunities<br>scored the<br>highest degree<br>of satisfaction. | Group<br>4   | Focus Groups<br>The degree of<br>satisfaction<br>between<br>Directorate'<br>Development<br>Team which<br>reached to<br>(2.3) but it<br>was (1.6) for<br>supervisors<br>The general<br>satisfaction<br>degree was<br>(1.9) and it<br>ranged<br>between low<br>in Jearsh at<br>(1.0) to high<br>South Ghor at<br>(3.0) | Focus<br>Groups<br>The degree<br>of<br>satisfaction<br>between<br>Directorat<br>e'<br>Developm<br>ent Team<br>which<br>reached to<br>(4.0) but it<br>was (3.0)<br>for<br>supervisor<br>s<br>The<br>general<br>satisfactio<br>n degree<br>was (3.5)<br>and it<br>ranged<br>between<br>low in<br>North<br>Mazar at | Focus<br>Groups<br>The degree of<br>satisfaction<br>between<br>Directorate'<br>Development<br>Team which<br>reached to<br>(3.3) but it<br>was (2.3) for<br>supervisors<br>The general<br>satisfaction<br>degree was<br>(2.8)<br>and it ranged<br>between low<br>in South<br>Badia &<br>Ramtha at<br>(2.0) to high<br>Rusaifa & Al-<br>Qaser at (3.5) | Focus Groups<br>The degree of<br>satisfaction<br>between<br>Directorate'<br>Development<br>Team which<br>reached to (2.5)<br>but it was (3.3)<br>for supervisors<br>The general<br>satisfaction<br>degree was (2.9)<br>and it ranged<br>between low in<br>Taybeh &<br>Wasteyeh at (2.0)<br>to high Petra &<br>Salt at (3.5) | Focus Groups<br>The degree of<br>satisfaction<br>between<br>Directorate'<br>Development<br>Team which<br>reached to (2.9)<br>but it was (2.5)<br>for supervisors<br>The general<br>satisfaction<br>degree was<br>(2.7)<br>and it ranged<br>between low in<br>Jerash at (1.0)<br>to high Bani<br>Obeid at (4.5) |   |
|  | MoE center<br>on reports<br>submitted by<br>directorates  |                  |  |   |   |              |  | (2.5) to<br>high <b>Bani</b><br>Obied at<br>(4.5)  |  |   |  | 4 |
|  | <ul> <li>Support<br/>provide by<br/>MoE center to</li> </ul>  |                  |  |   |   |              | <u>Questionnair</u><br><u>e Analysis</u>   | <u>Questionn</u><br>aire   | <u>Questionnair</u><br><u>e Analysis</u>   | <u>Questionnaire</u><br><u>Analysis</u>   | <u>Questionnaire</u><br><u>Analysis</u>  |   |
|  | activate the<br>role of the<br>Educational  |                  |  |   |   |              | The general satisfaction degree was  | Analysis<br>The<br>general   | The general satisfaction degree was  | The general<br>satisfaction degree<br>was (2.6)   | The general satisfaction degree was  |   |
|  | council.<br>- Support<br>provide by<br>MoE center to<br>help  |                  |  |   |   |              | (2.2)<br>The degree of<br>the general<br>satisfaction<br>ranged from   | satisfaction<br>degree was<br>(2.9)<br>The degree<br>of the  | (2.5)<br>The degree of<br>the general<br>satisfaction<br>ranged from   | The degree of the<br>general<br>satisfaction<br>ranged from low<br>in   | (2.5)<br>The degree of<br>the general<br>satisfaction<br>ranged from low   |   |
|  | directorate<br>implement<br>regulations<br>when<br>disbursing the<br>grant and  |                  |  |   |   |              | low in<br>Mafraq at<br>(1.8) to high in<br>North-<br>Eastern<br>Badia at (2.5)   | general<br>satisfaction<br>ranged<br>from low<br>in <b>Madaba</b><br>at <b>(2.6)</b> to  | low in<br>Ramtha at<br>(1.8) to high<br>in Rusaifa &<br>Marka at<br>(2.9)  | <b>Trafela</b> at (2.0)<br>to high in <b>Petra</b> at<br>(3.3)  | in<br>Mafraq &<br>Ramtha at<br>(1.8) to high in<br>Petra at (3.3)  |   |
|  | carry out<br>financial<br>analysis of<br>the grant to   |                  |  |   |   |              |  | high in<br>Bani<br>Obied at<br>(3.1)   |  |   |  |   |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

#### Notices

#### Strengths:

- Educational supervisors' new role which based on offering their experience to any one who wants to benefit from
- Monitoring and evaluation provided by the Managing Directorate of Planning and Educational Research at the Ministry's center to the SDDP

#### Weaknesses:

- Poor communication and follow-up by the Managing Directorate of Education Training Center at the Ministry's center to SDDP and failure to provide feedback on report submitted by the directorates of education
- Lack of support provided by the educational supervisors at Ministry's center to assist directorates of education in implementing professional development plans to meet their needs and the common needs of schools
- Lack of a sufficient number of supervisors to cover the program as required
- Multiplicity of programs and projects with similar goals, which are carried out by the Ministry and lack of coordination among them. In addition to the large number of incongruent training courses
- Lack of support offered by Ministry's center to support efforts exerted by the directorates of education to trigger the Educational Development Council because of legislation, regulations and laws

- The Ministry should develop a database of the common needs of the directorates of education.
- The Ministry should amend the instructions pertain to the financial support offered to the directorates of education and schools so that the value of support meets their actual needs.
- The Ministry should organize and hold ongoing workshops to raise awareness of the importance of the program to clarify the roles and responsibilities of all those involved in the program.
- Educational supervisors at the Ministry's center should provide the required support to help directorates of education implement professional development plans to meet the needs of the directorates and the common needs of the schools.
- The Ministry should provide sufficient number of supervisors to cover the program as required.
- The Ministry's center should provide support the directorates' efforts to activate the Educational Development Council through the amendment of legislation, regulations and laws.
- The Ministry's center should integrate development programs that have similar objectives.

| Indicators | Standards  | Baseline<br>2009 | Target<br>2015 | June 2012<br>Group 1 | June 2012<br>Group 2&3 | June<br>2012<br>Group<br>4 | June 2013<br>Group 1   | June 2013<br>Group 2   | June 2013<br>Group 3   | June 2013<br>Group 4   | June, 2013<br>Average  |  |
|------------|--|------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|            | define aspects<br>of its<br>disbursement<br>at schools and<br>directorates<br>– The effect of<br>data and<br>information<br>resulted from<br>the<br>implementati<br>on of SDDP<br>submitted by<br>directorates to<br>MoE on<br>policy<br>development<br>or to reach at<br>new policies<br>or<br>instructions |                  |                |                      |                        |                            | The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was on<br>paragraph 2<br>"The<br>educational<br>supervisors<br>provide<br>support to<br>implement<br>professional<br>development<br>plan to the<br>needs of the<br>directorates of<br>education and<br>schools"<br>which reached<br>to 2.2<br>whereas; the<br>least degree<br>was on<br>paragraph 1<br>"MoE<br>provides<br>Support to<br>ensure the<br>optimal use<br>and continue<br>in developing<br>the database<br>on common<br>needs of<br>schools<br>And<br>paragraph 4<br>"MoE<br>provides<br>support to<br>activate the<br>role of the<br>Educational<br>councils" at<br>(2.0) | The<br>highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was on<br>paragraph<br>2 ""MoE<br>provides<br>support to<br>ensure the<br>optimal<br>use and<br>continue<br>in<br>developing<br>the<br>database<br>on<br>common<br>needs of<br>schools"<br>and<br>paragraph<br>1 "<br>The<br>educationa<br>l<br>supervisor<br>s provide<br>support to<br>implement<br>profession<br>al<br>developme<br>nt plan to<br>the needs<br>of the<br>directorate<br>s of<br>education<br>and<br>schools"<br>which<br>reached to<br><b>3.0</b><br>whereas;<br>the lowest<br>degree was<br>on<br>paragraph<br>4 "MoE<br>provides | The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction<br>was on<br>paragraph 3<br>"The Ministry<br>provides<br>feedback on<br>reports<br>submitted<br>your<br>directorate"<br>and paragraph<br>4<br>"MoE<br>provides<br>support to<br>activate the<br>role of the<br>Educational<br>council", and<br>paragraph 6<br>"The effect of<br>data and<br>information<br>resulted from<br>the<br>implementation<br>resulted from<br>the<br>implementation<br>n of SDDP<br>submitted by<br>your<br>directorate to<br>MoE on<br>policy<br>development<br>or to reach at<br>new policies<br>or<br>instructions"<br>which scored<br>2.6 whereas<br>the lowest<br>satisfaction<br>degree was on<br>paragraph 1<br>"MoE<br>provides<br>Support to<br>ensure the<br>optimal use<br>and continue<br>in developing<br>the database | The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction was<br>on paragraph 1<br>"MoE provides<br>Support to ensure<br>the optimal use<br>and continue in<br>developing the<br>database on<br>common needs of<br>schools" which<br>reached to 2.7<br>whereas; the<br>lowest degree was<br>on paragraph<br>3"The Ministry<br>provides feedback<br>on reports<br>submitted your<br>directorate" and<br>paragraph 4<br>"MoE provides<br>support to<br>activate the role<br>of the<br>Educational<br>councils" at (2.3) | The highest<br>degree of<br>satisfaction was<br>on paragraph 2<br>"The<br>educational<br>supervisors<br>provide support<br>to implement<br>professional<br>development<br>plan to the<br>needs of the<br>directorates of<br>education and<br>schools" and<br>paragraph 6<br>"The effect of<br>data and<br>information<br>resulted from<br>the<br>implementation<br>of SDDP<br>submitted by<br>your directorate<br>to MoE on<br>policy<br>development or<br>to reach at new<br>policies or<br>instructions"<br>which reached<br>to 2.5<br>whereas the<br>lowest<br>satisfaction<br>degree was on<br>paragraph 1<br>"MoE provides<br>Support to<br>ensure the<br>optimal use and<br>continue in<br>developing the<br>database on<br>common needs<br>of schools" and<br>paragraph 4<br>"MoE provides<br>support to<br>activate the role<br>of the |  |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

Notices

• The Ministry's center should carry out ongoing follow-up and coordination and provide feedback on the reports submitted which are related to SDDP and intensify field visits to the directorates of education by the supervisors of the Ministry.

| Indicators   | Standards | Baseline<br>2009 | Target<br>2015  | June 2012<br>Group 1 | June 2012<br>Group 2&3 | June<br>2012<br>Group<br>4 | June 2013<br>Group 1 | June 2013<br>Group 2  | June 2013<br>Group 3                          | June 2013<br>Group 4 | June, 2013<br>Average  |
|--|-----------|------------------|---|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---|---|----------------------|--|
|  |           |                  |   |                      |                        | -                          |                      | Support by<br>to activate<br>the role of<br>the<br>Education<br>al council"<br>at (2.7) | on common<br>needs of<br>schools" at<br>(2.3) |                      | <i>Educational</i><br><i>councils</i> " and<br>paragraph 3<br><i>"The Ministry</i><br><i>provides</i><br><i>feedback on</i><br><i>reports</i><br><i>submitted your</i><br><i>directorate</i> "<br>at (2.4) |
| 1.7 Qualitatively<br>Degree to which<br>SDDP<br>Communication<br>Strategy is<br>implemented  |           | N/A              | High level of<br>implementatio<br>n (4.0/5.0) as<br>per the rubrics | NOT IMPLEMEN         |                        |                            |                      |   |   |                      |  |
| 1.8 Qualitatively; of<br>satisfaction of<br>MoE staff with<br>inter-<br>departmental<br>communications<br>at the Center,<br>Field<br>Directorates and<br>Schools, and<br>with<br>communication<br>with local<br>community in<br>relation to SDDP |           | N/A              | High level of<br>satisfaction<br>(4.0/5.0) as<br>per the rubrics    | NOT IMPLEMENT        | TED YET                |                            |                      |   |   |                      |  |

# **School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP)** The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

The communication strategy was approved in the second half of the year 2012, training manuals were prepared in addition to the training of a pilot group of staff at Ministry's center including both the staff of the Managing Directorate of Information and Communal Communication, the staff of Davison of Public Service at the Directorate of General Divan and the staff of Department of Website in the Managing Directorate of the Queen Rania Center for Education and Information Technology. The training manuals were experimented on a sample of specialized directors at Ministry's center as part of a special training guide of senior management. An awareness session on strategy was held to the heads of departments of information and Communal Communication in the directorates of education.

It is early to measure this indicator

| Percentage of<br>schoolgroup OVE and<br>THR levelplans met<br>minimum<br>mprovement<br>plans mit<br>minimum<br>maschool needsproces was (3.0.<br>minimum<br>school needswavrage score<br>minimum<br>accore va<br>standards (4.0wavrage score<br>minimum<br>movest district<br>wavrage score<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>profitiesaverage score<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>aligned with<br>profitiesaverage score<br>the lowest of<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>profitiesprofities<br>minimum<br>school needsaverage score<br>the lowest of<br>minimum<br>movest district<br>wavrage score vas (3.0.)average score<br>wavrage score<br>the lowest of<br>aligned with<br>aligned with<br>results<br>aligned with<br>resultsprofities<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>profitiesaverage score<br>the lowest of<br>aligned with<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>procedure<br>free score<br>standardsaverage score<br>the lowest of<br>aligned with<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>procedure<br>free score<br>(4.1) and the<br>bighest sub-<br>minimum<br>mealingaverage score<br>the lowest of<br>aligned with<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>mealingaverage score<br>the lowest of<br>aligned with<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>minimum<br>mealingaverage score<br>the | Indica  |   | Standards  | Baseline<br>2009 | Target<br>2015  | June 2012<br>Group 1  | June 2012<br>Group 2&3   | June<br>2012<br>Group<br>4 | June 2013<br>Group 1   | June 2013<br>Group 2   | June 2013<br>Group 3   | June 2013<br>Group 4   | June, 2013<br>Average   |   |
|---|---|---|--|------------------|---|---|--|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Percentage of<br>schoolgroup <i>DVE</i> and<br><i>THREPE</i> plans:plans met<br>minimum<br>standards (40)wavrage score<br>the lowest district<br>wavrage score<br>the school needsaverage score<br>minimum<br>aligned with<br>profilesaverage score<br>the lowest district<br>wavrage score<br>the lowest district<br>wavrage score<br>the lowest district<br>aligned with<br>results<br>aligned with<br>resultsprofiles<br>the lowest district<br>madoru district<br>wavrage score by<br>standard<br>aligned with<br>results aligned with<br>resultsaverage score<br>the lowest district<br>wavrage score by<br>standard<br>aligned with<br>results aligned with<br>results<br>aligned with<br>resultsprofiles<br>the lowest district<br>wavrage score by<br>  | Innieulate  |   | 1.1: A whole-schoo   | of freeds-based  | i, gender sensitiv  | e development appr  | oach at the level  | OI MOE CO                  | enter, riela Dire  | ctorates and s   | chools implement   | aed with active part   | icipation of loca   | i con                                   |
| angled with<br>prioritiesof (77) which<br>werewhich<br>reached toboys'with quality<br>scoredscored3. Results are<br>clearly writtenclearly writtenclearly written4.0 while<br>it was 3.7aligned with<br>(83%)math definition  | 1.1.1 Quant<br>Percer<br>schoo<br>impro<br>plans<br>minim<br>qualit | titatively;<br>entage of<br>ol<br>ovement<br>that meet<br>num<br>ty | For plans of<br>group ONE and<br>THREE plans:<br>– Priorities<br>based on<br>school needs<br>– Results<br>aligned with<br>priorities<br>– Indicators<br>aligned with<br>results<br>– Procedure<br>aligned with<br>results<br>– Suitable<br>responsibiliti<br>es assigned<br>for each<br>procedure<br>– Realistic<br>timeframe<br>– Endorsed by<br>the<br>education<br>council of<br>schools<br>network<br>For directorates'<br>plans of groups<br>TWO and<br>FOUR plans:<br>1. School<br>common<br>needs and<br>directorate<br>needs inform<br>priorities as<br>shown in data<br>review.<br>2. Results are<br>clearly written<br>4. Indicators | •                | 90% of school<br>plans meet<br>minimum<br>standards (4.0<br>Score) as per | Overall average<br>score was (3.0).<br>The lowest<br>district was<br>Mafraq (2.4) and<br>the highest was<br>Giza (4.3). The<br>highest sub-<br>indicator was<br>"results aligned<br>with priorities"<br>(4.1) and the<br>lowest was<br>"responsibilities<br>identified for each<br>procedure (1.7).<br>There were<br>significant<br>difference<br>between boys and<br>girls/mixed<br>schools for<br>girls/mixed | Overall<br>average score<br>was 4.2. The<br>lowest district<br>was Madaba<br>and South<br>Badia (3.9) for<br>both, and the<br>highest was<br>Russaifah<br>(4.7). The<br>highest sub-<br>indicator was<br>"results<br>aligned with<br>priorities"<br>(4.5) and the<br>lowest was<br>"responsibiliti<br>es identified<br>for each<br>procedure<br>(3.8). No<br>significant<br>difference<br>between boys<br>and<br>girls/mixed | of MoE C                   | Overall<br>average score<br>was 3.3<br>The lowest of<br>quality<br>standard<br>alignment was<br>scored by<br>Jerash at 1.9<br>and the<br>highest was<br>scored by<br>Mafraq<br>Qasbat at 4.1<br>The indicator<br>"Procedures<br>and activity<br>are aligned<br>with results"<br>scored the<br>highest degree<br>at 3.9<br>Whereas the<br>degree was<br>scored by the<br>indicator<br>"The<br>timeframe is<br>Realistic"<br>(NO)<br>Girls' schools<br>achieve the<br>highest degree<br>which reached<br>to 3.3 while it<br>was 3.2 for<br>boys'<br>Standards<br>aligned with<br>(29) plans out<br>of (77) which<br>were<br>evaluated.<br>Therefore; | Overall<br>average<br>score was<br><b>3.9</b><br>The lowest<br>of quality<br>standard<br>alignment<br>was scored<br>by <b>North</b><br><b>Mazar</b> at<br><b>3.5</b> and<br>the highest<br>was scored<br>by<br><b>Madaba</b><br><b>Qasbat</b> at<br><b>4.2</b><br>The<br>indicator<br>"Procedur<br>es and<br>activity are<br>linked with<br>results"<br>scored the<br>highest<br>degree at<br><b>4.5</b><br>Whereas<br>the degree<br>was scored<br>by the<br>indicator<br>" <i>timefram</i><br>e is<br>Realistic"<br>(No)<br>Girls'<br>schools<br>achieve the<br>highest<br>degree<br>which<br>reached to<br><b>4.0</b> while<br>it was <b>3.7</b> | Overall<br>average score<br>was 3.9<br>The lowest of<br>quality<br>standard<br>alignment was<br>scored by Ein<br>Al-Basah at<br>3.4 and the<br>highest was<br>scored by<br><i>Russiafah</i> at<br>4.3<br>The indicators<br>" <i>Procedures</i><br>and activity<br>are aligned<br>with results"<br>and "They<br>were endorsed<br>by the<br>educational<br>council of<br>schools<br>network"<br>scored the<br>highest degree<br>at 4.3 where<br>as the<br>indicator "The<br>implantation<br>timeframe is<br><i>Realistic</i> "<br>Scored lowest<br>degree at<br>"NO"<br>Girls' schools<br>achieve the<br>highest degree<br>which reached<br>to 4.0 while it<br>was 3.7 for<br>boys'<br>Standards<br>aligned with<br>(31) plans out | Overall average<br>score was 4.4The lowest of<br>quality standard<br>alignment was<br>scored by Ajlun<br>at 4.1 and the<br>highest was<br>scored by Tafela<br>& Quwaismeh at<br>4.6. The indicator<br>"They were<br>endorsed by the<br>education<br>council of school<br>network" was the<br>highest (105) at<br>(4.9) while the<br>lowest degree was<br>scored by the<br>indicator "The<br>implementation<br>timeframe is<br>Realistic" (YES)<br>at (4.1)Girls' schools<br>achieve the<br>highest degree<br>which reached to<br>4.4 while it was<br>4.5 for boys'Standards<br>aligned with (49)<br>plans out of<br>(59) which were<br>evaluated.<br>Therefore; the<br>percentage of<br>school<br>development<br>plans' alignment<br>with quality<br>standards was | Groups ONE &<br>THREE<br>Overall averag<br>score was 3.5<br>The lowest of<br>quality standar<br>alignment was<br>scored by<br>Jerash at 1.9<br>and the highest<br>was scored by<br>Russiafah at4.<br>The indicator<br>"Procedures<br>and activity ar<br>aligned with<br>results" scored<br>the highest<br>degree at 4.3<br>while the lowe<br>degree was<br>scored by the<br>indicator<br>The<br>implementatio<br>timeframe is<br>Realistic" (NC<br>Girls' schools<br>achieve the<br>highest degree<br>which reached<br>to 3.6 while it<br>was 3.4 for | & e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e |

# **School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 Interim Report – Data Analysis**

| Notice | S |
|--------|---|
|--------|---|

#### ommunity

# **GROUP ONE:**

#### Strengths:

- Procedures (activities) are linked to the results of the majority of the plans.
- Responsibilities were identified for procedures (activities) intended to be implemented for the majority of the plans.

#### Weaknesses:

- Priorities were not set according to the needs of the school, as shown by self-revision data in many plans.
- Results were not linked with the priorities of the school in many plans
- Indicators were not linked with desired results to be achieved in many plans.
- Implementation timetable is not realistic in many plans.
- Many of the plans were not approved by the Educational Council for the school network.
- Many of the plans lacked result-based standards plans and the need to be re-designed comprehensively.

#### **Recommendations:**

- The Ministry should develop a database of the common needs of the directorates of education.
- The Ministry should build the capacity of those who are involved in the schools and directorates of education in the area of results-oriented management.
- Schools and directorates of education should rebuild all of development & procedural plans through using resultsoriented management methodology by the direct supervision and support of those involved at the Ministry's center level.
- Concerned staff in the directorates of education should visit schools periodically to ensure implementation of the recommendations contained in the M&E report issued by the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation.

# **GROUP THREE:**

# Strengths:

- Priorities are set according to the needs of schools as shown in self-revision data in most plans.
- Results are linked with the priorities of schools in most plans.
- Indicators are linked with the desired results to be achieved in most plans.
- Procedures (activities) are linked with results in most of the plans.
- Responsibilities were identified for the indented action (activities) to be implemented in most of the plans.

| Indicators | Standards   | Baseline<br>2009 | Target<br>2015 | June 2012<br>Group 1 | June 2012<br>Group 2&3 | June<br>2012<br>Group<br>4 | June 2013<br>Group 1  | June 2013<br>Group 2  | June 2013<br>Group 3   | June 2013<br>Group 4 | June, 2013<br>Average   |  |
|------------|---|------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---|--|
|            | written<br>6. Indicators are<br>aligned with<br>outcomes<br>7. Activities,<br>outcomes and<br>results are<br>logically<br>aligned<br>8. Responsibilitie<br>s of activities<br>intended to be<br>carried out are<br>defined<br>9. Realistic<br>implementation<br>n timeframe<br>10. Endorsed by<br>educational<br>development<br>council |                  |                |                      |                        |                            | plans'<br>alignment<br>with quality<br>standards<br>was (38%) | with (16)<br>plans out<br>of (34)<br>which<br>were<br>evaluated.<br>Therefore;<br>the<br>percentag<br>e of school<br>developme<br>nt plans'<br>alignment<br>with<br>quality<br>standards<br>was (41%) | the<br>percentage of<br>school<br>development<br>plans'<br>alignment<br>with quality<br>standards<br>was (57%) |                      | "Procedures<br>and activity are<br>aligned with<br>results" and<br>"They were<br>endorsed by the<br>educational<br>council of<br>schools<br>network""<br>scored the<br>highest degree<br>at 4.6<br>while the lowest<br>degree was<br>scored by the<br>indicator<br>The<br>implementation<br>timeframe is<br>Realistic " at 3.6<br>(NO)<br>Girls' schools<br>achieve the<br>highest degree<br>which reached<br>to 4.1 while it<br>was 4.3 for<br>boys'<br>Standards<br>aligned with<br>(125)plans out<br>of (227)which<br>were evaluated.<br>Therefore; the<br>percentage of<br>school<br>development<br>plans'<br>alignment with<br>quality<br>standards was<br>(55%) |  |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

| Notices |
|---------|
|         |
|         |
|         |

• Most plans were approved by the educational councils of the school networks.

#### Weaknesses:

- Implementation timetable of many plans is not realistic.
- There are some plans need to be re-designed wholly and others need to be re-check to meet the standards.

#### **Recommendations:**

- Directorates of Education should continue develop capacity in the field of results-oriented management in collaboration with concerned staff in the Ministry's center and reflect this in the developmental and procedural plans of schools and directorates of education.
- Concerned staff in the directorates of education should visit schools periodically to ensure implementation of the recommendations contained in the M&E report issued by the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation.

# **GROUP TWO & FOUR:**

### Strengths:

- Priorities are set according to the needs of schools as shown in self-revision data in most plans.
- Results are linked with the priorities of schools in most plans.
- Results are correctly written in most plans.
- Indicators are linked with the desired results to be achieved in most plans.
- Outcomes are correctly written in most plans.
- Indicators are linked with outcomes in most plans.
- There is a logical link between activities, output, and outcomes in most plans.
- Responsibilities are defined for activities intended to be implemented in most of the plans.
- Responsibilities & activities are approved by the Board of Educational Development in most plans.

### Weaknesses:

- Implementation timetable of many plans is not realistic.
- There are some plans need to be re-designed wholly and others need to be re-check to meet the standards.

- Directorates of Education should continue in providing capacity building activities in the field of results-oriented management in collaboration with concerned staff in the Ministry's center and reflect this in the developmental and procedural plans of schools.
- Concerned staff in the directorates of education should visit schools periodically to ensure implementation of the recommendations contained in the M&E report issued by the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation.

| Interlige of<br>the property of<br>th | 1.1.2 Quantitatively; | For directorates' | N/A | 90% of      | Overall average   | Overall      | Overall       | Overall                | Overall          | Overall      | Groups: ONE &   | GRO   |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|-----|-------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------|
| <ul> <li>differentiate</li> <li>i. Schold and intervention and generation and interventiation in the process information and process information in the process information information information in the process information information in the process information information information in the process information information in the process information informatino information information information information information</li></ul>   | Percentage of         | plans of groups   |     | directorate | score of          |              | average score | average                | average          | average      | THREE           |       |
| <ul> <li>Laplack that means and directories</li> <li>standards</li> <li>(4.0-5) Scott</li> <li>(4.0-5) Scott</li></ul>   | field                 | ONE & THREE       |     | improvement | standards         | of standards | of standards  | score of               | score of         | score of     | Overall average |       |
| and methodsand method   | directorate           |                   |     |             | alignment was     |              |               | standards              | standards        | standards    |                 |       |
| minimum mass<br>guality<br>andords       cools alform<br>pointies       (d) 50 Viscorp)<br>sorth Ghe<br>nubrics       South Ghe<br>nubrics       North<br>sorth Ghe<br>nub  |                       |                   |     |             | (2.7).            |              | <b>3.7</b> .  |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| quality<br>standardsexpert at C3D<br>with prioritiessorred in Ear<br>resultssorred in Ear<br>sorred in Ear<br>adigned with<br>adigned with<br>a   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               | was <mark>3.9</mark> . |                  |              |                 |       |
| sandards       2. Recult algoed<br>with priorities<br>aligned with<br>results       indicators<br>aligned with<br>results   | minimum               |                   |     | · · · ·     |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| <ul> <li>a til promite:</li> <li>a til produktion:</li> <li>a transmitting occurrent i til produktion:</li> <li>a transmit</li></ul>  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        | scored the       |              |                 |       |
| 3. Indicators       aligned with<br>results       aligned with<br>results       Al-Basha al<br>(4.1)       Al-Basha al<br>(4.5)       aligned with<br>results       while the<br>bighest was<br>cored by while<br>the bighest was<br>cored by<br>aligned with<br>results       while the<br>bighest was<br>cored by<br>aligned with<br>results       while the<br>bighest was<br>cored by<br>aligned with<br>results       Al-Basha al<br>(4.5)       while the<br>bighest was<br>cored by<br>aligned with<br>results       Al-Basha al<br>(4.5)       while the<br>bighest was<br>cored by<br>aligned with<br>results       Al-Paser al<br>(4.6)       Wreat<br>bighest was<br>cored by<br>while the<br>aligned with<br>results       Al-Paser al<br>(4.6)       Wreat<br>bighest was<br>cored by<br>while the<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>while the<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>while the<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>while the<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>while the<br>scored by<br>while the<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>while the<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>scor   | standards             |                   |     | rubrics     |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| Image: construct resultsStored North-<br>Eastern Badin<br>a digned with<br>a digned with<br>identified for<br>exponsibilitiesEastern Badin<br>of They<br>construct<br>of Construct<br>sensitive"Image: construct<br>the highest<br>the h  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| Image: constant of the standard of the standar  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  | 0            |                 | • Imp |
| 4. Procedures       at (4.1)       The standard       of "They consider       the highest example in the indicator in the frame indicator in the frame indicator in the frame indicator in the frame indicator indinonindic indinitia indicator indinindicator indi   |                       | -                 |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| aligned with<br>results<br>responsibilitiesThe standard<br>of<br>The standard<br>of<br>The standard<br>of<br>The standard<br>of They<br>gender<br>schedi<br>infineframe<br>the flowest was<br>schedie de statis"<br>of anotanditation<br>timeframe<br>the flowest was<br>schedie de statis"<br>of anotanditation<br>the flowest was<br>schedie de statis"Eastern Badin de<br>the standard of<br>the standard of<br>the standard of<br>the standard of<br>the standard of<br>the standard statis"<br>the standard statis<br>the standard statis<br>the standard statis"<br>the standard statis<br>the standard statis"<br>the standard statis<br>the standard  |                       |                   |     |             |                   | (4.5)        |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| Image: consider space in the standard of the space in the lowest of the space in the l  |                       |                   |     |             | at ( <b>4.1</b> ) |              |               | -                      |                  |              |                 |       |
| 5. Appropriate<br>responsibilities<br>identified for<br>each activity<br>each activity       of<br>implementation<br>integrane"       of<br>implementation<br>integrane"       The standard<br>of<br>"They<br>which scored       The standard<br>of<br>"They<br>consider       The standard<br>of<br>"They<br>standards       The standard<br>of<br>"Standards  |                       | U                 |     |             |                   |              |               |                        | <mark>4.9</mark> |              | Qaser at 4.9    | achi  |
| responsibilities"ImplementationgenderThe standardStandard"They consider"They managementeach activityeach activityscored thescored thewhich scoredconsider"They consider"They considerstandard of"Considerscored here sciencesscored here s  |                       |                   |     |             |                   | •            | at 4.4        | •                      |                  | <b>5.0</b>   |                 | • Mos |
| identified for<br>each activity<br>each activity<br>6. Realistic<br>implementation<br>timeframeon nimeframe'<br>screet full<br>highest degree<br>(2,2)on nimeframe'<br>consider<br>gender<br>consider<br>gender<br>screet full<br>(2,2)consider<br>gender<br>screet full<br>screet   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 | Dev   |
| cach activityscored the<br>highest degree<br>implementation<br>timeframescored the<br>highest degree<br>at (5.0) whereas<br>the lowest<br>scored lowest<br>activitymethod<br>scored lowest<br>scored lowest<br>sco   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               | <mark>4.8</mark>       |                  |              | •               | • Nor |
| 6. Realistichighest degree<br>implementation<br>timeframehighest degree<br>extra dard<br>at (5.0) whereas<br>scored by the<br>two standards'gender<br>scored<br>scored<br>gender<br>scored<br>gender<br>scored<br>gender<br>scored<br>gender<br>scored<br>gender<br>scored<br>gender<br>scored<br>gender<br>standard of<br>scored<br>gender<br>scored<br>gender<br>standard of<br>"Theight the<br>standard of<br>"Theight the<br>   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              | •             |                        |                  | •            |                 | mal   |
| implementationat (5.0) whereas<br>the lowest was<br>scored by the<br>two standards"scored in lowest<br>scored by the<br>two standards"scored in lowest<br>scored by the<br>two standards"scored in lowest<br>scored by the<br>two standards"scored in lowest<br>standard of<br>"Indicators<br>and dretorate" was<br>the lighest scored by<br>educational<br>desired results"scored in lowest<br>scored by the<br>two standards"scored in lowest<br>scored by the<br>two standard of<br>"Indicators"scored in lowest<br>scored by<br>education<br>digene thin<br>in the lighest scored by<br>educational<br>development<br>endorsed by<br>educational<br>developmentscored in lowest<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>indicator scored by<br>educational<br>development<br>development<br>of (I which<br>were set)scored in lowest<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>indicator scored by<br>educational<br>development<br>development<br>of themscored in lowest<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>indicator scored by<br>indicator scored by<br>educational<br>development<br>of (I which<br>were set)scored in lowest<br>scored by<br>scored by<br>indicator scored by<br>council of<br>schools<br>the highest scored<br>by<br>scored by<br>council of<br>schools<br>indicator scored by<br>council of<br>schools<br>indicator scored by<br>council of<br>schools<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>shown in data<br>review.<br>correctly<br>schools<br>indicators ar<br>aligned with<br>desired enditiesscored indicator<br>schools<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicatorsstandard of<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indicators<br>indica  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 | • Mar |
| timeframethe lowest was<br>educational<br>developmentscored ty the<br>vos standards"<br>"Indicators<br>aligned with<br>actor of<br>genderscored ty the<br>wile the<br>standard of<br>"Indicators<br>aligned with<br>actor of<br>gendercored ty the<br>standard of<br>"Indicators<br>aligned with<br>actor of<br>"Indicators<br>aligned with<br>desired results"<br>andscored ty the<br>standard of<br>"Indicators<br>aligned with<br>wile the<br>standard of<br>"Indicators<br>aligned with<br>the highest<br>scored the<br>scored the<br>standard of<br>"Indicators"<br>scored the<br>standard of<br>"Indicators"<br>aligned with<br>educational<br>degree attributed the<br>standard of<br>"Indicators"<br>aligned with<br>degree attributed the<br>standard score<br>aligned with<br>degree attributed the<br>standard score<br>aligned with<br>degree attributed the<br>standard score<br>"Indicators"<br>aligned with<br>degree attributed the<br>standard score<br>"Indicators attributed the<br>standard score<br>"Indicators"<br>aligned with<br>degree attributed the<br>standard score<br>"Indicators"<br>aligned with<br>degree attributed the<br>standard score<br>"Indicators attributed the<br>standard score<br>"Indicator  |                       |                   |     |             |                   | (2.2)        |               |                        |                  |              |                 | desi  |
| Productional<br>development<br>council of<br>schools<br>network'<br>andscored by the<br>two standards'<br>"Indicators<br>aligned with<br>development<br>and<br>desired results"degree NO<br>scored<br>standard of<br>"Indicators<br>accord us<br>scored by<br>development<br>desired results"degree NO<br>scored<br>standard of<br>scored the<br>standard of<br>the<br>scored the<br>scored the<br>   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               | •                      |                  |              |                 |       |
| educationaltwo standards"<br>"Indicators<br>aligned with<br>eshoolstwo standards"<br>"Indicators<br>aligned with<br>desired results"while the<br>scoredsensitive"<br>"Indicators<br>scoredwhile the<br>scored"Setting<br>"Priorities""Setting<br>"standards of<br>"Indicators<br>according to the<br>or time frame<br>or time frame<br>is realistic""Setting<br>"standards of<br>"Indicators<br>according to the<br>or time frame<br>or time frame<br>is realistic""While the<br>scored<br>the<br>the scored<br>the<br>scored the<br>the highest scored<br>the<br>the highest scored<br>the highest  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| concal of<br>development<br>conneil of<br>schoolsTheorem<br>aligned with<br>adired results"<br>andwine use<br>aligned with<br>adired results"<br>andwine use<br>aligned with<br>adired results"<br>andwine use<br>aligned with<br>according to the<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oricSendard of<br>"Implementati<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>oric<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo<br>invo   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 | Reco  |
| IndextorInductorStandard ofStandard of  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              | 0               |       |
| Image: Control of<br>schools<br>networkdagmet with<br>and<br>desired results"<br>anddagmet with<br>and<br>desired results"<br>anddagmet with<br>and<br>is realistic"<br>is cored the<br>highest scored<br>of<br>development<br>council of<br>to mono needs<br>and directorateDivest<br>the priorities'<br>and and and and and and and and and and   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              | •               |       |
| and workand<   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              | •             |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| B.Integration of<br>gender"They<br>endorsed by<br>endorsed by<br>endorse   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| Solution of<br>genderIntegration of<br>educational<br>development<br>council of<br>schoolIntegration of<br>educational<br>development<br>council of<br>schoolsIntegration of<br>educational<br>schoolsIntegration of<br>educational<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>council of<br>schoolsIntegration of<br>educational<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>development<br>deve  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| Image: StandardsConcent of the standards<   |                       | -                 |     |             | •                 |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 | _     |
| For directorates'<br>plans of groupsdevelopment<br>council of<br>schoolsThe diamon<br>s aligned<br>with<br>standardsThe diamon<br>s aligned<br>with<br>standardsThe diamon<br>s aligned<br>with<br>standardsThe diamon<br>s aligned<br>aligned with<br>development<br>aligned with<br>development<br>schoolsGroups: TWO<br>educational<br>& FOUR<br>tereal of<br>Div<br>aligned with<br>aligned with<br>aligned with<br>aligned with<br>aligned withThe diamon<br>s aligned with<br>aligned with<br>development<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>the<br>priorities as<br>school with prioritiesThe diamon<br>development<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>the<br>the<br>plans out<br>priorities as<br>school with prioritiesThe diamon<br>development<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>the<br>the<br>plans out<br>priorities as<br>school with prioritiesThe diamon<br>development<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>tereal of<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>plans out<br>plans out<br>plans out<br>the<br>the<br>plans out<br>plans out<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br><td></td> <td>gender</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>degree at 5.0</td> <td></td> <td>stanuaru at 4.0</td> <td></td>   |                       | gender            |     |             |                   |              |               |                        | degree at 5.0    |              | stanuaru at 4.0 |       |
| IndicatorUniversity<br>plans of groups<br>TWO & FOURCouncil of<br>schoolsCouncil of<br>   |                       | For directorates' |     |             |                   |              |               |                        | "Onality         | •            | Groups: TWO     |       |
| TWO & FOURcontrolcontrolcontroldesiredaligned withdesiredaligned withdesiredaligned withdesiredaligned withAverage scorereconcil ofoverall ofstandards1. Schoolnetwork" at(1.6) for eachof them(1.6) for eachof them''Ouality''Oualityout of forout of forschoolsstandardsaligned withaligned with  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              | "Ouality      |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| 1. School<br>common needs<br>and directorate<br>needs inform<br>priorities as<br>shown in data<br>review.network" at<br>(1.6) for each<br>of themnetwork" at<br>(1.6) for each<br>of themaligned with<br>(4) plans out<br>of (7) which<br>were<br>evaluated.fesuits" at<br>50<br>out of 16<br>were<br>evaluated.council of<br>schools<br>out of 16<br>were<br>evaluated.council of<br>schools<br>out of 16<br>were<br>evaluated.council of<br>schoolsoverall of<br>schoolsDiv<br>schools<br>schools2. Results aigned<br>with priorities<br>aligned with<br>deired results are<br>clearly written071which<br>schoolwere<br>evaluated.160<br>plans out<br>of (7) which<br>were<br>the<br>plans out<br>plans out<br>of (2)overall of<br>school<br>which<br>with (2)North Mazar<br>school<br>which<br>were<br>the<br>plans out<br>of school<br>whichWhich<br>were<br>evaluated.North Mazar<br>aligned with (2)Which<br>were<br>evaluated.Which<br>were<br>evaluated.North Mazar<br>aligned with<br>scored the<br>lowest degree at<br>aligned withNorth Mazar<br>scored the<br>lowest degree at<br>aligned with<br>which were<br>were<br>the<br>with quality<br>the<br>standards was<br>(57%)School<br>school<br>with quality<br>the<br>standards was<br>(57%)School<br>schoolSchool<br>school<br>with quality<br>the<br>standards was<br>(57%)School<br>schoolWhich<br>were<br>school<br>with quality<br>the<br>standards was<br>(57%)School<br>school<br>with quality<br>the<br>the<br>school<br>developmen<br>aligned withNorth Mazar<br>school<br>school<br>which were<br>school<br>schoolNorth Mazar<br>school<br>which<br>with quality<br>the<br>the refore;<br>the<br>the refore;<br>the<br><td></td> <td></td>   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| Instantion<   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  | -            |                 | Div   |
| and directorate<br>needs inform<br>priorities as<br>shown in data<br>   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| needs inform<br>priorities as<br>shown in data<br>review.needs inform<br>priorities as<br>shown in data<br>review.were<br>evaluated.Standards<br>evaluated.evaluated.<br>aligned<br>with (2)4.2<br>North Mazar<br>Ware<br>evaluated.Morth Mazar<br>Ware<br>evaluated.Morth Mazar<br>With (2)GRC<br>Strem<br>North Mazar<br>evaluated.2. Results aligned<br>with priorities<br>3. Results are<br>clearly written2. Results aligned<br>with quality<br>aligned with<br>desired results5. and ards<br>schoolevaluated.<br>percentage<br>of (2)5. and ards<br>bigment10 west degree at<br>aligned with<br>developmen<br>with quality<br>standards<br>of school5. Outcomes are<br>correctly<br>written5. Outcomes are<br>correctly<br>written5. Outcomes are<br>correctly<br>written10 mest<br>school5. Could mest<br>developmen10 mest<br>school10 me   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| priorities as<br>shown in data<br>review.North Mazar<br>scored the<br>oreview.North Mazar<br>scored the<br>oreview.Street<br>with (2)Hee<br>with (2)Wee<br>the<br>orestageQuality<br>scored the<br>orestadeStreet<br>oreview.2. Results aligned<br>with priorities2. Results aligned<br>with prioritiesImage with<br>school3. Street<br>with (2)Image with<br>scored the<br>percentage of<br>schoolaligned with<br>schoolaligned with<br>scored by Al-<br>out of 10Image with<br>scored by Al-<br>ou  |                       |                   |     |             | or them           |              |               | - •                    |                  |              |                 | GR    |
| shown in data<br>review."Qualityscored the<br>pans out<br>of (2)"Qualityscored the<br>odust degree at<br>aligned with<br>ig plans2. Results aligned<br>with priorities2. Results aligned<br>with priorities3.3<br>standardswith can<br>percentage of<br>schoolof (2)<br>schoolof school<br>developmenStandards<br>aligned with<br>ig plans'<br>out of for<br>schoolbivest degree at<br>aligned with<br>ig plans'<br>which were<br>evaluated.bivest degree at<br>aligned with<br>ig plans'<br>with quality<br>standards was<br>(57%)scored by Al-<br>with quality<br>standards was<br>(57%)with can<br>evaluated.with can<br>percentage<br>of school<br>developmentSalt at 5.0<br>edus<br>scored by Al-<br>which were<br>evaluated.Prioric<br>edus<br>school<br>were<br>were<br>the<br>the plans'<br>alignment<br>with quality<br>standards was<br>of school<br>developme<br>of school<br>developme<br>developme<br>the<br>the<br>standards<br>the<br>the<br>school<br>developme<br>the<br>the<br>standards<br>the<br>the<br>school<br>developme<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>school<br>developme<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>school<br>developme<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<br>the<  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| review.the<br>percentage of<br>with prioritiesplans out<br>of (2)percentage<br>of schoolStandards<br>aligned with<br>development<br>plans'lowest degree at<br>of schoollowest degree at<br>of schoolend<br>of<br>self-<br>highest was3. Results are<br>clearly written4. Indicators<br>aligned with<br>desired results <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>"Ouality</td><td></td><td></td></t<>  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  | "Ouality     |                 |       |
| 2. Results aligned<br>with prioritiesaligned with<br>priorities3.3 while the<br>highest was3.3 while the<br>highest was3.3 while the<br>highest was3.4 while the<br>highest was4.1<br>evaluated.3.4 while the<br>highest was4.1<br>evaluated.4.1<br>highest was4.1<br>evaluated.4.1<br>highest was4.1<br>evaluated.4.1<br>evaluated.4.1<br>evaluated.4.1<br>evaluated.4.1<br>evaluated.4.1<br>evaluated.5.0<br>evaluated.5.0<br>evaluated.5.0<br>evaluated.5.0<br>eventage5.0<br>eventage5.0<br>eventage6.1<br>for school6.1<br>evaluated.6.1<br>evaluated.6.1<br>evaluated.6.1<br>evaluated.6.1<br>evaluated.6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage6.1<br>eventage <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>· · · ·</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              | · · · ·       |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| with priorities<br>3. Results are<br>clearly written<br>4. Indicators<br>aligned with<br>desired resultswith<br>aligned with<br>correctly<br>writtendevelopment<br>(b)<br>(b)<br>(c)which<br>(c)<br>(c)development<br>(c)<br>(c)b)<br>(c)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h)<br>(c)h) <b< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></b<>   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| 3. Results are<br>clearly written3. Results are<br>clearly writtenout of <b>fo</b><br>scored by Al-<br>Qwaismeh &<br>Salt at <b>5.0</b> scored by Al-<br>Under<br>Salt at <b>5.0</b> index<br>index<br>Prod<br>Salt at <b>5.0</b> 4. Indicators<br>aligned with<br>desired resultsalignment<br>with quality<br>the<br>standards was<br>(57%)were<br>evaluated.the<br>standards<br>percentage<br>of school<br>developmescored by Al-<br>Qwaismeh &<br>Salt at <b>5.0</b> index<br>index<br>Prod<br>eRes<br>to b5. Outcomes are<br>correctly<br>writtenof school<br>gendergender<br>of school<br>developmeof school<br>genderimp<br>ecored lowest<br>alignmentimp<br>ecored lowest<br>alignment6. Indicators are<br>aligned withaligned withimp<br>degree <b>NO</b> scored lowest<br>alignmentimp<br>ecore <b>NO</b> 6. Indicators are<br>aligned withaligned withimp<br>degree <b>NO</b> imp<br>ecore <b>NO</b> scored lowest<br>alignment6. Indicators are<br>aligned withaligneentwithimp<br>degree <b>NO</b> scored lowest<br>alignment   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  | (5) plans    |                 |       |
| clearly written<br>4. Indicators<br>aligned with<br>desired resultsclearly writtenmain<br>bit alignedwhich were<br>evaluated.Qwaismeh &<br>standards• Indi<br>• Procession<br>• Resp5. Outcomes are<br>correctly<br>written5. Outcomes are<br>correctly<br>written- Freedome<br>of school<br>written- Freedome<br>of school<br>developme<br>nt plans'- Mes<br>of school<br>developme- Mes<br>of school<br>developme<br>of school<br>developme- Mes<br>of school<br>developme<br>of school<br>developme- Mes<br>of school<br>developme- Mes<br>of school<br>developme- Mes<br>of school<br>developme<br>of school- Mes<br>of school<br>developme- Mes<br>of school  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  | out of (6)   |                 |       |
| 4. Indicators<br>aligned with<br>desired results4. Indicators<br>aligned with<br>desired resultsSalt at 5.0• Processor<br>• Results5. Outcomes are<br>correctly<br>written5. Outcomes are<br>correctly<br>written• Freedom<br>(\$7%)• Results• Results6. Indicators are<br>aligned with• Indicators are<br>aligned with <td></td>   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| aligned with<br>desired results       aligned with<br>desired results       mith quality<br>desired results       the       standards       standards was<br>standards was       percentage<br>of school       Therefore;<br>the       The standard of<br>the       the       They consider       to b         5. Outcomes are<br>correctly<br>written       correctly<br>written       developme<br>for school       of school       gender       of school       of school       gender       of school       of school       b       of school       of school       gender       of school       of school       of school       gender       of school       of school <td></td>  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| desired resultsdesired resultstheThe standard ofto b5. Outcomes are<br>correctly5. Outcomes are<br>correctlyof school<br>writtenof school<br>developmeof school<br>developmeof school<br>genderof school<br>emercentageof school<br>emercentage   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              | -               |       |
| 5. Outcomes are correctly       5. Outcomes are correctly       integration   |                       | 5                 |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              | The standard of |       |
| correctly<br>writtendevelopme<br>t plans'of school<br>gendergender<br>• Mos<br>Dev6. Indicators are<br>aligned with <td></td>   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| written     written     nt plans'     developmen     sensitive"     Dev       6. Indicators are<br>aligned with     alignment     t plans'     scored lowest     degree (NO)  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 |       |
| 6. Indicators are aligned with       6. Indicators are aligned with       indicators are aligned with <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Dev</td>   |                       | •                 |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  |              |                 | Dev   |
| aligned with degree (NO)  |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               | -                      |                  |              |                 |       |
|   |                       |                   |     |             |                   |              |               |                        |                  | -            |                 |       |
|   |                       | outcomes          |     |             |                   |              |               | quality                |                  | with quality | while the       |       |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

# ROUP ONE:

#### engths:

riorities are set according to the needs of directorates of ducation and the common needs of their schools as shown in elf-revision data in most plans.

esults are linked with the priorities in most plans.

rocedures (activities) are linked with results in most plans.

esponsibilities are identified for the indented action (activities) be implemented in most plans.

nplementation timetable of many plans is realistic.

#### aknesses:

ndicators are not linked with the desired results intended to be chieved in most plans.

fost plans are not adopted by the Board of Educational Development.

Non-observance of the plans for the difference in needs between nales and females (gender).

fany plans lack result-based standards and need to be reesigned wholly.

#### commendations:

he Ministry should build the capacity of those who are volved in the directorates of education in the area of resultsriented management.

Directorates of education should re-design all of development & procedural plans through using results-oriented management hethodology by the direct supervision and support of those nvolved at the Ministry's center level.

oncerned staff in Ministry's center should visit directorates of ducation periodically to ensure the implementation of the ecommendations contained in the M&E report issued by the Division of Monitoring and Evaluation.

# **ROUP THREE:**

# engths:

riorities are set according to the needs of directorates of ducation and the common needs of their schools as shown in elf-revision data in most plans.

esults are linked with the priorities in most plans.

ndicators are linked with desired results to be achieved.

rocedures (activities) are linked with results in most plans.

esponsibilities are identified for the indented action (activities) be implemented in most plans.

nplementation timetable of many plans is realistic.

lost plans are adopted by the Board of Educational Development.

| 7. Activities,<br>outcomes and<br>results are<br>logically  |  | standards<br>was <mark>(50%)</mark> | standards<br>was <mark>(83%)</mark> | standard of<br>"Results are<br>aligned with<br>priorities" was<br>the bickest   |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| aligned<br>8. Responsibilitie<br>s of activities<br>intended to be<br>carried out are<br>defined<br>9. Realistic<br>implementation<br>timeframe<br>10. Endorsed by<br>educational<br>development<br>council<br>11. They consider<br>the different<br>needs between<br>males and |  |                                     |                                     | the highest<br>standard at 4.9<br>"Quality<br>Standards<br>aligned with<br>(17) plans out<br>of (23) which<br>were evaluated.<br>Therefore; the<br>percentage of<br>school<br>development<br>plans'<br>alignment with<br>quality<br>standards was |
| females<br>(Gender)   |  |                                     |                                     | (74%)<br>Gi<br>Stu<br>• F<br>e<br>s<br>• F<br>a<br>• F<br>a<br>• F<br>a<br>• F<br>a<br>• F<br>a<br>• F<br>a<br>• F<br>a<br>• F<br>• C   |
|   |  |                                     |                                     | • I<br>• T<br>• T<br>• F<br>• F<br>• F<br>• F<br>• F<br>• F<br>• F<br>• F<br>• F<br>• F   |
|   |  |                                     |                                     | Re       • I       b       c       r       d       • C       d       c       d       t  |

#### <u>aknesses:</u>

on-observance of the plans for the difference in needs between ales and females (gender).

ome plans are not adopted by the Board of Educational evelopment.

#### <u>commendations:</u>

ll plans should observe the different needs between males and males (Gender).

ll plans should be adopted by the councils of educational evelopment.

irectorates of Education should continue in providing capacity adding activities in the field of results-oriented management in a bilaboration with concerned staff in the Ministry's center and flect this in the developmental and procedural plans of rectorates of education.

oncerned staff in the Ministry's center should visit the rectorates of education periodically to ensure implementation if the recommendations contained in the M&E report issued by e Division of Monitoring and Evaluation.

# <u>ROUP TWO & FOUR:</u>

#### <u>engths:</u>

ciorities are set according to the needs of directorates of lucation and the common needs of their schools as shown in lf-revision data

esults are linked with the priorities of directorates of education ad common need of schools in most plans.

esults are correctly written in most plans.

dicators are linked with the desired results to be achieved in ost plans.

utcomes are correctly written in most plans.

dicators are linked with output in most plans.

here is a logical link between activities, output, and outcomes most plans.

esponsibilities are defined for activities intended to be plemented in most of the plans.

esponsibilities & activities are approved by the Board of ducational Development in most plans.

#### <u>aknesses:</u>

nplementation timetable of many plans is not realistic.

on-observance of the plans for the difference in needs between ales and females (gender).

# <u>commendations:</u>

irectorates of Education should continue in providing capacity ailding activities in the field of results-oriented management in ollaboration with concerned staff in the Ministry's center and flect this in the developmental and procedural plans of rectorates of education.

oncerned staff in the Ministry's center should visit the rectorates of education periodically to ensure implementation if the recommendations contained in the M&E report issued by e Division of Monitoring and Evaluation.

| School & D |
|------------|
| The Secon  |
| Interim R  |

| 1.1.3 Qualitatively;  |                      | N/A   | High level of                |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  | It is ea              |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Level to which        |                      |       | integration                  |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| gender is             |                      |       | (5.0/4.0 score)              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| integrated into       |                      |       | as per the                   |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| SDDP                  |                      |       | rubrics                      |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| 1.1.4 Quantitatively; |                      | N/A   | All initiatives in           |                             |                  | - |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  | It is ear             |
| Number of             |                      | 1.011 | the                          |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  | it is eu              |
| communication         |                      |       | Communication                |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| initiatives           |                      |       | s Strategy                   |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| related to            |                      |       | sourcegy                     |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| SDDP as per           |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| the                   |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| communication         |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| strategy              |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| 1.1.5 Quantitatively  |                      | N/A   | All schools                  | 789 schools                 | 732 schools      |   | 824 schools                 | <mark>245</mark>     | 503 schools               | 506 schools                         | 2078 schools     | Group                 |
| ;Number of            |                      |       | through out the              | and 7                       | and <b>9</b>     |   | have their own              | schools              | have their                | have their                          | have their own   | Mafrq                 |
| School                |                      |       | Kingdom                      | directorates of             | directorates of  |   | development                 | have their           | own                       | own                                 | development      | Group                 |
| Improvement           |                      |       | 8                            | education                   | education        |   | plans in 7                  | own                  | development               | development                         | plans in 23      | Mazar                 |
| plans                 |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   | directorates of             | developme            | plans in $6$              | plans in $6$                        | directorates of  | Group                 |
| developed             |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   | education                   | nt plans in          | directorates              | directorates                        | education        | Qsar, a               |
| uevelopeu             |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      | of education              | of education                        | cuucution        | Group                 |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             | directorates         | or education              | or education                        |                  | Quwai                 |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             | of                   |                           |                                     |                  | Quwai                 |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             | education            |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
| 1.1.6 Qualitatively;  | 1. Establishment     | N/A   | High degree of               | The deeree of               | The degree of    |   | The deeres of               |                      | The degree                | The degree                          | The degree of    | <b>C</b> 4            |
|                       | of school            | IN/A  | High degree of effectiveness | The degree of effectiveness | effectiveness    |   | The degree of effectiveness | The degree of        | of                        | of                                  | effectiveness    | <u>Stren</u>          |
| Degree of             |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           | **                                  |                  | • The                 |
| effectiveness         | development          |       | (5.0/4.0 score as            | according                   | according        |   | according                   | effectivene          | effectiveness             | effectiveness                       | according        | arrai                 |
| of the process        | team                 |       | per the rubrics)             | principals' and             | principals and   |   | principals and              | ss                   | according                 | according                           | principals and   | com                   |
| for developing        | 2. State of          |       |                              | school                      | school           |   | school                      | according            | principals                | principals                          | school           | • The                 |
| school                | readiness            |       |                              | developments                | developments     |   | developments                | principals           | and school                | and school                          | developments     | using                 |
| improvement           | (leadership,         |       |                              | teams'                      | teams'           |   | teams'                      | and school           | development               | development                         | teams'           | stude                 |
| plans                 | community            |       |                              | estimations                 | estimations      |   | estimations                 | developme            | s teams'                  | s teams'                            | estimations was  | • Need                |
| (Perceptions of       | partnership,         |       |                              | were (3.3) and              | was <b>4.2</b> . |   | was <mark>3.3</mark>        | nts teams'           | estimations               | estimations                         | <mark>3.9</mark> | proc                  |
| school leaders)       | gender, school       |       |                              | (3.9)                       | The standard     |   |                             | estimations          | was <mark>4.1</mark>      | was <mark>4.2</mark>                | The standard of  | • The                 |
|                       | development          |       |                              | respectively.               | "Sharing of      |   | The standard                | was <mark>4.3</mark> | The standard              | The standard                        | "Sharing of      |                       |
|                       | plans)               |       |                              | The standard                | schools          |   | of "Sharing                 | The                  | of "Sharing               | of "Sharing                         | schools          | prog                  |
|                       | 3. Self-review       |       |                              | "Sharing of                 | development      |   | of schools                  | standard of          | of schools                | of schools                          | development      | scho                  |
|                       | 4. Needs             |       |                              | schools                     | plans with the   |   | development                 | "Sharing             | development               | development                         | plans with the   | • The                 |
|                       | prioritization       |       |                              | development                 | educational      |   | plans with the              | of schools           | plans with                | plans with                          | educational      | deve                  |
|                       | 5. Developing        |       |                              | plans with the              | councils"        |   | educational                 | developme            | the                       | the                                 | councils"        | direc                 |
|                       | school               |       |                              | educational                 | scored the       |   | councils"                   | nt plans             | educational               | educational                         | scored the       |                       |
|                       | improvement          |       |                              | councils"                   | lowest degree    |   | scored the                  | with the             | councils"                 | councils"                           | lowest degree of | Weak                  |
|                       | plans                |       |                              | scored the                  | of               |   | lowest degree               | educationa           | scored the                | scored the                          | effectiveness at | • Prin                |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   | -                           |                      |                           |                                     |                  | all o                 |
|                       | 6. Sharing SIP       |       |                              | lowest degree               | effectiveness    |   | of                          | <i>l councils</i> "  | lowest                    | lowest                              | <mark>2.9</mark> | • Field               |
|                       | with                 |       |                              | of effectiveness            | Also,            |   | effectiveness               | scored the           | degree of                 | degree of                           |                  |                       |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             | principals       |   | at 2.2 whereas              | lowest               | effectiveness             | effectiveness                       | whereas the      | deve                  |
|                       | educational          |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      |                           |                                     |                  |                       |
|                       | educational councils |       |                              |                             | evaluated self-  |   | "Formation of               | degree of            | at <mark>2.9</mark>       | at <mark>3.3</mark>                 | indicator "The   |                       |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             | review at a      |   | school                      | effectivene          | at <mark>2.9</mark>       |                                     | school           | deve                  |
|                       |                      |       |                              |                             |                  |   |                             |                      | at <b>2.9</b> whereas the | at <b>3.3</b> whereas the indicator |                  | Educ<br>deve<br>obset |

# Directorate Development Program (SDDP) ad Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 Report – Data Analysis

early to measure this indicator

early to measure this indicator

**up One:** Jerash, North-Eastern Badia, North-Western Badia, rq District, Al-Mowqar and Al-Giza. **up Two:** Madaba, South Mazar, Bain Obied and North car.

up Three: Marka, Ein Al-Basha, Russaifah, Ramtha, Alr, and South Badia.

up Four: Petra, Tafela, Al-Tayba & Al-Wasteya, Ajlun, Alvaisma and Salt

#### engths:

he principals attended all relevant training programs and they ranged awareness campaigns the program to school pmmunity.

he Schools carried out comprehensive self-review through sing program methodology and implemented it on teachers, udents and local community.

eeds were arranged by levels resulting from the review occess and priorities of levels (1 + 2) were chosen.

he development plan was designed for the school according to ogram methodology with the participation of members of the hool development team.

he Educational Board of the school network review school evelopment plan which was approved and signed by the rector.

#### <u>aknesses:</u>

rincipals didn't transfer knowledge/impact of the program to l of those who involved in the schools.

elds coordination Team did not participate in designing evelopment plans.

ducational Council of schools network didn't discuss evelopment plans for schools and it didn't record any oservations on these plans or provide feedback to schools. riorities were not chosen upon the standards of the SDDP.

|  |  |     |  |  | -  | <br>  |  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|-----|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1.1.7 Quantitatively<br>;Number of<br>Field  |  | N/A | All directorates<br>of education<br>through out the                      | 19 development<br>directorates of ec   | •  | the highest<br>degree at <b>4.3</b><br><b>Girls Schools</b><br>achieved<br>higher degree<br>at ( <b>3.6</b> )<br>compared with<br>boys schools<br>which scored<br>( <b>3.0</b> )<br><b>7</b> directorates<br>of education   | "Formatio<br>n of school<br>developme<br>nt team"<br>scored the<br>highest<br>degree at<br>4.8<br>Girls<br>Schools<br>achieved<br>higher<br>degree at<br>(4.6)<br>compared<br>with boys<br>schools<br>which<br>scored<br>(4.1)<br>4<br>directorates<br>of                          | "The school<br>conducted<br>comprehensi<br>ve self-<br>review"<br>scored the<br>highest<br>degree at 4.7<br>Girls<br>Schools<br>achieved<br>higher<br>degree at<br>(4.3)<br>compared<br>with boys<br>schools<br>which<br>scored (3.9)  | "The school<br>conducted<br>comprehensi<br>ve self-<br>review"<br>scored the<br>highest<br>degree at 4.6<br>Girls<br>Schools<br>achieved<br>higher<br>degree at<br>(4.3)<br>compared<br>with boys<br>schools<br>which<br>scored (4.2)   | self-review"<br>scored the<br>highest degree<br>at 4.5<br>Girls Schools<br>achieved higher<br>degree at (4.1)<br>compared with<br>boys schools<br>which scored<br>(3.8)  | Recon     Orre     educ     cour     resp     and     scho     Acti     and     scho     Mafrq     Group   |
| Directorate<br>plans<br>developed that<br>were prepared<br>according to<br>approved form<br>of SDDP  |  |     | Kingdom  |  |  |   | education  |  |   |  | Mazar.<br><u>Group</u><br>Qsar, a<br><u>Group</u><br>Quwai   |
| 1.1.8 Qualitatively;<br>Degree of<br>effectiveness<br>of the process<br>for developing<br>Field<br>Directorate<br>improvement<br>plans<br>(Perceptions of<br>FD staff) | readiness<br>(leadership,<br>community<br>partnership, | N/A | High degree of<br>effectiveness<br>(5.0/4.0 score as<br>per the rubrics) | Supervisors'<br>evaluation of<br>the<br>effectiveness of<br>plans<br>development<br>process was<br>lower than that<br>of directorates<br>development<br>teams which<br>was ( <b>3.4</b> ) and<br>( <b>3.6</b> )<br>respectively<br>because they<br>didn't<br>participate in<br>the process of<br>plan<br>development | Supervisors'<br>evaluation of<br>the<br>effectiveness<br>of plans<br>development<br>process was<br>lower than that<br>of directorates<br>development<br>teams which<br>was ( <b>3.4</b> ) and<br>( <b>4.3</b> )<br>respectively<br>because they<br>didn't<br>participate in<br>the process of<br>plan<br>development | Supervisors'<br>evaluation of<br>the<br>effectiveness<br>of plans<br>development<br>process was<br>lower than that<br>of<br>directorates<br>development<br>teams which<br>was (2.8) and<br>(3.3)<br>respectively<br>because they<br>didn't<br>participate in<br>the process of<br>plan<br>development | Superviso<br>rs'<br>evaluation<br>of the<br>effectivene<br>ss of plans<br>developme<br>nt process<br>was lower<br>than that of<br>directorat<br>es<br>developme<br>nt teams<br>which was<br>(3.0) and<br>(4.4)<br>respectivel<br>y because<br>they didn't<br>participate<br>in the | Supervisors<br>' evaluation<br>of the<br>effectiveness<br>of plans<br>development<br>process was<br>lower than<br>that of<br>directorates<br>developmen<br>t teams<br>which was<br>(3.3) and<br>(3.9)<br>respectively<br>because they<br>didn't<br>participate in<br>the process<br>of plan<br>development | Supervisors<br>' evaluation<br>of the<br>effectiveness<br>of plans<br>development<br>process was<br>lower than<br>that of<br>directorates<br>development<br>t teams<br>which was<br>(3.3) and<br>(4.4)<br>respectively<br>because they<br>didn't<br>participate in<br>the process<br>of plan<br>development | Supervisors'<br>evaluation of<br>the<br>effectiveness of<br>plans<br>development<br>process was<br>lower than that<br>of directorates<br>development<br>teams which<br>was (3.1) and<br>(3.9)<br>respectively<br>because they<br>didn't<br>participate in<br>the process of<br>plan<br>development | <ul> <li>Streng</li> <li>The requirement</li> <li>Directrain</li> <li>The program</li> <li>The program</li> <li>The signed</li> <li>Weak</li> <li>Desi</li> <li>Directrain</li> <li>Deversion</li> <li>Directrain</li> </ul> |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

#### ommendations:

irectorates of Education should hold awareness workshops to lucate both school development teams and the educational ouncils of schools networks about their roles and sponsibilities in order to activate the process of developmental d procedural plans preparation for schools and to motivate hools' staffs to participate in this process.

ctivation of accountability mechanisms for school principals d staff

up One: Jerash, North-Eastern Badia, North-Western Badia, rq District, Al-Mowqar and Al-Giza.

up Two: Madaba, South Mazar, Bain Obied and North ar.

up Three: Marka, Ein Al-Basha, Russaifah, Ramtha, Al-, and South Badia.

up Four: Petra, Tafela, Al-Tayba & Al-Wasteya, Ajlun, Alvaisma and Salt

#### engths:

he directorate development team was formed according to the quirements of the program and field's coordination teams embers were selected based on their job titles.

irectorate development team members attended all relevant aining programs.

he Directorate carried out self-review according to the ogram methodology through applying it to those who were oncerned and its needs were identified based on the results.

he Board of Educational Development of directorate examined e development plan of the directorate and it was adopted and gned by the director of the board without discussion.

#### aknesses:

esire standard was not adopted in teams' formation.

irectorates' development teams examined samples of the data ceived from the self-review results of schools; accordingly, ommon needs among them were identified.

evelopment plans were designed with the participation of me of directorates of education cadres.

irectorates' development teams didn't educate other staff

| Image: Subset inspection of important inspection of the sector of the            |   |   |                |                                   |                                     |                   |              |                 |                   |                  |               |                 |   |
|--|---|---|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|
| Image: Instruction of the second state of the second st            |   | improvement<br>plans<br>7. Sharing SIP<br>with<br>educational |                |                                   |                                     |                   |              |                 | plan<br>developme |                  |               |                 | <ul> <li>Nee<br/>from<br/>rand</li> <li>The<br/>educe<br/>notion</li> <li>The<br/>educe<br/>educe<br/>the<br/>preprint</li> </ul> |
| Percentage of<br>recommendatio<br>ns implemented       recommendatio<br>ns implemented       carried so far.       procest<br>recommendatio<br>ns implemented         Output 1.1.1: SDDP Communications Strategy was<br>of SDDP<br>communications<br>strategy       N/A       SDDP<br>communications Strategy was<br>in August , 2012       Communications Strategy was<br>prepared       communication Strategy was<br>prepared   |   |   |                |                                   |                                     |                   |              |                 |                   |                  |               |                 | <ul><li>in the</li><li>Actual</li><li>dire</li></ul>  |
| 1.1.1.1 Quantitative<br>of SDDP<br>communications<br>strategy exists<br>in August , 2012       N/A       SDDP<br>communications<br>Strategy exists<br>in August , 2012       Communication Strategy was<br>prepared       Prepared       Image: Communication Strategy was<br>prepared       Image: Communication  | ;Percentage of<br>review process<br>recommendatio<br>ns |   | N/A            | recommendatio                     | Review process l<br>carried so far. | hasn't been       |              |                 |                   |                  |               |                 |   |
| Ivertified of SDDP<br>Communications<br>strategy       communications<br>Strategy exists<br>in August , 2012       prepared       vertified  | Output 1.1.1: SDD                                       | P Communications S  | Strategy was o | developed                         | I                                   |                   |              | I               | 1                 | I                |               | I               |   |
| 1.1.1.2 Quantitative<br>ly; Number<br>of members     Image: Constraint of the second se | ly; Presence<br>of SDDP<br>Communica<br>tions           |   | N/A            | communications<br>Strategy exists |                                     | Strategy was      |              |                 |                   |                  |               |                 |   |
| 1.1.1.2 Quantitative<br>ly; Number<br>of members     Image: Constraint of the second se | Output 1.1.2: Train                                     | ning delivered on Stra  | ategic Comm    | unication Skills &                | Management of N                     | Aedia Relations v | vith Stakeho | lders to MoE Ce | nter &Field D     | irectorate staff | and Education | Council members | 5   |
| ly; Number<br>of members   |   |   |                |                                   |                                     |                   |              |                 |                   |                  |               |                 |   |
|  | ly; Number of members                                   |   |                |                                   |                                     |                   |              |                 |                   |                  |               |                 |   |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

members about the program.

leeds were prioritized in accordance with the levels resulting rom the process of self-review, but priorities were selected indomly without putting levels into account.

he Board of educational Development of the directorate of ducation didn't discuss development plans or document their otices in order to provide written feedback to the directorates education.

#### commendations:

he Ministry's center should hold awareness workshops to ducate both the development teams in the directorates of ducation and about their roles and responsibilities to activate e processes of developmental and procedural plans reparation in the directorates of education in addition to imulate other staff members in the directorates to participate these processes.

Activation of accountability mechanisms for directors of the rectorates of education and their administrative and technical adres.

indicator will be measured after completing the review cess and after looking at its recommendations.

nmunication strategy was approved in the second half of the 2012.

|                      |                      |                |                     | ſ                  |               |             |                           |                          | T              |               |                            | T        |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------------|----------|
| Communica            |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| tion Team,           |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Field                |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Directorates         |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Media staff          |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
|                      |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| and                  |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Education            |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Council              |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Members              |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| trained              |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
|                      |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| TOTAL                |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| IOTAL                |                      |                | 565                 |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| A) Number of         |                      |                | 505                 |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| A) Number of         |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Communicatio         |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| n team               |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| members in           |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| MoE center           |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
|                      |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| 1. Males             |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
|                      |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| 2. females           |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| 2. Iciliales         |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| TOTAL                |                      |                | -                   |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| TOTAL                |                      |                | 5                   |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
|                      |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| <b>B</b> ) Number of |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| communicatio         |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| n staff in the       |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| directorates of      |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| education            |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
|                      |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| 1. Males             |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| 2. Females           |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
|                      |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| TOTAL                |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| C) Number of         |                      |                | 60                  |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Educational          |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Councils'            |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| members              |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| 1- Females           |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
|                      |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| 2- Males             |                      |                | -                   |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| TOTAL                |                      |                | 500                 | l                  |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Output 1.1.3: MoE    | school leaders and I | Field Director | ates supervisors tr | rained to plan and | implement RBN | 1-based gen | der sensitive Sch         | ool Improvem             | ent Plans with | community par | ticipation                 |          |
|                      |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| 1.1.3.1 Quantitativ  |                      | N/A            | All of              |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            | T        |
| ely;                 |                      | 1 1/2 1        | principals,         |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Number of            |                      |                | principals,         |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
|                      |                      |                | principal           |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| principals,          |                      |                | assistants and      |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| principal            |                      |                | supervisors in      |                    |               |             | Total: <mark>1167</mark>  | Total: <mark>2864</mark> |                |               | Total: <mark>4031</mark>   |          |
| assistants           |                      |                | the Kingdom         |                    |               |             | I                         |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| and                  |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             | Males: <mark>617</mark>   | Males: 1234              |                |               | Males: <mark>1851</mark>   |          |
| supervisors          |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| trained on           |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             | Females: <mark>550</mark> | Females: 16.             | 30             |               | Females: <mark>2180</mark> | 1        |
| School               |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| Developme            |                      |                |                     |                    |               |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| nt Program           |                      |                |                     | 1167               | 1759          |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
| ni i rogram          |                      |                |                     | 110/               | 1/37          |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
|                      |                      |                |                     | Males: 617         | Males: 779    |             |                           |                          |                |               |                            |          |
|                      |                      |                |                     | wates, 017         | Iviales. 119  |             |                           | 1                        |                |               |                            | <u> </u> |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 Interim Report – Data Analysis

| School & I | C |
|------------|---|
| The Secon  | 1 |
| Interim R  |   |

| TOTAL:   |     |   | Females: 550                             | Females: 980                             |                                  |  |   |   |
|--|-----|---|--|--|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Males<br>Females   |     |   |  |  |                                  |  |   |   |
| 1.1.3.2 Quantitativ<br>ely;<br>Number of<br>Principals,<br>Principal<br>Assistants,<br>Supervisor<br>s and Filed<br>Directorate<br>Division<br>Head<br>Trained on<br>Leadership  | N/A | All of principals<br>& principals'<br>assistants in the<br>Kingdom                                      | 1267                                     | 1589                                     | M: <b>152</b> 98<br>F: <b>54</b> | Total: <mark>1267</mark><br>Males: <mark>713</mark><br>Females: <mark>554</mark> | Total: 2962<br>Males: 1363<br>Females: 1599 | Total: 4229<br>Males: 2046<br>Females: 2153 |
| Males<br>Females   |     |   | Males: <b>713</b><br>Females: <b>554</b> | Males: <b>852</b><br>Females: <b>737</b> |                                  |  |   |   |
| 1.1.3.3 Quantitativ<br>ely;<br>Number of<br>Communit<br>y<br>Members,<br>Education<br>Council<br>members,<br>Principals,<br>Principal<br>Assistants,<br>Councilors<br>and<br>supervisors<br>trained on<br>Communit<br>y<br>Engageme<br>nt<br>Program | N/A | All Education<br>Council<br>members ,<br>Principals, P.<br>Assistants,<br>Councilors and<br>supervisors | 657                                      | 2813                                     | M: <b>15171</b><br>F: <b>80</b>  | Total: <mark>657</mark><br>Males: <mark>267</mark><br>Females: <mark>390</mark>  | Total: 5145<br>Males: 1915<br>Females: 3230 | Total: 5802<br>Males: 2182<br>Females: 3620 |
| TOTAL:<br>Males  |     |   | Males: 267                               | Males: 1093                              |                                  |  |   |   |
| Females  |     |   | Females: 390                             | Females: 1720                            |                                  |  |   |   |

# Directorate Development Program (SDDP) nd Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 Report – Data Analysis

| 1.1.3.4 Quantitativ ely;  | ,                       | N/A                     | All Field<br>Directors, D.   |                   |                     |                              | Total: <mark>147</mark>   | Total: <mark>921</mark> |                          |                 | Total: <mark>1068</mark>   |                   |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Number of   |                         |                         | Assistants,  |                   |                     |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            |                   |
| field   |                         |                         | Division Heads   |                   |                     |                              | Males: 132                | Males: <mark>671</mark> |                          |                 | Males: <mark>803</mark>    |                   |
| directorate<br>staff<br>trained on  |                         |                         | and Supervisors<br>in the Kingdom  |                   |                     |                              | Females: 15               | Females: 250            | )                        |                 | Females: <mark>265</mark>  |                   |
| FDP (M/F)   |                         |                         |  |                   |                     |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            |                   |
| TOTAL:  |                         |                         |  | 147<br>Males: 132 | 614<br>Males: 390   |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            |                   |
| Males<br>Females  |                         |                         |  | Females: 15       | Females: 224        |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            |                   |
|   | cess for reviewing an   | d revising the          | SDDP implemente  | d based on a part | icipatory approa    | ch                           |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            |                   |
| 1.1.5.1 Quantitativ   | ,                       | N/A                     | 2  |                   |                     |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            | Review            |
| ely;<br>Number of<br>reviews  |                         |                         |  |                   |                     |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            |                   |
| conducted<br>1.1.5.2 Quantitativ<br>ely;<br>Number of<br>education<br>stakeholder<br>s involved<br>in the<br>SDDP<br>review |                         | N/A                     | 10 minimum, in<br>addition to<br>MoE, such as<br>MoPIC, MoHE,<br>universities,<br>MoF, NCHRD,<br>Private Sector,<br>CSOs,<br>community |                   |                     |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            |                   |
| review<br>process   |                         |                         | community<br>members and<br>others   |                   |                     |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            |                   |
| Output 1.1.6: MoF   | E staff trained on into | egrating Gend           | ler analysis into da   | ily work to suppo | rt school improve   | ement                        |                           | •                       |                          |                 |                            |                   |
| 1.1.6.1 Quantitativ<br>ely;<br>Number of<br>Field<br>Directorate<br>s, schools<br>and MoE                                   |                         | 0/accordin<br>g to SDIP | All MoE Center<br>staff, Field<br>Directors, FD<br>Assistants,<br>supervisors,<br>School<br>Principals and                             |                   |                     | 152                          | Total: <mark>599</mark>   |                         | Total: 2962              |                 | Total: 3561                |                   |
| Central   |                         |                         | SP Assistants in   |                   |                     | M: <b>98</b><br>F: <b>54</b> |                           |                         | NG 1 10/0                |                 | N 1 1/00                   |                   |
| staff<br>trained to   |                         |                         | the kingdom  |                   |                     | Г: 54                        | Males: 327                |                         | Males: <mark>1363</mark> |                 | Males: <mark>1690</mark>   |                   |
| use gender<br>analysis<br>(M/F)   |                         |                         |  |                   |                     |                              | Females: <mark>272</mark> |                         | Females: 159             | 9               | Females: <mark>1871</mark> |                   |
| TOTAL:  |                         |                         |  | 599<br>Males: 327 | 1601<br>Males: 862  |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            |                   |
| Males<br>Females  |                         |                         |  | Females: 272      | Females: <b>739</b> |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            |                   |
| Intermediate Outc<br>economy institutio   | come 2.0: An effectiv   | ve, school-base         | ed education develo  | opment system as  | main vehicle to d   | eliver to all                | young people in           | Jordan a qual           | ity education f          | ocused on devel | loping the abilities       | , skills, a       |
| 2.1 Quantitatively;   |                         | N/A                     | 100% of  |                   |                     |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            | Docur             |
| Percentage of enabling  |                         |                         | policies<br>developed  |                   |                     |                              |                           |                         |                          |                 |                            | were r<br>After t |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

views haven't been carried out until now.

s, attitudes and values associated with knowledge-based

ocuments of the general framework of the educational policy are reviewed and recommendations were prepared in July 2012. For the adoption of the general framework of educational policy,

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 Interim Report – Data Analysis

| gender-<br>sensitive<br>policies,<br>guidelines,<br>procedures and<br>regulatory<br>recommendatio<br>ns that have<br>been<br>implemented  |     |   |   |             |                                |               |          |   | this fr<br>into a<br>frame            |
|---|-----|---|---|-------------|--------------------------------|---------------|----------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 2.2 Quantitatively;<br>Single school<br>evaluation<br>Instrument<br>focused on<br>ERfKE<br>outcomes, has<br>been agreed to<br>and is being<br>used for school<br>self-evaluation<br>and for public<br>and<br>professional<br>accountability                 | N/A | A 1 (Same<br>instrument used<br>by all schools)                           | A standardized from was<br>designed and approved by MoE<br>to replace all other forms used<br>before; namely: <i>Planning, and</i><br><i>Evaluation Form for SDDP</i> " |             |                                |               |          |   |                                       |
| 2.5 Qualitatively;<br>Degree of<br>satisfaction of<br>stakeholders<br>with extent to<br>which central<br>MoE uses<br>SDDP<br>information to<br>inform national<br>policies,<br>strategic<br>planning,<br>annual<br>priorities and<br>resource<br>allocation | N/A | A High degree of<br>satisfaction<br>(5.0/4.0 score as<br>per the rubrics) |   |             |                                |               |          |   | Monitt<br>– W<br>er<br>co<br>m<br>al  |
|   |     |   | ond to the developmental needs of   | schools and | directorates and accountabilit | y mechanism d | eveloped | _ |                                       |
| 2.1.1 Qualitatively<br>; Degree of<br>satisfaction<br>of<br>stakeholders<br>with the<br>quality of<br>SDDP<br>monitoring<br>and   | N/A | A High degree of<br>satisfaction<br>(5.0/4.0 score as<br>per the rubrics) | The first monitoring report was<br>accomplished in August, 2012   |             |                                |               |          |   | The se<br>end of<br>Satisfa<br>report |

framework will be reviewed to determine the extent of taking account the recommendations in the preparation of the new nework which will be applied upon approval immediately.

nitoring & Evaluation Framework of the SDDP was prepared. Work is underway to develop and adopt a mechanism to ensure that the data resulting from the application of SDDP to concerned parties to use these data and information in policy making and in strategic plans preparation and resources allocation.

second Monitoring report of SDDP will the period until the of June 2013.

sfaction degree will be studies after the issuance of the second ort.

|   | evaluation reports   |                       |                         |   |   |           |   |  |                 |   |  |                           |
|---|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|---|---|-----------|---|--|-----------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| 2.1.2   | Qualitatively<br>; Degree of<br>Satisfaction<br>of<br>stakeholders<br>with MoE<br>policies,<br>guidelines<br>and<br>procedures<br>related to<br>SDDP   |                       | N/A                     | High degree of<br>satisfaction<br>(5.0/4.0 score as<br>per the rubrics)   |   |           |   |  |                 |   |  | This                      |
| 2.1.3   | Qualitatively<br>; Degree to<br>which<br>monitoring<br>and<br>evaluation<br>reports<br>recommenda<br>tions are<br>used to<br>inform the<br>implementati<br>on and<br>continuous<br>improvement<br>s of the<br>SDDP |                       | N/A                     | High Degree<br>(5.0/4.0 score as<br>per the rubrics)  |   |           |   |  |                 |   |  | Prelir<br>benef<br>issuar |
| _   |  | sults-based, gender : |                         |   | ation Framework for SDDP develo   | oped      |   |  |                 |   |  |                           |
| ly; Nu<br>trained<br>based<br>A. Mo<br>1. M<br>2. fe<br>B. Diro<br>1. M<br>2. fe<br>C. Sch<br>1. M<br>2. fe | Males<br>Temales   |                       | N/A                     | <ul> <li>M&amp;E Division<br/>staff</li> <li>M&amp;E<br/>Coordinators in<br/>MoE center,<br/>directorates of<br/>education &amp;<br/>schools</li> </ul> | Field Directorates in Groups<br>1,2,3 &4 (M: 4 F:18)                                      |           | Refreshing<br>Training was<br>held for M&E<br>coordinators<br>in<br>directorates<br>of education<br>for Group<br>One:<br>(7)<br>coordinators<br>Males (6)<br>Females: (1) | education (C<br>as a refreshin<br><b>M&amp;E coord</b><br>the beginnin<br>directorates<br><i>FOUR</i> .<br><b>Males: (31)</b><br><b>Females: (4)</b> | directorates' ( | <i>SIX</i> ). As well<br>held for ( <b>15</b> )<br>ere chosen at<br>n, from the<br>, <i>THREE</i> & | (42) M&E<br>coordinators in<br>directorates of<br>education<br>Males: (37)<br>Females: (5)<br>Schools and<br>directorates'<br>center<br>Total: 1679<br>Males: (849)<br>Females: (830 |                           |
| Numb<br>M&E<br>produe   | titatively;<br>per of SDDP<br>Reports<br>ced   | SDDP related polici   | N/A<br>es to institutio | 4 reports<br>starting 2012  | The first M&E Report was issued<br>in August. 2012<br>anning at school, Field Directorate | and MoE c | central levels deve   | eloped   |                 |   |  | The s<br>end o            |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

is indicator will be examined after reviewing and adopting the neral framework of the educational policy immediately.

eliminary study will be conducted to find out the extent of nefiting from the recommendations of the second report after its uance.

e second monitoring report of SDDP will cover period until the d of June 2013.

| 2.1.2.1                      | N/A                    | The institutional    |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | Work   |
|------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|--------|
| Quantitatively;              |                        | mechanism            |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | the de |
| Presence of                  |                        | exists               |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | use th |
| institutional                |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | and re |
| mechanism that               |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| facilitates                  |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| information flow             |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
|                              |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| across all levels &          |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| directions.                  |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| 2.1.2.2                      | N/A                    | Enabling             | Policy recommendations             |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | Neces  |
| Quantitatively;              |                        | policies and         | prepared which support the         |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | sustai |
| Existence of SDDP            |                        | regulations exist    | institutionalization of the SDDP   |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | The g  |
| enabling policies            |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | revise |
| and regulations              |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | system |
| Immediate Outcome 2.2: Imp   | proved range sustainab | le financial and tec | hnical support to schools and Fiel | d Directorat  | es for the implen | nentation of th  | eir improveme | ent plans |                 | 1      |
| 2.2.1                        | N/A                    | 60% of plans'        |                                    |               | Zero              |                  |               |           |                 | No ad  |
| Quantitatively;              | 11/12                  | activities           |                                    |               | 2010              |                  |               |           |                 | provid |
| Percentage of                |                        | activities           |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | delayi |
| school and Field             |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | 2012/  |
|                              |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | 2012/. |
| Directorate                  |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| Improvement                  |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| Plans' activities            |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| implemented with             |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| financial support            |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| from MoE budget              |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| 2.2.2                        |                        | A 11 4 . 1 1         |                                    |               | ID 250000         |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| 2.2.2                        | N/A                    | As allocated by      |                                    |               | JD 250000 in      |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| Quantitatively;              |                        | MoE                  |                                    |               | MoE's fiscal      |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| Amount allocated             |                        |                      |                                    |               | year/2013         |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| in MoE annual                |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| budget as financial          |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| support for the              |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| implementation of            |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| the schools' and             |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| Field Directorates'          |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| Improvement Plans            |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| -                            |                        | A 11 11              |                                    |               | <b>924</b>        |                  |               |           |                 | C      |
| 2.2.3                        | N/A                    | All directorates     |                                    |               | 824 schools &     | -                | -             | -         | 824 schools & 7 | Grou   |
| Quantitatively;              |                        | of education &       |                                    |               | 7 directorates    |                  |               |           | directorates of | Badia  |
| Number of schools            |                        | schools              |                                    |               | of education      |                  |               |           | education       |        |
| and directorates             |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| having received              |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| MoE grants                   |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
| Output 2.2.2: Financial mech | anism to provide finan | cial support for the | e implementation of School and Fi  | eld Directora | ate Improvement   | t Plans establis | shed          |           |                 |        |
| 2.2.2.1                      | N/A                    | Presence of          |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | Instru |
| Quantitatively;              |                        | procedures and       |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | the ba |
| Procedures and               |                        | guidelines           |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | to dir |
| guidelines for               |                        | 0                    |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | Educa  |
| grants developed             |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 | 24404  |
| Branto de reroped            |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |
|                              |                        |                      |                                    |               |                   |                  |               |           |                 |        |

# School & Directorate Development Program (SDDP) The Second Monitoring & Evaluation Report – 2013 **Interim Report – Data Analysis**

ork is underway to develop and adopt a mechanism to ensure delivery of these data and information to the relevant parties to them in policy formulation and preparation of strategic plans l resources allocation

cessary supportive and procedural policies recommendations to tain the SDDP were prepared.

general framework of the new educational policy will be ised upon its approval to determine the extent of integrating the tem of supportive policies in the SDDP.

activities was carried out through using the financial grant vided by the Ministry to Group One due to disbursement aying until June 2013 after the end of the scholastic year 12/2013.

oup One: Jerash, Northern-Eastern Badia, Northern-Western dia, Mafrq District, Al-Mowqar & Al-Giza.

tructions and procedures that defined the allocated sums and bases of grants disbursement was approved and disseminated directorates of education through his Excellency Minister of ucation letter no. 14/6/20359 on 30/05/2013.