A WORLD BANK STUDY

Improving Learning in Uganda Vol. III

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT: POLICY
AND FUNCTIONALITY

Innocent Mulindwa Najjumba,

James Habyarimana, and Charles Lwanga Bunjo

THE WORLD BANK

A WORLD BANK STUDY

Improving Learning in Uganda Vol. III

School-Based Management: Policy and Functionality

Innocent Mulindwa Najjumba,
James Habyarimana, and Charles Lwanga Bunjo

THE WORLD BANK
Washington, D.C.

© 2013 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank
1818 H Street NW, Washington DC 20433
Telephone: 202-473-1000; Internet: www.worldbank.org

Some rights reserved

1 2 3 4 16 15 14 13

World Bank Studies are published to communicate the results of the Bank's work to the development community with the least possible delay. The manuscript of this paper therefore has not been prepared in accordance with the procedures appropriate to formally edited texts.

This work is a product of the staff of The World Bank with external contributions. Note that The World Bank does not necessarily own each component of the content included in the work. The World Bank therefore does not warrant that the use of the content contained in the work will not infringe on the rights of third parties. The risk of claims resulting from such infringement rests solely with you.

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect the views of The World Bank, its Board of Executive Directors, or the governments they represent. The World Bank does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in this work do not imply any judgment on the part of The World Bank concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

Nothing herein shall constitute or be considered to be a limitation upon or waiver of the privileges and immunities of The World Bank, all of which are specifically reserved.

Rights and Permissions

This work is available under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported license (CC BY 3.0) <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>. Under the Creative Commons Attribution license, you are free to copy, distribute, transmit, and adapt this work, including for commercial purposes, under the following conditions:

Attribution—Please cite the work as follows: Najjumba, Innocent Mulindwa, James Habyarimana, and Charles Lwanga Bunjo. 2013. *Improving Learning in Uganda Vol. III: School-Based Management: Policy and Functionality*. Washington, DC: World Bank. doi: 10.1596/978-0-8213-9847-0. License: Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 3.0.

Translations—If you create a translation of this work, please add the following disclaimer along with the attribution: *This translation was not created by The World Bank and should not be considered an official World Bank translation. The World Bank shall not be liable for any content or error in this translation.*

All queries on rights and licenses should be addressed to the Office of the Publisher, The World Bank, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433, USA; fax: 202-522-2625; e-mail: pubrights@worldbank.org.

ISBN (paper): 978-0-8213-9847-0
ISBN (electronic): 978-0-8213-9849-4
DOI: 10.1596/978-0-8213-9847-0

Cover photo: A primary school in Kampala, Uganda. © Arne Hoel/World Bank.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data has been requested.

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>		<i>ix</i>
<i>About the Authors</i>		<i>xi</i>
<i>Abbreviations and Acronyms</i>		<i>xiii</i>
<i>Executive Summary</i>		<i>xv</i>
<i>Legislative Context of School-Based Management</i>		<i>xv</i>
Chapter 1	Introduction	1
	Background to the Study	1
	Study Scope and Data	4
	Report Structure	5
Chapter 2	Policy and Regulatory Framework of School-Based Management in Uganda	7
Chapter 3	Capacity of School Management Committees	13
	SMC Members' Knowledge and Perceptions	
	about Their Roles	13
	Capacity Development Efforts for SMCs	18
	Supervisory Support to Schools from the Districts as	
	Another Capacity Enhancement Measure	21
	Notes	23
Chapter 4	Functionality of School-Based Management Structures	25
	Who Participates and Avenues of Participation	
	in School Governance	25
	Client Participation in School Governance	
	and Responsiveness to Education	41
	How are Schools Organized for Learning?	55
	Information for School-level Accountability	65
	Notes	72
Chapter 5	School Management and School-Level Results	73
	School Management and Learning Outcomes	73

	School-Based Management and Teacher Absenteeism	75
	School Management and Information for Accountability	76
Chapter 6	Performance Monitoring and Evaluation of School-Based Management	79
Chapter 7	Strategic Options for the Government Going Forward	81
Appendix A	Data Sources	83
Appendix B	Estimation of the Likelihood of SMC Members Participating in Key School-Based Management Activities	89
Appendix C	Some of the Documented Capacity Development Programs for SMCs in Uganda	93
	Notes	99
Appendix D	Description of the Sensitivity Tests Model for the Multivariate Analysis	101
References		103
Boxes		
	Box 2.1: Current Membership to SMC	7
	Box 3.1: USAID/UNITY Project SMC Training Model	20
	Box 3.2: Summary of Findings	22
	Box 4.1: Constraints to SMC Participation in the SIP Process—Views from Focus Group Discussions	32
	Box 4.2: Constraints to SMC Participation in the Budgeting and Financial Management Process—Views From Focus Group Discussions	35
	Box 4.3: SMC Members' Responses That Indicate the Still Expected Roles of PTAs—Focus Group Discussions	45
	Box 4.4: Constraints to SMC Participation in Head Teacher and Teacher Supervision—Views from the Focus Group Discussions	63
	Box 4.5: Why SMCs Cannot Hold Head Teachers Financially Accountable—Responses from FGDs	71
	Box 4.6: Summary of Findings	71
Figures		
	Figure 2.1: Overall Objective of SMCs in Uganda, 1969–2010	8
	Figure 2.2: Evolution of SMC's Roles in Uganda, 2001–2010	10
	Figure 3.1: Reported Functions of SMCs by SMC members; Uganda 2011	14

Figure 3.2: Access to SMC Handbook and Education Act, SBM Survey 2011	15
Figure 3.3: Head Teachers' Perceptions about SMC Members; Uganda SBM Survey, 2011	16
Figure 3.4: Most Important Problems Facing Public Schools; Uganda SBM Survey, 2011	16
Figure 3.5: Most Important Problems Facing Private Schools; Uganda SBM Survey 2011	16
Figure 3.6: Most Serious Problems Faced by Schools as Identified by Head Teachers, UNPS 2009/10	17
Figure 3.7: SMC Knowledge about Key Aspects in the School vis-à-vis Head Teachers' Reports; Uganda 2011	18
Figure 3.8: Months Since the DEOs and DIS' Visit to Schools by Type of School and Region; SBM Survey; Uganda 2011	21
Figure 3.9: Percent Distribution of Schools Visited by District and Other Officials in the Last 12 Months in Uganda; UNHS 2009/10	22
Figures 4.1a–c: Existence of School Improvement Plans by Type of School and Region; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	26
Figure 4.2: Most Important Objective of the SIP by School Type and Region; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	27
Figure 4.3: Year When the School Development Plan was Developed; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	29
Figure 4.4: Role Played by SMC Members in the School Development Planning Process; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	29
Figure 4.5: SMC Members' Satisfaction with Planning and Budgeting Processes; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	33
Figure 4.6: SMC Members' Views on the Planning and Budgeting Process in Schools; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	35
Figure 4.7: Percent of SMC Members Reporting Various Aspects of Their School Plans and Budgets; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	37
Figures 4.8a–b: SMC Members Attendance of School Meetings; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	38
Figure 4.9: Conduct of SMC Meetings; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	39
Figure 4.10: Issues Discussed at the Most Recent SMC Meeting; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	40
Figure 4.11: Percent Distribution of SMC Members by Membership to School Committees; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	40
Figure 4.12: Role Played by Representatives of Parents in the Planning Process; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	44
Figures 4.13a–f: Some Indicators of Low Parental Support to Education in Uganda	46
Figures 4.14a–b: Who Makes Decisions at the School Level on Any of the Following; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	49

Figures 4.15a–d: School Shortages and Requests for Assistance; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	53
Figure 4.16: Last Time Instructional Visit to School Was Provided by School Type and Region; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	57
Figure 4.17: Percent Schools Visited by CCTs in Last 12 Months UNHS 2009/10	59
Figure 4.18: Head Teacher Absences from School; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	60
Figure 4.19: Teacher Absenteeism in Uganda by grade; UNPS 2009/10	60
Figure 4.20: Percent P3 Teachers with Schemes of Work; QEI Survey 2009/10	61
Figure 4.21: Percentage Classrooms with Displayed Learning Materials; UNPS 2009/10	64
Figure 4.22: Classroom Environment; UNPS 2009/10	64
Figure 4.23: Percent Distribution of Schools with Class Reports for Term 1; Uganda QEI Survey 2010	67
Figure 4.24: Type of Meetings Held at School; UNPS 2009/10	68
Figure 4.25: Percent Distribution of Schools That Invited or Issued Information to Parents; Uganda QEI Survey 2009	69
Figure 4.26: Posting of UPE Grants on School Notice Boards; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	69
Figure 4.27: Percent Schools Sharing Financial Reports with SMCs in Uganda; QEI Baseline Survey 2009	70
Figure D.1: ROC Curve	102

Tables

Table ES.1: Potential Policy and Programmatic Options	xxii
Table 1.1: Key Primary Education Indicators	3
Table 4.1: Likelihood of SMC Members Engagement with the Head Teacher in the School Planning Process; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	30
Table 4.2: Likelihood of Participation in the Endorsement of the Most Recent Plan by SMC Members; SBM Survey, 2011	31
Table 4.3: Likelihood of Being Satisfied with the School Budgeting Process by SMC Sociodemographic Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011	34
Table 4.4: Likelihood of Rejecting Some Aspects of the School Budget by Sociodemographic Attributes of SMC Members; SBM Survey, Uganda, 2011	36
Table 4.5: Likelihood of Attending SMC Meetings by Sociodemographic Attributes; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	38
Table 4.6: Likelihood of SMC Members Participation on the School Finance Committee; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011	41
Table 4.7: Likelihood of SMC Members Participation on the School Academic Committee; Uganda SBM Survey, 2011	42

Table 5.1: Covariates of Good Primary Education Pass Rates for Schools—At Least 50 Percent of Candidates Passing with Grades I–III in Public Schools; Uganda SBM Survey 2011	74
Table 5.2: Covariates of Teacher Absenteeism in Public Schools; Uganda SBM Survey 2011	75
Table 5.3: Predictors of School-level Accountability; Uganda SBM Survey 2011	76
Table 7.1 Emerging Issues, Strategic Policy, and Programmatic Options	81
Table A.1: Number of Schools Sampled by District and Ownership Status	85
Table A.2: Sociodemographic Characteristics of SMC Members, Uganda 2011	86
Table B.1: Likelihood of Discussing with Parents in the School Development Planning Process, by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011	89
Table B.2: Likelihood of Participating in the Identification of School Needs in School Development Planning Process by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011	90
Table B.3: Likelihood of Participating in the School Plan Endorsement Process, by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011	90
Table B.4: Likelihood of Playing No Role in the School Planning Process by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011	91
Table B.5: Likelihood of Being Satisfied with the School Planning Process by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011	91
Table B.6: Likelihood of Ever Rejecting Aspects of the School Plan by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011	92
Table C.1: Some Ongoing Capacity-Development Initiatives by NGOs and CSOs with Support from Various Development Partners in Uganda	94
Table C.2: Summary of Existing Training Materials/Guidelines for SMCs in Uganda Developed/Used by Various Actors	95
Table D.1: Suggested Guidelines Regarding the Area under ROC Curve	101

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Education Program Development Fund for Africa, and special thanks to the fund management team of the World Bank that extended this support.

This work was conceptualized and executed by Innocent Mulindwa Najjumba, who is also the author of this report. Coauthors are James Habyarimana, who supported the SBM survey design, and Charles Lwanga Bunjo, who provided extensive data analysis support.

Special thanks to InfoPlus Consults Limited under the management of Sylvester Mubiru, which undertook the data collection for the 2011 World Bank-commissioned study on School-based Management, whose data set can be accessed by interested users. The technical support provided by Shwetlena Sabarwal in the tools development phase was highly valuable. John Bosco Asiimwe undertook the review of inspection reports and training programs for SMCs in Uganda commissioned by the World Bank, a copy of which can also be accessed by interested stakeholders.

The guidance received from the World Bank peer reviewers from the concept note development phase right through to report writing and finalization was extremely valuable. These include Barbara Magezi, Clarence Tsimpo Nkengne, Cornelia Jesse, Daniel Lukwago, Deon Filmer, Martin Onyach-Olaa, Mathieu Brossard, Sukhdeep Brar, Suleiman Namara, Susan Oppen, and Tony Verheijen. Strategic advice from Ahmadou Moustapha Ndiaye, Peter Nicolas Materu, and Sajitha Bashir greatly shaped the main messages to government. The administrative support from Bee Pang, Agnes Kaye, and Clare Busingye was also very useful.

The valuable support of the Government of Uganda counterpart team at the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES), most especially Catherine Mugerwa, Daniel Nkaada, Evans Jemba, and Joseph Ntege Lubwama, under the overall leadership of the Permanent Secretary, F.X. Lubanga, is extremely appreciated.

About the Authors

Innocent Mulindwa Najjumba is a senior education specialist in the World Bank, currently working on Uganda. She is a trained demographer and educator, with a working experience spanning education (all sub sectors), local governance, development assistance, together with emergency programming. She also has vast research experience on Uganda with special focus on HIV and AIDS, chronic poverty, adolescent reproductive health, disability, and gender. Current research efforts on education have centered on issues affecting quality education service delivery, particularly school based management, school feeding, teacher effectiveness, and learning outcomes. She holds a Ph.D. in population studies of Makerere University.

James Habyarimana is an Associate Professor at the Georgetown Public Policy Institute. His research is primarily empirical and endeavors to use credible research designs aimed at identifying causal effects. He has conducted randomized experiments and used other methodological approaches to determine how programs and policies should be designed to improve health and education outcomes. In education, he is currently conducting randomized field experiments examining the role of digital technologies in improving learning outcomes in Nigeria and Tanzania; the role of the private sector in providing secondary school instruction in Uganda; different modalities for financial literacy instruction in Kenya; and encouraging secondary school enrollment among girls in northern Nigeria. He is a non-resident fellow at the Center for Global Development in Washington, DC. He holds a Ph.D. in economics from Harvard University.

Charles Lwanga Bunjo is a lecturer of demographic methods at Makerere University currently pursuing a doctoral degree at the Northwest University-Mafikeng Campus of South Africa. He is a trained statistician with extensive experience in designing social surveys, managing large data sets, and undertaking analyses with application of various statistical models. His current research interests are in the area of family demography, working on the implications of cohabitation for marriage, marital stability, and fertility in Uganda with application of event history analysis methods.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BRMS	Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards
CAO	Chief Administrative Officer
CC	Coordinating Centre
CCTs	Coordinating Centre Tutors
DEO	District Education Officer
DIS	District Inspector of Schools
DSC	District Service Commission
EMIS	Education Management Information System
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GER	Gross Enrollment Ratio
JBSF	Joint Budget Support Framework
MoES	Ministry of Education and Sports
MoLG	Ministry of Local Governments
MoPS	Ministry of Public Service
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAPE	National Assessment of Progress in Education
NER	Net Enrollment Ratio
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
PCR	Pupil to Classroom Ratio
PETS	Public Expenditure Tracking Study
PLE	Primary Leaving Exam
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
PTC	Primary Teachers' College
PTR	Pupil to Teacher Ratio
QEI	Quality Enhancement Initiative
SBM	School-Based Management
SIP	School Improvement Plan

SMC	School Management Committee
TOT	Training-of-Trainers
UBOS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
UNEB	Uganda National Examination Board
UNHS	Uganda National Household Survey
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNPS	Uganda National Panel Survey
UPE	Universal Primary Education
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WDR	World Development Report

Executive Summary

As African countries expand educational access, quality and efficiency challenges emerge. These challenges are currently the focus of attention of many governments. In a number of countries, efforts to improve educational quality are centered on the provision of key inputs—predominantly qualified teachers, instructional materials, a curriculum, and physical infrastructure. This is also true in Uganda, where the reform of primary education, already mature after being 15 years, is anchored in a clear legislated policy framework supported by the intensive provision of key inputs.

School management practices in Uganda schools, however, remain weak. Members of school management organs have limited knowledge of their roles. Decision-making rights are, moreover, spread among various stakeholders across the education service delivery chain. In addition, there are limited downward and outward information flows about educational outcomes and reform efforts. Beneficiaries of education have little involvement in overseeing its delivery and there is a low degree of accountability at the school level. Strengthening school-based management and support structures should therefore become an integral part of all educational quality and efficiency enhancement efforts.

Multiple data sources have been used for the analysis presented in this report. These include sectoral policy and legislative documents on school management in Uganda, existing data sets such as the 2009/10 Uganda National Household Survey and Uganda National Panel Survey (UNPS), together with the 2008/09 Quality Enhancement Initiative (QEI) survey dataset. These sources were complemented by the 2011 School-Based Management (SBM) sample survey, which investigated the management practices, functionality, and autonomy of school management teams vis-à-vis their legislated roles, as well as their knowledge levels and accountability.

Legislative Context of School-based Management

School-based management in Uganda is mandated in accordance with the 1995 Constitution and the 1997 Local Governments Act, as further amplified by the 2008 Education Act and other guidelines on education policy, planning, and implementation. Overall school management functions at the primary-school

level are vested in School Management Committees (SMCs), for which the head teacher acts as the executive officer. SMCs are constituted of 12 members, of which 6 are appointed by the foundation body of the school, including the chairperson. The other 6 members include 3 local government representatives, 1 parent, 1 older girl or boy, and 1 teacher. Pursuant to international standards, Uganda's integrative policy on school management is consistent with a balanced control model, reflecting the government's positive intent to embrace all key players, including parents and teachers, in management and decision making at the school level.

The specific roles of SMCs as stipulated in key policy documents have varied since their establishment in 1969, but four distinct roles have been ultimately maintained: (1) financial management of schools, including budget approval and generation of new funding sources; (2) infrastructure and property development, management, and maintenance; (3) ensuring the discipline of learners and staff; and (4) school-level conflict resolution. In addition, both the 2008 Act and the 2001 guidelines for enhanced school governance and management name the additional role of school-level goal setting and planning; the 2008 Act and the 2010 Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards for Schools also identify the role of "establishing a linkage with the community and parents."

Current Challenges

Several constraints to education service delivery challenge the functionality of school-based management structures, together with higher-level organs that support their operations. The Joint Budget Support Framework (JBSF) identified four such binding constraints: inequitable teacher deployment (across districts, within districts and schools), high teacher absenteeism, inadequate instructional materials, and insufficient and ineffective community participation. An additional challenge is high learner absenteeism. A 2006 study (Heneveld et al.) found, for example, that students' readiness to learn, as shown by their access to scholastic materials (pen/pencil and exercise book), was only 58 percent, with wide variations between public (47 percent) and private schools (70 percent), a situation also confirmed by district-specific studies like the QEI. Learners without these simple but key inputs compromise the teaching-learning process and demotivate instructors. Some 92 percent of all students, moreover, arrive at school without having had breakfast, and an estimated 70 percent continue without lunch.

Insufficient Parental Participation

The outlawing of parent teacher associations (PTAs)—an historic feature of Ugandan school governance—has in particular weakened parents' participation in school operations and their voice in school governance, leading to their underrepresentation on SMCs. This change is not in line with the vision and policy intent of a decentralized service delivery framework. Moreover, it is contrary to the recognition of parents in the 2008 act as key players in their

children's educations, with legislated roles and responsibilities. It should not be surprising, therefore, that their interest and involvement in educational programs is low.

Parents in Uganda who participated in a multicountry study of parental participation in African schools (Marphatia et al. 2010). perceived that "free education" blocked their involvement in schools, since they felt they had no say over a service for which they were not paying. Overall, the study concluded that parents were the least powerful and least informed of all stakeholders, particularly about how they could become involved, and had limited access to decision-making fora. As much as they were aware of education being free and mandatory, they remained unaware of the roles and responsibilities that the policies formally ascribe to them with respect to school-level engagement and governance issues.

Low parental responsiveness to education programs can be seen in the unresolved problem of high learner absenteeism, which is detrimental to learning and academic achievement. The student absentee rate is estimated at 33 percent in Uganda, with a higher proportion reported in rural (37 percent) than in urban (29 percent) schools. Students who do not attend school as frequently as required receive fewer hours of classroom instruction and consequently perform more poorly. In their study of five Rwenzori region districts in Uganda, Heneveld et al. (2006) identified high pupil participation in school—that is, regular attendance—as a critical factor in improving learning outcomes in Uganda.

In sum, school management systems in Uganda have been largely ineffectual in mobilizing parents and the local community to support education programs. This poses a big challenge to the system because parents are expected to be the crucial drivers of quality education in Uganda through their sustained desire to see their children attend and successfully complete school. However, failure to fulfill their core roles points to limited interest in, or understanding of, their children's learning, weakens their position and compromises their ability to hold school management teams accountable. The free-of-charge nature of universal education is often emphasized more than the responsibility of parents and the community to enter into a sustainable partnership with government. Negative politicization of universal education programs has also reportedly made school managers and district leaders reluctant to involve parents in school matters due to insecurity about their own positions and the unpredictable manner in which affected parents and the entire local-level leadership would respond. From the perspective of head teachers, moreover, 97 percent of school-level problems emanate from parental and community factors, as opposed to in-school factors.

Limited Capacity of SMCs Translates into Limited Impact on School Governance

Despite positive steps to strengthen the capacity of SMCs, such as the development of guidelines and various training manuals and handbooks, together with project-based (but isolated) training programs, the knowledge base of SMC

members about their legislated roles remains very low. Only one in three SMC members consider school development planning, ensuring transparency of school resources, and monitoring of school-level program implementation to be SMC responsibilities, while even fewer (22 percent) considered the elaboration and approval of school budgets their responsibility. Yet this study reveals that SMC members' awareness of their functions, together with the provision of supportive informational materials, improves their participation in school management and, consequently, school financial accountability and student performance. For example, the public posting of information on schools' financial disbursements improves by at least 60 percent where SMC members are knowledgeable about their responsibilities. Similarly, there is a high probability that in schools where SMC members are satisfied with the school planning process, at least half of primary 7 candidates pass the Primary Leaving Exam (PLE) with grades of I–III.

SMCs are expected to actively participate in both the development and implementation of school improvement plans (SIPs) and school budgets, including the definition of school needs. However, their participation in these processes is low, even though three-quarters of the schools surveyed for this study had three-year SIPs and approved annual school budgets for 2011. Just half of SMC members reported having ever been involved in the preliminary school planning process of identifying school needs, and only 11 percent reported having been involved in the approval of their respective school plans, with an even lower proportion (8 percent) reported by members of SMC finance and development subcommittees! Among the constraints to their participation in school planning and budgeting processes are:

- A lack of established procedures
- Limited contact with district officials who are responsible for offering requisite support
- The inability of schools to raise additional funds to cover unfunded priorities
- The overall perception of SMC members that school planning is simply routine
- The inconsistency between school development plans and budgets, together with a lack of clear budgeting guidelines for conditional school grants.

Nevertheless, participation in school-level SMC meetings is high. Improving academic performance, as evidenced in pass rates on the PLE, was found to be one of the most frequently discussed issues in SMC meetings. And although the participation rate of SMCs in school-level planning and budgeting processes is low, SMC members reported high levels of satisfaction with these processes. Apparently, variation in the socioeconomic characteristic of different SMC members, and their knowledge of the scope of SMC responsibilities, explains this anomaly.

Unfortunately, local governments do not prioritize capacity development for SMCs, nor do budgets exist for such activities at the Ministry of Local

Government (MoLG). The justification for a solid and comprehensive capacity-development program for SMCs thus exists, and existing materials and ongoing initiatives would form a good starting point, notwithstanding the need to expand their scope to cover the wide range of skills reflected in the mandated role of SMCs.

Unclear Lines of Authority and Procedures

School-level decision making in general, as well as the approval of such decisions, is vested in various stakeholders across the education service delivery chain, with no consistent pattern by either issue or region. The same problem holds for the submission of school requests for various inputs. This lack of consistency points to limited decision-making powers on the part of school-based management structures, together with a lack of clarity on their operational scope—notwithstanding their capacity challenges. Similarly, the nonuniform manner in which school submissions for inputs are reported is likely fertile ground for the existence of informal and personality-based networks, which makes it difficult to attribute poor performance to any particular duty bearer.

The lack of response to school requests for key inputs is a disincentive for school management, leading to resignation and, often, repeated compromises on quality as implementers struggle to deliver educational services with lower-than-minimal requirement levels. As a result, schools tend not to be proactive in the face of shortages of certain school inputs, the diversity of submission channels notwithstanding. For example, 88 percent of schools reported having experienced textbook shortages, but only 42 percent ever submitted requests for this input, to which only half (21 percent) reported having received a response.

Inadequate Administrative and Pedagogical Support of Teachers

Although administrative and pedagogical support of teachers is vital to the success of any education program, the structures legislated to provide this support lack the capacity to do so. These structures are run by the district inspectorate divisions of Education Offices (DEOs) and the outreach arm of the PTCs, operationalized through the nationwide Coordinating Centre Tutors (CCTs) framework. Their capacity is, however, hampered by personnel and logistical constraints. Only one in every four schools reported ever having been visited by personnel from either system in the previous year, with no significant variations by rural-urban location or type of school ownership (public or private).

Regular support of teachers is needed to improve instructional practices, as well as to motivate and reinforce the supervisory and pedagogical support strategies of head teachers. The SMCs, which are supposed to oversee school operations, empathize with the problems of teachers, including low pay and lack of accommodations, highlighting the need to improve teachers' working

conditions. At the same time, newly introduced public service management standards, together with other innovative school-based teacher monitoring practices, need to be supported. For example, head teachers, who are the first-line supervisors of teachers, have a 38 percent absentee rate due to emergencies, with some 83 percent of these absences reported to be official! Some progress has been made on the teacher absentee rate in recent years, which was estimated at 21 percent in 2009/10 (a decline from 27 percent in 2007). Yet schools that have been visited by district inspectors have almost zero chance (a probability of 0.09) of teacher absenteeism. More importantly, at least half of primary 7 candidates in 58 percent of such schools pass the PLE with grades of I–III. This finding brings to the fore the importance of school inspections as quality assurance mechanisms in education service delivery. Ongoing initiatives need to be heightened, including continued exploration of more efficient ways of conducting school inspections.

Limited Transparency and Accountability at the School Level

The elimination of PTAs hinders parental communication and responsiveness to school issues, rendering outward accountability for school operations non-existent. When parents are involved in planning for and using school grants, a process of social auditing promotes transparency and accountability. The barring of the collective voice of parents in Uganda is thus likely to seriously undermine the ability to hold SMCs and school administrations accountable. Reliance on annual school meetings with parents, as is the case today, rests on the assumption that all school management teams adhere to this requirement. However, evidence from the 2009 Uganda National Household Survey indicates that only 24 percent of public schools reported holding annual meetings with parents. The SBM survey conducted for this study also indicates that in most cases, schools do not avail themselves of the opportunity to use annual meetings to report to parents on budgets vis-à-vis expenditures, or on school-level performance and functioning status. Focus group discussants articulated the crucial role of parental involvement in ensuring proper budgeting and financial management at the school level, with an appeal for the reinstitution of PTAs.

School-level information on learners' performance flows more upward than downward and outward, and is more reactive than proactive. In other words, schools share more information on student academic achievement and school performance with institutions that sit above them in the educational system hierarchy than with parents and local communities. Information systems that support upward accountability exist, including well-established channels through which data are routed to the center for national-level school planning and budgeting. In particular, management discussion of school-level performance of grades other than primary 7 was absent. The existing public interest in—and the national focus on—school-level performance on the PLE at the end of the primary education cycle, together with regular information submissions

to update the national education management information system (EMIS), promote the upward information flow. However, schools' adherence to established requirements, such as the issuance of class performance reports at the end of each school term, together with year-end circulars, is mixed. At one end of the spectrum there are isolated cases of 100 percent adherence to these requirements; at the other end there are 12 districts with an average of 49 percent adherence.

Quality improvement efforts can only bear fruit if they are instituted throughout the learning cycle, thereby enhancing early detection and resolution of issues that require attention. Most information about student performance is unavailable to parents (or school management structures), giving them limited knowledge of school effectiveness and hampering their ability to make informed choices about their children's schooling. Soft vertical accountability initiatives, such as the "school profiles" launched in 2001, seem to have waned, as they were not reported in any of the districts surveyed for this report. These profiles were a form of feedback to schools by MoES, based on the EMIS; reports indicate that head teachers found them useful for dialogue with parents and school communities, which improved community perceptions of education. Lessons learned from such initiatives would form good building blocks for new initiatives, such as the school report card.

Potential Policy Actions

Mainstreaming the government's SMC capacity-development efforts is crucial for improving educational quality and efficiency. Steps to improve the participation of SMC members in critical school management processes deserve immediate attention; the widespread existence of the school improvement plans provides a good starting point for these efforts. As stressed in the World Bank Education Strategy 2020, education systems work better when standards, rules, responsibilities, and financing incentives are clear and aligned to achieve education goals.

Ongoing efforts to educate and increase the involvement of SMC members in school-level operations—led by the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) and supported by various development partners, including NGOs and the outreach arm of the PTCs—should address several drawbacks:

- Limited geographical scope
- Weak coordination and thus uneven quality
- Greater focus on "what" SMCs should do rather than "how" their functions should be executed
- A concentration on a few functions, such as school-level planning, rather than the entire scope of SMC responsibilities
- Short training periods (normally one day), with limited follow-up to monitor training effectiveness at the school level
- Inadequate documentation of the impact of training efforts on improvements in school management.

Good management practices that enable participatory development of an SIP, consistency of management discussions, and appropriate knowledge about the roles and responsibilities of SMCs would give schools better chances of registering higher pass rates at the P7 level, reducing teacher absenteeism, and improving school-level accountability. Similarly, regular inspections would reduce teacher absenteeism to almost zero and improve school-level accountability. A range of potential policy and programmatic options are outlined in table ES.1.

Table ES.1 Potential Policy and Programmatic Options

	<i>Emerging issues</i>	<i>Strategic policy and programmatic options</i>
1.	Low capacity of SMCs to deliver against mandated roles arising from low appreciation of their roles, limited support from legislated organs, and low demand for accountability from beneficiaries	1. Strengthen school-based management through a three-pronged approach that embraces the following elements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Train SMCs on their roles and responsibilities using a consolidated training package that draws from existing materials supplemented by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple school-level planning and budget monitoring guidelines More insights on “how” to execute the functions beyond the “what.” Improve school support systems, most especially inspections and the outreach teacher support system Institute school report cards to enable information flow to parents and the wider community for improved accountability. Past and existing initiatives should inform this initiative.
2.	Low participation of clients/parents in school governance, and low response to education	1. Either <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Revitalize PTAs, which should not be seen as synonymous with parental contributions, but rather as organs central to the enhancement of the accountability function of the SMCs and school administration, itself is central to effective school operations; <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Expand the current membership of SMCs to increase the representation of parents/clients by an equal number (6), like the other constituencies, with distinct roles to safeguard against abuse. 2. Provide political guidance on measures schools need to institute against noncompliant parents, including providing school management full powers to ensure adherence for greater efficiency in the education system.
3.	Lack of clarity on school management decision-making rights and the system through which school requests for shortages could be addressed in a coordinated and timely manner	1. Clarify decision-making roles and responsibilities at the school level. 2. Establish and disseminate a system of addressing school requests for key inputs.

(table continues on next page)

Table ES.1 Potential Policy and Programmatic Options (*continued*)

	<i>Emerging issues</i>	<i>Strategic policy and programmatic options</i>
4.	Weak supervision of head teachers and teachers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to explore efficient and sustainable mechanisms for improving school inspections beyond the provision of logistical support to district inspectors. Efficient modalities should enable extension of the powers of the DES beyond the regional centers to the district inspectorate divisions for effective and efficient execution of the quality assurance function for schools. 2. Expedite the planned remapping exercise for CCs, including alignment with district administrative borders for greater synergies with district inspection teams. 3. Address CCT staffing and logistical requirements.
5.	Low provision of school-level information resulting in weak downward and outward accountability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institute school report cards, building on the “school profiles” initiative. This implies two report cards would be generated, one based on EMIS information including school characteristics; and the other drawing from school-based operational data on student flows (for example, promotions, retentions, and dropouts by grade) and test performance scores for at least three key grades across the cycle. A few performance areas for head teachers, SMCs, parents, and community would also be added to the report card for objective assessment, transparency, and accountability of all players involved in school-level operations. 2. Ensure adherence with the requirement to postfinancial disbursements at schools. 3. Provide postaudit feedback to schools for increased transparency and accountability, including empowerment of the SMCs and wider community to engage head teachers.
6.	Weak monitoring and evaluation of SMC operations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Performance monitoring of the SMCs and development of other performance-based indicators for SMCs to deepen local governments’ sensitivity to operational units. 2. Establishment of a national data tracking system of school inspections to enable performance monitoring of school-level management organs, together with a capacity-needs assessment for more strategic and evidence-based school improvement programming.

Source: World Bank data.

Introduction

This analytical work focuses on school-based management in Uganda with particular attention to the execution of key functions by mandated school organs, together with other key players that support school running. It is an integral part of the World Bank-led analytical work on Improving Learning in Uganda, which attempts to build knowledge around key constraints to quality primary education service delivery that have dominated the education sector policy discourse in recent years. Other areas explored under the improving-learning-in-Uganda theme include community-led school feeding practices, learning outcomes, and teacher effectiveness.

Background to the Study

The need to improve education quality continues to dominate education policy discourse in Uganda. Good education is not only about physical inputs but also school-level processes and practices that enable better management of resources, and effective parental and community involvement in children's learning, together with accountability for results. Government of Uganda, through the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES), together with development partners, are increasingly interested in finding ways of boosting the quality of education service delivery for improved outcomes and efficiency. Success in expanding primary education has been registered since the introduction of the pro-poor Universal Primary Education (UPE) program in 1997, under which the government pays tuition through capitation grants to schools, pays the teaching and nonteaching staff, provides instructional materials (textbook and nontextbook), and supports infrastructure developments including classrooms and complementary physical facilities. This has substantially reduced parental cost of education and as a consequence, primary enrollment increased from a low of 2.5 million in 1996 to 5.2 million learners in 1998. To date, primary enrollment is estimated at about 8.5 million learners. The primary Net Enrollment Ratio (NER) currently stands at about 90 percent according to one estimate, with almost gender parity at the national level. Another estimate, however, based on the Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS), points to a decline in

education access from a NER of 86 percent in 2002/03 to 84 percent in 2005/06 and 83.7 percent in 2009/10.

The input-focused approach followed to-date is under immense challenge in the national pursuit of greater efficiency in social service delivery, following the realization that implementation of critical processes crucial to the attainment of anticipated results was at a low ebb. Teacher absenteeism is estimated at 21 percent; there is poor textbook utilization by both teachers and learners, their limited availability notwithstanding; school dropout rates are high, as reflected in the low completion rates; learner attendance is low, which has been partly attributed to lack of midday meals at school, low teacher attendance, low societal appreciation of the long-term benefits of schooling, and weak parental support, as manifested in students' lack of basic scholastic materials (books and pens/pencils). These patterns challenge the existence and functionality of the school-based institutions mandated to oversee education management and administration in partnership with communities. The 2004 World Development Report argues that increasing resource flows for better access to quality education for the poor has by no means proved sufficient in raising education levels to desired levels. Instead, increased funding has to be coupled with increasing recipients' choice and participation in service delivery through a voice in school management, increasing information access, strengthening the incentives for schools to deliver effective services, and penalizing those who fail to deliver (World Bank, 2007b). Again, having enabling laws that mandate a transformation of relationships among stakeholders in the system and schools' decision making processes is not sufficient. Schools may choose not to exercise the provided authority, or may lack the will and capacity to do so (King, Ozler, and Rawlings 1998), problems that are not easy to discern without a deliberate effort to delve into understanding school-based management practices.

Primary education takes up about 54 percent of the overall education sector budget. Table 1.1 provides insights into key primary education sector indicators for Uganda. With a Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) of 120 percent, the country posts a 54 percent completion rate at primary seven (P7), indicating a decline from the 56 percent registered in 2003. Cohort completion/survival to P7 is estimated at 32 percent, an increase from a low of 24 percent in 2003. Gains in numeracy and literacy achievement have been slow but steady, and reached the 50 percent proficiency levels at primary 6 in 2010. The constrained financial resources vis-à-vis the rapidly increasing population (3.3 percent population growth rate per annum), and the need to support other sectors that are central to national economic growth enhancement (transport, energy, and so on) are pointers to the efficiency imperative as the education sector pursues the quality agenda.

In Uganda, the Local Governments Act (1997 and the amended version of 2006) provides for decentralization of social services, including primary education; the Second Schedule of the Act further provides for devolution of the provision of nursery and primary education from the district councils to the lower local government councils. At the school level, management is further

Table 1.1 Key Primary Education Indicators

	2003	2010
Total enrollment	7,633,314 (49.3% girls; 89.6% public)	8,374,648 (50% girls; 85.6% public)
Total schools	14,816	20,459 (60% public)
Teachers on government payroll	121,772	126,448
Qualified teachers in the public primary system (%)	n.a.	89
Repetition rate (%)	13.8	10.6
Pupil to Classroom Ratio (PCR) in government schools	94	67
Pupil to Teacher Ratio (PTR)	56	57
Net Intake Ratio	n.a	70.2
Gross Enrollment Ratio (%)	n.a	120
Survival to P7 (%)	24	32
Pupils reaching defined levels of numeracy (%)	P3:42.9; P6:20.5	P3:72.7; P6:55.4
Pupils reaching defined levels of literacy (%)	P3:34.3; P6:20.0	P3:57.6; P6:50.2
Pupil performance at the Primary Leaving Exam (PLE)	n.a	Division 1: 8.6%; Division II-III: 67% Division IV+: 24%

Source: Ministry of Education and Sports, Education Management Information System (EMIS) and National Assessment of Progress in Education reports, Uganda.

Notes: Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) = proportion of pupils attending primary school (P1–P7) to the number of children aged 6–12 in the population; Survival to P7 = percentage of a pupil cohort that actually reach P7; n.a. = not available.

devolved to the School Management Committees (SMCs), drawing from the 1994 Education Act, while the roles of these committees were further refined in more recent legal instruments as will be later discussed. School-based management is believed to enable democratic and less bureaucratic decision making by school agents (head teachers, teachers, and parents), increase the relevance of policies, and empower school-level personnel and the community with anticipated gains in commitment, involvement, and effort. The goal is also to increase transparency and accountability within the school.

The increase in enrollment resulting from the universalization of education has a direct bearing on the expansion of schools, most especially in terms of numbers and inputs (capitation grants, teachers, infrastructure, learning materials), with likely school-level management challenges. However, not much attention has been given to operational modalities of management teams at the school level. The enactment of the 2008 Education Act was a legal attempt to streamline operations at all levels including the school level, as a follow-up to years of experience largely informed by the primary education reform program. The Joint Budget Support Framework (JBSF) identified four binding constraints to education service delivery: inequitable teacher deployment (across districts, within districts and schools), high teacher absenteeism, inadequate instructional materials, and insufficient and ineffective community participation. Coupled with this is high learner absenteeism. The persistence of these constraints challenges the functionality of school-based management structures, together with higher-level organs that support their operations. Bruns, Filmer, and Patrinos (2011) indicate that there is an association across countries between good performance on

international student achievement tests and local- and school-level autonomy to adapt and implement education content and allocate and manage resources. The devolution of education service delivery to school-level authorities in Uganda, therefore, is consistent with the trend in many well-performing systems, but school-level management practices should aim at ensuring improved school-level performance on all fronts.

The existing laws spell out expected roles of key players at the school level, including the SMC, head teachers, teachers, parents, and the community, together with actors external to the school, such as local government and the central Ministry of Education and Sports, for example. The clarity on roles points to the fact that effective execution of these roles by the respective players would result in the desired education outputs and outcomes at the school-level. However, not much is known about how well these players can fulfil their stipulated roles, making informed discussion around school-level management processes and challenges to improve school-level operations more difficult. Broadening understanding on how the school as a service delivery unit functions is therefore, central to the ongoing quest for quality education in Uganda and hence the justification for this analytical work.

Study Scope and Data

This analytical work focuses on key processes undertaken by the SMCs at the school level, including planning, decision making, budgeting, and teacher management, as well as on accountability. These processes have been analyzed under the following themes: participation, decision making/autonomy, organization of schools for learning, and information for accountability. The evolution of SMCs in Uganda, together with capacity development efforts undertaken for SMCs, is delved into for contextualization of the problem.

Multiple data sources have been used in a bid to explore the extent to which the above-mentioned processes are executed at the school level. These include sector policy and legislative documents on school management in Uganda, existing data sets such as the 2009/10 Uganda National Household Survey and the Uganda National Panel Survey (UNPS), together with the 2008/09 Quality Enhancement Initiative (QEI) Survey. These were complemented by the 2011 School-Based Management (SBM) Sample Survey.

The 2009/10 UNHS sample was designed to allow reliable estimation of key indicators for Uganda. A two-stage stratified sampling design was used. In the first stage, enumeration areas were grouped by district and rural-urban location, drawing from Probability Proportion to Size (PPS). At the second stage, households, which are the ultimate sampling units, were chosen using systematic sampling. A total of 712 enumeration areas representing the general household population were selected using the Uganda population and housing census frame for 2002. This generated a sample size of 6,800 households. The 2009/10 UNHS was undertaken in a bid to track key outcome indicators on an annual

basis, using the 2005/06 UNHS as its baseline. A sample of 3,200 households was selected out of the 7,200 households polled in the 2005/06 UNHS. The survey constituted five modules, which included a community in which investigation on education was undertaken, drawing from a sample of about 280 schools. For purposes of this analysis, this data set has been used for supplementary information to the SBM survey, more especially regarding administrative and technical support supervision to schools, teacher absenteeism levels, organization of schools for learning, and parental support to education.

The QEI surveys were undertaken in 2009 and 2010 with the former serving as a baseline. The main goal of the baseline survey was to provide key information on selected critical performance indicators derived from targeted interventions by the Ministry of Education and Sports to improve the quality of primary education and pupil completion rates in 12 poorly performing districts. A longitudinal research design consisting of a panel of primary schools under UPE was selected from 12 least performing districts in Uganda. The districts were identified by the MoES: Nakapiripirit, Kaabong, Oyam, Amuru, Arua, Nebbi, Bududa, Bukedea, Kyenjojo, Bulisa, Lyantonde, and Mubende. The total number of targeted schools is 406, selected using systematic random sampling procedures. This data set complemented the results on teacher pedagogical practices and information for accountability.

The SBM survey was commissioned by the World Bank and targeted head teachers and members of SMCs from 204 randomly selected schools drawn from 12 districts consistent with the 6 regions, as mapped out by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS). The districts include Alebtong, Buikwe, Butaleja, Gulu, Kaabong, Kabale, Kalungu, Kapchorwa, Kasese, Kotido, Kyegegwa, and Mbarara. Quantitative and qualitative research approaches were used, and the detailed methodology for the SBM survey is presented in appendix A. The survey enabled in-depth exploration of school management practices from the SMC and head teacher perspectives with special focus on knowledge and capacity levels of SMCs, participation of stakeholders in school governance, information availability for accountability, teacher management, decision-making practices (including channels used in the request for key inputs at the school level), school access to administrative and technical support, and overall operational challenges.

Report Structure

The report is structured into seven chapters. Chapter 2 explores the evolution of SMCs in Uganda based on key policy documents and guidelines, while chapter 3 looks at the capacity of SMCs, followed by chapter 4, which examines the functionality of school-based management structures in Uganda. Chapter 5 provides multivariate analysis of school management and school-level results, while chapter 6 attempts to highlight the need for school-based monitoring systems to track the performance of SMCs. Chapter 7 provides strategic options for the government going forward.

Policy and Regulatory Framework of School-Based Management in Uganda

In Uganda, the Local Governments' Act (1997 and the amended version of 2006) provide for decentralization of social services, including primary education; the Second Schedule of the Act further provides for the devolution of the provision of nursery and primary education from the district councils to the lower local government councils. School Management Committees (SMCs) were established in Uganda as school-based organs by the 1964 Education Act No. 228, later amended under the statutory instrument No. 244 of 1969. Subsequently, the Education Bill of 2004 provided for their establishment as governing bodies of primary schools empowered by law to manage schools on behalf of government. The Second and Third Schedules of the 2008 Education Act provide further clarity on the SMCs and clearly articulate the devolution of management of schools to SMCs, subject to any directions that may be given under the act by the Minister on matters of general policy. Box 2.1 shows the composition of SMCs in Uganda as provided by the 2008 Education Act.

Box 2.1

Current Membership to SMC

- Six (6) persons appointed by the Foundation Body of the school including chairperson;
- One (1) local government representative nominated by district council;
- One (1) representative of a local parish council executive committee—who is a secretary in charge of education at a parish council;
- One (1) person elected by the lowest local government (subcounty, city, or municipal division council);
- One (1) representative of parents elected at the school annual general meeting for parents;
- One (1) staff representative elected by school staff, either teaching or nonteaching; and
- One (1) representative of old boys/girls (former students), if any, of the respective school.

(box continues on next page)

Box 2.1 Current Membership to SMC *(continued)*

Once these convene for their first meeting of the two-year term, they elect a vice chairperson from the five remaining members appointed by the Foundation Body.

The head teacher serves as secretary to the SMC

Membership is voluntary, and SMC members can serve a maximum of two terms (four years).

Source: Education (pre-primary, primary and post-primary) Act, 2008, Acts Supplement No. 8, Uganda)

SMCs have existed in Uganda for over four decades, and it would be of interest to know whether their roles have changed overtime. The schema below (figure 2.1) shows the evolution of the overall objective of the SMCs in Uganda since 1969, based on a review of four key documents, namely (1) the 1969

Figure 2.1 Overall Objective of SMCs in Uganda, 1969–2010

Source: Ministry of Education and Sports Documents, Uganda.

Statutory Instrument for SMCs in Uganda; (2) the 2001 guidelines to enhance governance and management of schools in Uganda; (3) the 2008 Education Act; and (4) the 2010 Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards for School in Uganda. It is evident that the overall objective for which the SMCs were established is “to manage schools,” which implies making decisions within the established legal framework and other confines of primary education service delivery. However, there have been noticeable changes in the manner in which the overall management function has been operationalized over time. For example, the 1969 instrument is precise on the management and day-to-day administration, together with the proper and efficient conduct of the school. In 2001, the overall objective is decomposed into three parts, bringing to light the strategic role of the SMCs in (1) school-level planning and systems development; (2) supporting school teams to achieve the highest possible standards; and (3) holding head teachers and staff accountable. The 2008 act affirms that the SMC functions as a representation of the government at the school level.

This study further explores the specific roles of SMCs as stipulated in key policy documents indicated above. Figure 2.2 indicates that these roles have been changing, although there have also been common areas of focus identified over time. Four distinct roles have been ultimately maintained: (1) financial management of the school, including budget approval and generation of new funding sources; (2) infrastructure and property development, management, and maintenance; (3) ensuring the discipline of learners and staff; and (4) school-level conflict resolution. Further to these common areas, the 2008 Act and the 2001 guidelines also had one additional role in common: school-level goal setting and planning. Both the 2008 Act and the 2010 Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards (BRMS) also reflect one more common area: “establishing a linkage with the community and parents.”

In addition to the common specific roles identified, the respective documents spell out other distinct roles of SMCs. The 2001 guidelines for example highlight the linkage of the SMCs with Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) on policy matters, technical guidance to head teachers and staff, and the establishment of monitoring systems—provisions that were not included in the other documents. Similarly, the 2008 act amplifies the accountability aspect of its overall goal by specifying the need for SMCs to regularly report to parents, make school funding public, and follow up with District Education Officers on various school issues. The 2010 BRMS deepens the SMC focus on school management. The roles therein include time organization and management, teaching and learning organization, the organization and management of cocurricular programs, institutional safety and security, and health and environmental management issues.

It is worth noting that the added roles in each document should not be seen as distinctively different but as a further evolution of the management function of SMCs. In addition, the documents reflect the changing policy discourse at the

Figure 2.2 Evolution of SMC's Roles in Uganda, 2001–2010

Source: World Bank data.

Note: MoES = Ministry of Education and Sports; M&E = Monitoring and Evaluation.

sector level over time. The time management and teaching-learning issues specified by the 2010 BRMS, for example, are a clear indication of the attempt by the government to address emerging issues around teacher management in schools in light of increasing teacher absenteeism. Similarly, the government sought to address other pressing issues: revamping cocurricular activities, which have been identified as waning in most schools; improving school safety and security following the rampant outbreak of fires and staff strikes that have hit schools in the recent past; and the degenerating sanitation status of schools.

This also may make one conclude that while the central role of SMCs is to manage schools, their roles have been deepening day by day based on emerging policy issues and other challenges. This places the SMCs at the centre of education service delivery and the key question here is whether the SMCs, as a core service delivery organ, have been—or are now—regularly equipped to handle these new dimensions as they emerge.

Capacity of School Management Committees

The question addressed in this chapter is whether the School Management Committees (SMCs) have the capacity to oversee the management of schools in Uganda. The capacity of SMCs is analyzed based on their members' knowledge and perceptions about their roles and responsibilities. Also analyzed is supervisory support to schools provided by mandated structures, such as the local governments and other players external to schools. Insights into some of the ongoing capacity development initiatives are also presented in this chapter.

SMC Members' Knowledge and Perceptions about Their Roles

Three out of every four members (75 percent) of the SMCs report that they are charged with providing overall direction to the schools they serve, which is considered to be a high level of knowledge (figure 3.1). The findings were generated from the school-based management (SBM) survey by asking SMC members what they considered to be their major roles and responsibilities in regard to school management.

Despite the seemingly high levels of knowledge, further responses to questions that seek to decompose the main function of *overall direction to schools* reveal that SMC members actually have limited knowledge about their roles and functions. For example, only 32 percent of responding SMC members reported school development planning as a key responsibility of SMCs, with an even lower proportion among SMC members from private schools (20 percent). Receiving, reviewing, and amending school budgets was reported by only 22 percent, while monitoring school program implementation as a core function of SMCs was reported by only 32 percent. Communicating with parents and addressing disciplinary issues for teachers and students were reported by a relatively higher proportion though (47 percent and 41 percent, respectively). Noteworthy is that ensuring transparency of school resources as a key function of SMCs was reported more at private schools (47 percent) than at public ones (31 percent).

Figure 3.1 Reported Functions of SMCs by SMC members; Uganda 2011

Source: World Bank data.

Informational materials for use by SMC members have been developed by Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) to support their management operations. Copies of the 2008 Education Act and the School Management Committee Handbook are some of the key informational documents that stipulate school-level operations, including roles and responsibilities of various players. These are complemented by other materials available for use by school management teams, including the Child-Friendly Schools Framework, the Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards for schools in Uganda, together with many other guidelines and manuals developed in collaboration with development partners to further the MoES' policy guidance and quality assurance role in education service delivery. SMC members' access to and utilization of these materials should ideally enable them to build up a sound knowledge and skills base required to conduct their day-to-day school management functions.

SMC members however, make little use of existing informational materials. Results indicate that only 45 percent of SMC members were conversant with the 2008 Education Act, which is the guiding document on the roles and responsibilities of various players (figure 3.2). A slightly higher proportion (57 percent) reported having read the SMC handbook, which provides insights

Figure 3.2 Access to SMC Handbook and Education Act, SBM Survey 2011

Source: World Bank, 2011.

Note: SMC = School Management Committee.

on how some basic functions, such as planning and community mobilization, are executed by school management teams. Financial constraints were identified as key constraints to the provision of materials to SMC members, compounded by limited dissemination and training opportunities. Awareness about these key documents is more likely among SMC members with tertiary levels of education (184 percent more likely), those who belong to other organized community groups (67 percent more likely), government employees (39 percent more likely), and males (32 percent more likely). In addition, SMC members in the central and western regions were significantly less likely (47 percent and 27 percent, respectively) to be aware of the SMC Handbook and Education Act than those from the northern region (appendix B, table B.1). Impressively, head teachers' access to the identified materials is, however, much higher (about 80 percent). Overall, only half of the school-level managers (head teachers and SMC members) are conversant with the Education Act, which is the governing law of school operations in Uganda today.

SMC members can only be useful and effective if they have ample knowledge of the issues affecting the schools they serve. Despite the SMC members' limited knowledge of their roles above, 58 percent of the head teachers reported that all their SMC members were knowledgeable about school issues (figure 3.3). It is important to note the significant variation by regions. For example, only 33 percent of the head teachers in the northeastern region perceived all their SMC members as knowledgeable about school operations, compared with highs of 82 percent in the eastern region and 67 percent in the central region. Overall, lower proportions of head teachers, however, considered their SMC members dedicated to their work (45 percent countrywide).

The SBM survey also probed head teachers and SMC members on what they considered the most important problems faced by schools (figures 3.4 and 3.5). In both public and private schools, the two most important problems faced at

Figure 3.3 Head Teachers' Perceptions about SMC Members; Uganda SBM Survey, 2011

Source: World Bank, 2011.

Figure 3.4 Most Important Problems Facing Public Schools; Uganda SBM Survey, 2011

Source: World Bank, 2011.

Note: SMC = School Management Committee.

Figure 3.5 Most Important Problems Facing Private Schools; Uganda SBM Survey 2011

Source: World Bank, 2011.

Note: SMC = School Management Committee.

the school level were reported to be inadequate funding for school activities and poor school infrastructure. There were, however, variations in the proportions reporting these problems in either setting. For example, 15 percent of SMC members and head teachers in public schools reported inadequate funding, while the proportion for private schools was twice as much (32 percent). Similarly, lack of teachers’ accommodations was reported by 16 percent of public school managers compared to only 7 percent in private schools. It is important to note that a shortage of teachers was one of the four important problems in public schools, while for private schools, inadequate supplies featured in the top four. Further, there were no significant variations in what head teachers and SMCs considered the most important factors affecting schools, with the exception of only one factor: inadequate school supplies for private schools. This was reported by 17 percent of the head teachers, compared to only 6 percent of the SMC members.

An emerging challenge is that problems faced by schools vary by reporting time and source of information. For example, the 2009/10 Uganda National Panel Survey (UNPS) identified problems faced by schools as perceived by head teachers (see figure 3.6). The list of problems is, however, different from the results of the SBM survey. Half of the head teachers in the UNPS survey reported low community interest in school affairs, followed by irregular learner attendance. The problem of hungry pupils was mentioned by a substantial proportion of head teachers in public primary schools. Interesting to note is that teacher absenteeism was not mentioned by head teachers in private schools. The difference in the two surveys, though, is that the SMC members focused on school-based factors that hinder effective operations from the school side, while the head teachers’ list of issues centered on factors external to the schools—which they probably have no control over, with the exception of teacher absenteeism, which was actually the least reported. Nevertheless, the two dimensions bring forth the complex nature of school management issues in Uganda.

Figure 3.6 Most Serious Problems Faced by Schools as Identified by Head Teachers, UNPS 2009/10

Source: UNPS 2009/10.

Figure 3.7 SMC Knowledge about Key Aspects in the School vis-à-vis Head Teachers' Reports; Uganda 2011

Source: World Bank data.

Note: SMC = School Management Committee.

SMC members' capacity to deliver on their stipulated roles and functions could also be gauged from their knowledge about the status of key operational areas for the schools they serve. The SBM survey thus probed SMC members' knowledge about a number of aspects, including whether they had made requests for—and received—any instructional materials for their school in 2011, and whether SMC members knew when the capitation grants were sent to their respective schools. A comparison of the SMC and head teacher reports was hence done in a bid to identify whether the reports were consistent.

Results in figure 3.7, however, show a substantial degree of divergence. For example, 53 percent of SMC members reported having received instructional materials for their schools in 2011, but only 28 percent of the head teachers reported so. In addition, almost all head teachers reported that SMC members knew when capitation was sent to schools, yet only 53 percent of SMC members concurred with this. However, the proportion of head teachers and SMC members who reported having ever made requests for education materials in 2011 was close: 24 percent and 28 percent, respectively. Nevertheless, the variation reported in the earlier two issues may point to an information gap from the side of SMCs, which is likely to affect the effectiveness of their operations.

Capacity Development Efforts for SMCs

School-based management involves people who are unlikely to have been involved in managing institutions before, which makes the need for information, communication, and training central to their success, irrespective of how good or bad a system is. The frontline provider of requisite knowledge and skills to enable each SMC to function as an effective governing body for its school is the head teacher. This is done through the provision of key informational

materials on the education law, together with the following documents: agreed procedures and standing orders; a calendar of SMC committee meetings, school calendar, and school events for the year; staffing structure by subject and other responsibilities; school plan and prospectus, if any; most recent annual report to parents; most recent school inspection report; action plan for school improvement if any; and school site plan and status of land ownership of the school. It is the responsibility of the head teacher to ensure that all members of the SMC have this information and receive appropriate induction by approaching the local government or any other organ or partner that can provide this training. A brief to members is also required of the head teacher and chairperson at the start of the respective SMC term to provide clarity of roles, following a tour of the school to gain insights into school organization, teaching-learning, and available infrastructure. The head teacher also acquaints SMC members with operational rules and regulations that govern the conduct of SMC meetings.

Local governments are mandated by law to develop the capacity of operational management structures for decentralized services, including SMCs, based on standards developed for the respective sectors. However, SMC training is not reflected in the operational budgets of any local government visited. Similarly, such training is a nonfunded priority of the MoES, since it is outside the ministry's mandate. Nevertheless, the MoES acknowledges the importance of capacity development for SMCs, which should be enhanced through training on the manuals and handbooks produced. This responsibility has thus gradually been devolved to the Coordinating Centre Tutors (CCTs) as an integral part of their technical support role to schools, facilitated by a national team of trainers, even though it is not supported the MoES budget.

An exploratory study revealed that ongoing capacity development efforts are mostly led centrally, but limited to training and largely financed on a project basis by development partners and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) operating in various districts. Training materials have also been developed under various projects with the participation of MoES staff (appendix C). However, the delivery mechanisms used by respective players are neither uniform nor clearly documented, with the exception of some few delivered by partners as presented in box 3.1 and table C.2, appendix C.

Analysis of training programs delivered indicates the following common features: (1) no national or district-level coordination of respective players in the SMC capacity-development initiatives, leading to higher chances of duplication and/or omission; (2) respective actors use different materials, save for the UNICEF-supported districts, where the SMC handbook is mostly used and the USAID/UNITY project areas, where modular-based instructional materials were developed for use by NGOs; (3) all players train no more than four members per SMC, including the chairperson—these members are in turn expected to transfer the knowledge gained to all other members upon their return to schools after the training, an approach that was considered inadequate by SMC

Box 3.1**USAID/UNITY Project SMC Training Model**

The training is delivered through a multilevel cascade model as follows:

- National-level team of SMC facilitators
- College or regional-level trainers of trainers
- Coordinating Centre Tutors (CCTs) level, who are then mandated to train SMC members for the schools under their coordination (CCs)

Methodologies: brainstorming, role playing, case studies, group work, and plenary presentations.

Source: USAID/UNITY 2010 project operation manual.

members queried; (4) all programs train members for not more than two days due to financial constraints; (5) the follow up of SMCs by the respective training teams was identified as weak; and (6) there is heavy reliance on the Coordinating Centre Tutors structure, which probably points to an acknowledgment of the technical expertise required by the trainees, since the bulk of national trainers are also drawn from the CCT structure.

Development of school improvement plans is the anticipated outcome of most of the training programs examined. This may imply that providers of the training perceive the existence of school plans as an end rather than a means through which quality and efficient service delivery can be realized. Other core functions are also downplayed, for example, monitoring program implementation, budgeting, personnel management, and curriculum delivery did not feature in any of the capacity-development programs reviewed. This could be either due to limited capacity from the side of providers, especially in regard to the roles of SMCs in their entirety, or an inability to decompose the roles into small actions or steps with which SMCs could be trained to improve their functionality. This also implies that even where some SMC members have been involved in capacity-development programs, the skills acquired may not necessarily embrace the legislated scope of their committees' operations.

Key challenges to effective capacity development of SMCs that were identified through focus group discussions and key informant interviews conducted under the SBM survey include training that is limited to a few members of the SMCs due to financial constraints, high turnover of SMCs members due to the voluntary nature of their roles and lack of regular follow-up and re-training, and lack of impact assessments on this training to ascertain its relevance and effectiveness to SMC operations, including informing the various players of the weaknesses, strengths, and impacts of various training models with an eye to scaling up the more effective interventions.

Supervisory Support to Schools from the Districts as Another Capacity Enhancement Measure

Under the decentralization framework, schools are expected to be supported technically through the established local government structures.² District-level personnel from the Directorates of Education involved in the provision of school-level supervisory support include the District Education Officers (DEOs) and the District Inspectors of Schools (DISs).

Results from the SBM survey indicate that public schools are more frequently visited by district representatives than private schools (figure 3.8). On average, public schools received such a visit close to two months prior to the survey, compared to about three months for their private counterparts. Regional findings indicate that schools in the northern region (north and northeast) are more often visited by district representatives than schools in other regions. Fewer visits by the district representatives were reported especially in the western region, including the southwestern region.

Further analysis was undertaken based on the 2009/10 Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS). Results in figure 3.9 confirm the limited support provided to schools, as reflected by external technical visits to schools. Only one in every four schools (irrespective of school type: public or private, rural or urban), reported having been visited by a district inspector or a CCT during the 12 months prior to the 2009/10 UNHS survey. It is surprising to note that district-level officers (DEOs and DISs) were the least frequently reported visitors to schools in comparison to other visitors.

In sum, informational resources have been produced to guide the operations of SMCs, but there is limited access to such information by members of these committees, as indicated by the proportions that reported having read these materials. SMC members’ knowledge about their roles is very limited. Capacity development for SMCs by local governments is not prioritized, nor do budgets exist for such activities at the Ministry of Local Government (MoLG). Some of

Figure 3.8 Months Since the DEOs and DIS’ Visit to Schools by Type of School and Region; SBM Survey; Uganda 2011

Source: World Bank 2011.

Figure 3.9 Percent Distribution of Schools Visited by District and Other Officials in the Last 12 Months in Uganda; UNHS 2009/10

Source: Uganda National Household Survey data 2009/10.

the ongoing initiatives are led by the MoES, while there are also other capacity development activities undertaken by NGOs across the country. Coordination of these initiatives is lacking, however, and the content delivered is focused on a narrow range of roles vis-à-vis the entirety of mandated functions. The justification for a solid and comprehensive capacity-development program for SMCs thus exists, and existing materials and ongoing initiatives would form a good starting point, notwithstanding the need to expand their scope to cover the wide range of skills reflected in their mandated roles.

The summary of key findings for this section are presented in box 3.2 below.

Box 3.2

Summary of Findings

- SMC members' basic knowledge of their core role is high: three out of every four members cite overall directions to the schools they serve. However, their knowledge of the specific functions of SMCs as institutional organs is very low (for example, reviewing and amending budgets was reported by only 22 percent, while monitoring of school-level activities was only cited by 32 percent).
- Informational materials exist to enhance the functionality of SMCs, but access is limited.
- Capacity-development initiatives are undertaken on a project basis with limited geographical coverage, lack of coordination mechanisms for the various actors, high turnover of SMC members, low documentation of impact of various models used and lessons learned, greater focus on only a few responsibilities, and the "what" rather than the "how" these responsibilities can be executed for effective and efficient school-level operations.
- Administrative and technical support to schools by legislated organs is low, with only one in four schools reporting to have accessed such support in the year that preceded the survey.

Note

1. Local governments in Uganda include district and subcounty local governments, including local governments at the municipal and division levels in urban areas.

Functionality of School-Based Management Structures

This chapter explores the functionality of School Management Committees (SMCs) in a number of areas, with a special focus on participation, autonomy, and information for accountability.

Who Participates and Avenues of Participation in School Governance

One of the potential benefits of school-based management is effective use of resources, which is anchored in school-level planning and budgeting, processes together with other management practices that reflect local strategic direction in-service delivery. Effective school improvement plans (SIPs) have a description of goals and priority needs, strategies to achieve these goals that are shared and supported by all involved, and measures by which school performance can be assessed (World Bank 2007a). This section explores the interface of SMCs with these processes to establish SMCs' participation in school-level governance. Beneficiary participation in school-level processes, together with responsiveness to their roles, will also be explored in the latter parts of this chapter.

Three out of every four public primary schools in Uganda have SIPs—62 percent were seen by the enumerators, while another 13 percent were reported by head teachers, although copies were not seen by the enumerators (figure 4.1). The expansion of education in Uganda translates into increased school enrollment and school-level resources (financial, human, and physical), which necessitates effective planning for proper use. Schools are thus mandated to have three-year rolling SIPs. The SIP development process is led by the head teacher on behalf of the SMC and should be conducted in a consultative and participatory manner with full involvement of all key school-level actors, including parents and the community.

Evidence elsewhere indicates that school-level planning impacts learning in various ways. For example, Skoufias and Shapiro (2006) found in Mexico that a combination of increased resources to schools, along with local management,

Figures 4.1a–c Existence of School Improvement Plans by Type of School and Region; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

a. Percent public schools with SIP; Uganda SBM Survey, 2011

b. Percent private schools with SIP; Uganda SBM Survey 2011

c. Existence of SIPs by region; Uganda SBM Survey, 2011

Source: World Bank data.

Note: SIP = School improvement plan.

can produce small improvements in school outcomes—most especially in drop-out, repetition, and failure rates. It is, however, important to note that the high presence of SIPs in public schools is countered by the existence of few such plans in private schools (63 percent have no SIP), which, compounded by very limited inspection of private schools as earlier observed, may explain their relatively high noncompliance levels with some of the sector norms. Results by region also indicate that schools that did not have SIPs were more concentrated in the central region (53 percent there had no SIP) followed by the western region (47 percent), which highlights some of the regions where more action would be required to ensure compliance in this area. Despite the relatively

high level of district supervision, 35 percent of schools in the northeastern region also did not have SIPs.

Increasing pupils’ performance stands out as the major strategic objective for the majority of public schools (54 percent), in alignment with overall national goals and the concerns regularly expressed in education policy discourse. School-level focus on this issue should ideally translate into better school-level results. Yet the analysis of SIPs provided to the survey team from the schools that participated in the school-based management (SBM) survey shows that this goal is unevenly shared. Only 26 percent of the plans of private schools projected improvement in pupils’ performance as their main strategic objective. Of importance to note is that private primary schools outperform public primary schools in national assessments and hence the nonarticulation of the identified strategic objective may not necessarily imply a limited focus on children’s learning. The highest proportion of SIPs from private schools ranked expanding infrastructure, and most especially, classrooms, as their major objective, which shows the intensive capital investments required for the development of school establishments. It is also worth noting that improving staff wellbeing (staff welfare, including teachers’ houses) featured as a major objective of the SIPs in 14 percent of public schools (figure 4.2).

Participation in the school-level planning process by SMC members was, however, reported to be very low, notwithstanding the relatively high proportion of schools with SIPs in the public sector. Three core areas of involvement of SMCs in the SIPs were acknowledged: identification of school-level needs, holding or participating in consultative discussions with parents for consensus building and ownership, and consulting with the head teacher on the issues and strategies identified in the plan. All in all, SMC members reported to have fairly recent

Figure 4.2 Most Important Objective of the SIP by School Type and Region; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

a. Most important objective: School improvement plan

(figure continues on next page)

Figure 4.2 Most Important Objective of the SIP by School Type and Region; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011 (continued)

b. Most important objective: School improvement plan

Source: World Bank data.

SIPs in their schools (figure 4.3); and having been engaged in the needs identification process (figure 4.4). However, results further reveal that only 32 percent of the members of the planning and finance subcommittees were involved in this phase, even though the committee is at the center of development planning for the schools. Significantly higher participation in the needs identification process was recorded among SMC members who had secondary and tertiary education (55 percent and 95 percent more likely, respectively) than those with lower educational attainment, government employees (36 percent more likely), and those in the eastern region (60 percent).

Figure 4.3 Year When the School Development Plan was Developed; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

Source: World Bank data.

Figure 4.4 Role Played by SMC Members in the School Development Planning Process; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

Source: World Bank data.

Noteworthy is that a much lower proportion (29 percent) of SMCs reported to have ever engaged with head teachers in the SIP plan process—with the exception of those SMC members who were drawn from the parish level. These were 57 percent more likely to engage with head teachers compared to those from other backgrounds. This is, however, not a good result because the head teacher is the one who is supposed to ensure that all SMC members' views in regard to school progress are captured and well articulated in the SIP. Limited engagement of SMC members with head teachers in this process is likely to compromise SMC ownership and commitment to their respective schools' SIPs. Least engagement with head teachers in the planning process was reported in the central region (55 percent less likely) (table 4.1).

Only 11 percent of SMC members reported having participated in the endorsement process for their respective SIPs; including only 8 percent of members of the finance and development subcommittees (see table 4.2). Significantly higher participation in this exercise was reported by members with tertiary education attainment (179 percent more likely than members with other education levels), together with members who served on both the

Table 4.1 Likelihood of SMC Members Engagement with the Head Teacher in the School Planning Process; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	0.95	−5.2	0.751
Female ^a			
35–44	0.88	−11.6	0.572
45+	0.94	−5.9	0.772
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	1.26	26.1	0.153
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	1.15	15.1	0.418
Has tertiary education level	1.13	12.7	0.565
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	0.85	−15.4	0.429
Private sector & small business	1.04	4.5	0.838
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	0.45	−54.8	0.003
Western region	0.93	−7.2	0.693
Eastern region	1.15	14.9	0.467
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	1.56	56.5	0.011
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	1.16	16.2	0.344
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	0.99	−0.7	0.976
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

Table 4.2 Likelihood of Participation in the Endorsement of the Most Recent Plan by SMC Members; SBM Survey, 2011

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	1.16	16.1	0.540
Female ^a			
35–44	0.80	–20.1	0.445
45+	0.82	–17.9	0.485
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	1.04	3.9	0.860
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	1.35	35.2	0.270
Has tertiary education level	2.79	179.4	0.000
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	1.40	40.3	0.188
Private sector & small business	0.72	–27.9	0.311
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	0.56	–44.4	0.097
Western region	0.87	–13.2	0.576
Eastern region	0.60	–39.7	0.078
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	0.67	–32.7	0.063
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	1.14	14.1	0.550
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	1.80	80.1	0.048
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

local council and organized community groups (80 percent more likely than other members). Equally surprising is the substantial proportion of members who reported to have played no role, especially members of the finance and development subcommittees. Others with a significantly less likely role in the planning process include government employees (55 percent less likely) and those with no more than a secondary education (37 percent less likely) (table B.4 in appendix B).

The low participation of SMC members in the SIP development process is likely to have a negative effect on consensus generation around common issues affecting a school that deserve attention in program implementation. Constraints to SMC participation in school planning were raised in the focus group discussions, as summarized in box 4.1, which can inform improvements in this area. It is evident that keeping expectations in line with resources available to schools without curbing creativity and local initiative is one of the challenges, coupled with school planning and related team building skills, to enable effective engagement of all key players, including beneficiaries.

In a bid to protect school-level resources, Uganda instituted strategic reforms informed by Public Expenditure Tracking Studies (PETS), which revealed,

Box 4.1**Constraints to SMC Participation in the SIP Process—Views from Focus Group Discussions**

Lack of established and approved consultation process including mechanisms of identifying school needs following removal of Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs)

Limited contact with the district education office due to poor transport systems

Low educational attainment of some SMC members, which limits their ability to engage with school administration

Nonconsultative manner in which head teachers conduct the school-level planning process. Some responses from parents and SMC members: “as parents we are never consulted by the SMC members and the head teacher does not talk about the plan on the open day; the head teacher develops the plan himself and we don’t know what is contained in this plan”

Limited funding to schools, which demoralizes SMC members who want to participate in this process. “...however much we plan, school priorities are not addressed exhaustively due to lack of funds; this is a routine process and since we have no additional funds to implement school priorities, plans are useless; school plans in public schools have no budgets, since parents are not supposed to pay”

Limited logistical support to SMC members—this hampers regular communication with head teachers and parents for quality feedback in the school plans

Low governmental commitment to support schools’ efforts to implement the plans. School development planning is thus more routine than effective

Schools’ inability to raise funds to implement the school plan. Sample response: “...any initiative by the school is considered to be a trick by the head teacher and management committee to get money from the parents and is thus reported to the district education office immediately. We have all given up school-level planning.”

incredibly, that over 80 percent of school resources never reached schools and were susceptible to diversion for other district-level priorities, and that school expenditures on core teaching-learning items was also low. The initial reforms in the early 2000s focused on the institution of broad expenditure categories that indicate eligible items for UPE grant financing to protect school-level resources and ensure sufficient allocation toward teaching-learning processes. The broad categories include extra instructional/scholastic materials; cocurricular activities; management of school items, such as registers; provision of relevant specialized equipment/materials; and school-level discretionary expenditure resulting from unforeseen or unfunded priorities approved by management. Each expenditure category takes up not more than 20 percent of the capitation grants. These efforts were backed by media campaigns through which disbursement information to schools was published in the national newspapers, which

increased school grants that reached schools to 80 percent by 2001 (Reinikka and Svensson 2005). By 2010, grants were being sent directly to school accounts from the central government, resulting in total elimination of all forms of leakages outside the school system.

Devolution of the budgeting and financial management of school-level resources to the SMCs in collaboration with head teachers buttressed the above-mentioned reforms. School budgets are constituted of government grants, including capitation grants (conditional grants sent by the government directly to public schools based on an approved allocation formula¹) or funds that accrue for fees (where applicable); money from the sale of products; gifts, donations, or endowments from any sources; any other payments accruing from allowable payments by learners, for example, school feeding charges (where applicable); and any other funds raised in the name of, and on behalf of, the school. Annual school budgets are formulated by the school finance committee, working jointly with the head teacher, for approval by the SMC.

Satisfaction with the school budgeting process among SMC members is high (76 percent), as is members' satisfaction with planning (71 percent). There are, however, significant variations between public (78 percent) and private (62 percent) schools concerning satisfaction with budgeting (figure 4.5). Members of finance and development committees reported an even higher level of satisfaction (80 percent), which is not surprising, since it is their primary responsibility. They attributed it to adequacy of consultations held (34 percent), as well as cooperative administration and well-articulated issues affecting the schools (21 percent). Findings by sociodemographic characteristics of SMC members indicate that significantly higher levels of satisfaction with the school budgeting process were recorded among government employees (160 percent

Figure 4.5 SMC Members' Satisfaction with Planning and Budgeting Processes; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

Source: World Bank data.

more likely) and those working with the private sector (135 percent more likely) than among farmers. Higher satisfaction was also found among SMC members who were parents of children in the respective schools (63 percent more likely; table 4.3).

The effective participation of SMCs in the school budgeting process is, however, hindered by low discretion provided to schools in budgeting by virtue of the conditional nature of the grants, recurrently unfunded priorities, lack of simple budgeting guidelines for use by SMCs, and the low educational attainment of some SMC members. These concerns were raised by SMC members who participated in the focus group discussions, as captured in box 4.2.

Despite the high levels of satisfaction SMC members in school-level budgeting and planning processes, only about 28 percent of SMC members judged school-level consultations to be adequate and only 20 percent said school administration teams were cooperative, while about 15 percent of respondents felt relevant information for planning and budgeting was available (see figure 4.6).

About a fifth of SMC members reported having ever rejected some elements of their respective school budgets (18 percent of members) and plans (22 percent of members), which indicates some degree of objective discussions at the

Table 4.3 Likelihood of Being Satisfied with the School Budgeting Process by SMC Sociodemographic Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	1.30	29.8	0.147
Female ^a			
35–44	1.26	25.7	0.333
45+	1.29	29.0	0.257
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	1.63	62.8	0.005
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	0.75	–24.6	0.139
Has tertiary education level	0.77	–22.7	0.264
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	2.60	159.5	0.000
Private sector & small business	2.35	134.9	0.001
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	0.67	–33.0	0.119
Western region	0.72	–27.8	0.128
Eastern region	0.75	–24.5	0.203
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	0.88	–12.1	0.490
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	1.06	6.5	0.722
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	0.85	–14.9	0.515
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

Box 4.2

Constraints to SMC Participation in the Budgeting and Financial Management Process—Views From Focus Group Discussions

Conditional nature of grants to schools. Sample response: “funds to schools are known and their utilization is well communicated in the guidelines, therefore we have no role in budgeting except the head teacher; we have no issues with the school budget because there are rules governing the utilization of capitation grants to schools, therefore, the head teacher decides how to spend it”

Limited funds to schools and thus many unfunded priorities. Sample response: “...school budgets are based on what is provided, not on the school development plan, because many priorities in the plan are never funded”

Low educational levels of SMC members. Sample response: “... budgeting requires some knowledge of accounts and most of our members do not understand these issues. We leave them to the head teacher and bursar”

Lack of simple budget guidelines for use by SMC members to enhance school-level financial accountability. Sample response: “...yes, we have to review and approve the budget, but we do not know how to do this. It is the head teacher who leads the SMC members all the time; we do not know how to handle budget-related matters and all our suggestions are never addressed by the head teacher”.

Figure 4.6 SMC Members’ Views on the Planning and Budgeting Process in Schools; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

school level. Impressive to note is that the proportion that reported ever having rejected aspects of their SIPs or budgets was even higher among members of the finance and development committees, which is positive by virtue of the central role played by this committee in school affairs. Further analysis indicates that significantly higher chances of rejecting school plans were reported among the males (63 percent more likely) than females. In addition, SMC members from the eastern region were also more likely (by 235 percent) to reject school plans than those from other regions; together with those living within the parish (93 percent more likely) compared to those who lived elsewhere; and those members who had membership in local organized groups (97 percent more likely)—appendix B. In regard to school budgets, significantly higher chances of rejecting them was observed among SMC members from the eastern region (314 percent more likely) compared to others regions; those working with the private sector (118 percent more likely) compared to those in other employment categories; members of organized community groups (61 percent more likely) and those resident within the parish (54 percent more likely)—table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Likelihood of Rejecting Some Aspects of the School Budget by Sociodemographic Attributes of SMC Members; SBM Survey, Uganda, 2011

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	1.16	15.9	0.440
Female ^a			
35–44	0.80	–20.1	0.361
45+	1.12	12.4	0.610
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	1.14	14.2	0.456
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	0.78	–21.9	0.211
Has tertiary education level	1.33	33.1	0.196
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	0.81	–19.3	0.361
Private sector & small business	2.18	117.6	0.001
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	1.14	13.8	0.620
Western region	0.51	–49.4	0.005
Eastern region	4.14	313.9	0.000
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	1.54	54.3	0.023
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	1.61	60.5	0.007
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	0.51	–49.0	0.008
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

Overall, about 70 percent of SMC members reported having seen the SIP and budgets for their respective schools, which signals a high degree of transparency in school operations, although there are significant variations between public and private schools (see figure 4.7). However, only half of those who saw the documents reported having received copies for future reference. The financial implications of producing copies for the respective members (that is, the costs of printing or photocopying) could be one of the contributors to this situation. The lack of access to documents by SMCs members may limit their regular reference to the approved budget in their day-to-day discussions and monitoring of budget performance, thus reducing the effectiveness of their oversight.

Day-to-day school operations involve management meetings through which issues affecting the school are tabled for discussion, possible remedial actions suggested, and regular updates on school programs implementation provided by the head teacher to the SMC. Impressive to note is that SMC members' attendance of school management meetings is high—over 70 percent reported having attended the most recent meeting prior to the survey. The pattern is consistent across all regions of the country (figures 4.8a–b). Results further reveal that 56 percent of public schools reported having had their most recent SMC meeting six months prior to the survey, compared to 48 percent of private schools. The proportions, however, significantly varied across regions. For example, 68 percent of schools in the western region had had their most recent SMC meeting

Figure 4.7 Percent of SMC Members Reporting Various Aspects of Their School Plans and Budgets; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

Source: World Bank data.

Figure 4.8a–b SMC Members Attendance of School Meetings; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

a. Percent SMC members that attended the most recent meeting; SBM Survey Uganda 2011

b. Last time SMC met

Source: World Bank data.

Table 4.5 Likelihood of Attending SMC Meetings by Sociodemographic Attributes; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

Attendance of most recent meeting	Odds ratio	Percentage	P > z
Male	1.01	0.9	0.9620
Female ^a			
35–44	1.07	6.7	0.7800
45+	1.47	47.1	0.0880
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	0.92	–7.9	0.6360
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	1.38	37.6	0.0980
Has tertiary education level	1.22	22.1	0.3740
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	1.45	44.9	0.1100
Private sector & small business	1.08	8.2	0.7290
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	0.33	–67.5	0.0000
Western region	0.48	–52.4	0.0010
Eastern region	0.39	–60.9	0.0000
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	1.66	65.7	0.0040
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	0.79	–20.8	0.1850
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	0.70	–29.8	0.1200
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

within six months prior to the survey, compared to half (50 percent) in the eastern and 47 percent in the northern region. The likelihood of members attending SMC meetings is 66 percent more likely among SMC members who reside within the parish where the school is located together with those with secondary education (38 percent more likely) (see table 4.5).

Conduct of SMC meetings conforms to business norms, with 86 percent of members reporting having reviewed the minutes of the previous meeting prior to intensive discussions at their respective meetings (figure 4.9). Active participation of all members was reported by 71 percent of respondents, with a lower proportion in private (63 percent) compared to public (72 percent) schools. For democratic and harmonious consensus building, members are urged to subject controversial issues to a vote and one in every three members reported having done so at recently attended meetings prior to the survey. The most often reported issues discussed at meetings included the school budget, school development plan, pupil performance, and parental involvement in school matters (figure 4.10).

Participation of SMC members in school management is also accomplished through membership in school-level technical committees constituted of SMC members and additional members drawn from the teaching staff, consistent with the 2008 Education Act. The existence of these committees was confirmed through the SBM survey, especially the academic committee, disciplinary committee, sports and recreation committee, staff and students’ welfare committee, finance and development committee, and production and self-help committee (see figure 4.11). The aim of these teams is to support expeditious and informed decision making by the SMC, as well as ensuring that all policy and actions agreed to by the SMC are well implemented at the school level. SMC respondents in the SBM survey most often reported membership in the finance and development committee (48 percent), together with the disciplinary and academic committees (47 percent).

Participation in school-level committees significantly varies by sociodemographic characteristics of SMC members. Members of a finance and development committee are more likely to be men with postprimary education, nonfarmers and residents within the parish that hosts their respective schools. Similarly,

Figure 4.9 Conduct of SMC Meetings; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

Source: World Bank data.

Figure 4.10 Issues Discussed at the Most Recent SMC Meeting; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

Source: World Bank data.

Figure 4.11 Percent Distribution of SMC Members by Membership to School Committees; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

Source: World Bank data.

Table 4.6 Likelihood of SMC Members Participation on the School Finance Committee: SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

<i>Finance committee member</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	1.61	60.6	0.0020
Female ^a			
35–44	1.23	23.5	0.2670
45+	1.22	22.0	0.2750
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	0.73	–27.0	0.0200
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	1.62	62.1	0.0020
Has tertiary education level	2.24	124.0	0.0000
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	1.91	90.8	0.0000
Private sector & small business	1.50	50.1	0.0260
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	0.78	–21.6	0.2300
Western region	0.87	–13.2	0.3950
Eastern region	0.92	–7.9	0.6390
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	1.28	28.5	0.0840
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	1.02	2.4	0.8600
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	0.90	–9.9	0.6030
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

membership in an academic committee is significantly more likely among SMC members who are male, with postprimary education, and government employees. Of importance to note is that SMC members with children in the respective schools were least likely to belong to any of these committees, which may be indicative of issues of political economy that underlie the representation of the various SMC constituencies in such committees, a topic that needs further investigation beyond this work (tables 4.6 and 4.7).

Client Participation in School Governance and Responsiveness to Education

Giving citizens a stronger voice in service delivery is one of the identified tenets of school-based management and Ugandan law, as amplified in the 2008 Education Act, which clearly identifies the roles of parents in education service delivery, including monitoring of school-level resources, actively participating in school-level programs, and mobilizing fellow parents to participate in school-level programs. More parental and community involvement in school affairs

Table 4.7 Likelihood of SMC Members Participation on the School Academic Committee; Uganda SBM Survey, 2011

<i>Academic committee member</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	1.43	42.7	0.0270
Female ^a			
35–44	1.06	5.8	0.7780
45+	1.00	–0.5	0.9800
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	0.84	–16.1	0.2210
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	1.50	50.1	0.0150
Has tertiary education level	3.17	216.9	0.0000
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	2.28	128.0	0.0000
Private sector & small business	1.10	10.1	0.6270
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	1.10	9.6	0.6740
Western region	1.04	4.0	0.8280
Eastern region	1.87	87.1	0.0010
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	0.78	–22.4	0.0900
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	0.93	–6.6	0.6330
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	0.63	–36.7	0.0440
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

may translate into effective allocation of resources, improvements in school administration (including establishment of school-based systems that track learners' performance), and positive changes in the school climate through the expression of greater levels of satisfaction toward the delivered services (Patrinos et al. 2007). According to the World Development Report (WDR) 2004: Making Services Work for Poor People, client participation is also central to increasing the accountability of schools and holding policy makers on the whole accountable. This in turn is expected to strengthen the delivery of public services, including education. The accountability route for education services is, however, expected to become shorter and more direct when the representatives of clients—either parents or community members—get the authority to make certain decisions, or at least have a voice in decisions that affect their children's schooling.

A review of the decentralization policy clearly indicates that the roles of parents and communities in education service delivery were clearly envisaged. These are also amplified in the recent 2008 Education Act, as captioned below. Community involvement in the management function is reinforced by its role in resource mobilization, together with monitoring for effective utilization. Yet

how to nurture the relationship between formal school management, on the one hand, and parents and communities, on the other, remains a big challenge, especially with the introduction of the free education reforms.

<i>Parents</i>	<i>Community</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing children basic requirements (feeding, hygiene, and medical care)• Providing basic child nurturing and support (preparing the child to attend school, provision of a safe home environment, and so on)• Providing physical support (for example, scholastic materials)• Supporting and monitoring children’s learning at school and home• Developing relationships with teachers in a manner that supports children’s learning.• Ensuring children participate in school-level activities• Monitoring utilization of school-level resources• Actively participating in school-level programs• Mobilizing fellow parents to participate in school improvement efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contributing ideas toward the improvement of teaching-learning programs for schools in their locality• Contributing to the construction of school buildings by providing local materials and other support consistent with the laws• Contributing to security and safety of school children and school property, including buildings and grounds• Participating in community mobilization activities that support improved pupil learning at home and school• Providing informed guidance to school administrations for improved pupil discipline within and outside of school• Providing safe water sources• Ensuring schools have adequate and hygienic places for teacher operations• Ensuring schools have recreational facilities• Ensuring school signposts exist

The Parent Teacher Association (PTA), a traditional and a common feature of the Uganda education system, was outlawed by the 2008 Education Act. In its place, one parent representative—selected at the annual school parents meeting, either through voting by the parents present or through nomination by the head teacher together with the SMC, based on the active involvement of such parents in school affairs—sits on each school’s SMC. Although there is no formal documentation to explain the decision to ban the PTA, informal discussions with government officials and community members generated a number of reasons, the most important being (1) the misconception that PTAs were synonymous with cash contributions by parents and were thus not in sync with the free education reforms being implemented in the country; and (2) the likely misuse of the PTA platform by political opposition members following the resurgence of multiparty politics in Uganda. Further justification lies in the high representation of elected councilors on the SMC, with the assumption that since they are democratically elected by the people, then they are truly representative of the interests of the clients of the education system. The illegal status of the PTAs implies there is no officially recognized link between the school system and parents and, hence, the latter have no formally sanctioned channel through which to voice their concerns. Nevertheless, the representation of parents on the SMC is indicative of the policy intent to embrace the beneficiary

voice in school management. The key questions are then related to whether such representation is sufficient for the entire parent constituency for the respective schools and the acceptability of the SMC platform by both the representatives and the parents/community.

Beneficiary participation in school governance is low. Measurable proxy indicators of client participation in school governance include the role played by the representative of parents in the school planning process, as presented in figure 4.12. Although a good number of them reported having participated in the identification of school needs (60 percent), slightly less than half (48 percent) reported having discussed school issues with fellow parents in the course of developing the SIP, which points to a limited parental voice. A much lower proportion interfaced with the head teacher (27 percent), while only 14 percent reported having participated in the endorsement of the SIP. For all SMC members, only 34 percent (irrespective of the constituency that they represent) reported having consulted with parents in the SIP process, which shows limited parental participation in this process and further confirms limited client participation.

A decomposition by sociodemographic characteristics indicates a significantly higher engagement with parents in the planning process among older (45+ years) SMC members (44 percent more likely) and those with secondary education (52 percent more likely). Those who were least likely to engage parents in the planning process were SMC members who had membership in local councils and organized community groups (43 percent less likely) and those in regions other than the north.

Institutional reforms take time to be grounded in established systems. For example, some SMC members reiterated the inability of SMCs to effectively execute budgeting and financial management responsibilities, which they perceived to be roles of the PTAs. This issue was articulated in one of the focus group discussions, as presented in box 4.3.

Figure 4.12 Role Played by Representatives of Parents in the Planning Process; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

Source: World Bank data.

Box 4.3**SMC Members' Responses That Indicate the Still Expected Roles of PTAs—Focus Group Discussions**

Inability of SMCs to undertake budgeting and financial management functions of schools. Some focus group discussants attributed this to lack of clarity on SMCs roles in this regard, even though a review of roles and responsibilities indicates that this is a clearly articulated role for the SMCs in the 2008 Education Act, which outlawed the PTAs. Typical responses were as follows: "Follow-up to the elimination of PTAs, there is no organ charged with financial management issues at the school"; "PTAs were very useful and enabled head teachers to provide proper accountability to the parents, which is no longer possible today because all reports go directly to the districts."

Client responsiveness to education programs is central to their success. Mobilization of parents and the entire community is hence one of the core responsibilities of head teachers under the overall leadership of the SMCs. Effective execution should translate into the fulfillment of parental roles in education delivery, including regular learner attendance, provision of basic requirements (for example, scholastic materials), school feeding, and other requirements, as provided by law.

Parental responsiveness to education programs in Uganda is low (figures 4.13a–f). This is indicated by such unresolved problems as learner absenteeism, estimated at 33 percent, with a higher proportion reported in rural (37 percent) than in urban (29 percent) schools. Low attendance rates are detrimental to learning and academic achievement. Students who do not attend school as frequently as required receive fewer hours of classroom instruction and consequently perform more poorly. Finn (1989) found that consistently low levels of attendance in early grades were associated with higher future academic risks, including nonpromotion and dropout. In their study of five Rwenzori region districts in Uganda, Heneveld et al. (2006) also identified high pupil participation in school through regular attendance as one of the characteristics that define the critical path for improving learning outcomes in Uganda. Readiness to learn, as shown by learners' access to scholastic materials (pen/pencil and exercise book), was only 58 percent, with wide variations between public (47 percent) and private schools (70 percent), a situation also confirmed by district-specific studies like the Quality Enhancement Initiative (QEI). Learners without these simple but key inputs compromise the teaching-learning process and demotivate instructors.

These results thus show that school management systems have been largely ineffectual as far as mobilizing parents and the local community to support education programs is concerned. This poses a big challenge to the system

Figure 4.13a–f Some Indicators of Low Parental Support to Education in Uganda

a. Pupil absenteeism in Uganda by grade; UNPS 2009/10

b. Percent of observed classrooms where all primary school children had at least pen/pencil and exercise book in class; UNPS 2009/10

c. Percent of observed classrooms by district where primary school children had at least an exercise book per learning area in 2009/10; QEI Surveys, Uganda

d. Percent of observed classrooms where all children had pen/pencil in 2009/10, QEI Surveys, Uganda

e. Most serious problems faced by schools as identified by head teachers; UNPS 2009/10

f. Percentage of children 6–12 years in primary school, who had no breakfast; Uganda UNHS 2009/10

Sources: a. Uganda National Panel Survey data, 2009/10.

b. Uganda National Panel Survey, data, 2009/10.

c. Uganda Education Quality Enhancement Initiative Survey data, 2009/10.

d. Uganda Education Quality Enhancement Initiative Survey data, 2009/10.

e. Uganda National Panel Survey data, 2009/10.

f. Uganda National Household Survey, 2009/10.

because parents are expected to be the crucial drivers of quality education in Uganda through their sustained desire to see their children attend and successfully complete school. However, failure to fulfill their core roles points to limited interest in, or understanding of, their children's learning, and as a result weakens their position and compromises their ability to hold school management teams

accountable. There are no sanctions imposed on parents who fail to fulfill their roles, as the law forbids schools from sending away any child who turns up for fear this would eventually lead the student to drop out of school. The free-of-charge nature of universal education is often emphasized more than the responsibility of parents and the community to enter into a sustainable partnership with government. Coupled with this is the negative politicization of universal programs, with reported fear and reluctance on the part of school managers and district leaders to involve parents due to insecurity about their own positions and the unpredictable manner in which affected parents and the entire local-level leadership would respond.

In their findings from the study on parental participation conducted in Burundi, Malawi, Senegal, and Uganda, Marphatia et al. (n.d.) found that parents demonstrated a consistent lack of awareness of the full content of education policies. As much as they were aware of education being free and mandatory, they remained unaware of the roles and responsibilities that the policies formally ascribe to them with respect to school-level engagement and governance issues. The authors noted that there is a need for countries to facilitate parental engagement in school matters in a meaningful way. Specific to Uganda, parents who participated in this multicountry study perceived that “free education” blocked their involvement in schools, since they felt they had no say over a service for which they were not paying. The study concluded that parents were the least powerful and least informed of all stakeholders, particularly about how they could become involved, and have limited access to decision-making fora.

Innovative ways of engaging parents and the wider community to support education remains a binding constraint to improving learning in Uganda. The roles of parents are clearly articulated in the 2008 Education Act as highlighted above, which reflects the positive policy intent of government in this regard. However, space for parental engagement seems limited by virtue of their limited representation on the SMCs, coupled with the outlawing of the PTAs. Day-to-day interaction with the parents and community is in the ambit of the head teacher and the SMC.

Parents and the community have a vital role to play in efforts to provide quality education. School leadership needs political support in this effort so that effective realization of parental responsibilities is enhanced for efficient and effective education service delivery.

The elimination of the PTA hinders parental communication and responsiveness to school issues, rendering outward accountability for school operations nonexistent. When parents are involved in planning for and using school grants, a process of social auditing promotes transparency and accountability. The barring of the collective voice of parents in Uganda is thus likely to seriously undermine the ability to hold SMCs and school administrations accountable. Reliance on annual school meetings with parents, as is the case today, rests on the assumption that all school management teams adhere to this requirement, but evidence from the 2009 Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS) indicates that only 24 percent of public schools reported holding annual meetings

with parents. The SBM survey also indicated that in most cases, schools did not avail themselves of the opportunity to use annual meetings to report to parents on budgets vis-à-vis expenditures, together with school-level performance and functioning status. Open days held once a year to enable schools to showcase their activities in recreational and music competitions and other areas remain the only avenues through which parents are collectively invited to schools. Yet these occasions provide limited opportunities for open discussions of school matters. Focus group discussants articulated the crucial role of parental involvement in ensuring proper budgeting and financial management at the school level, with an appeal for the reinstitution of PTAs.

In conclusion, SMCs are delegated clear roles in school governance under the law, yet their participation in school governance processes, and especially planning and budgeting, is low. This is true, paradoxically, despite the high levels of satisfaction with both school-level planning and budgeting expressed by SMC members. Participation in various processes also varies by sociodemographic characteristics of SMC members. A number of constraints to their participation have been cited, ranging from lack of established processes to limited funding to schools, which makes the entire process routine. Nevertheless, participation in school-level SMC meetings is high. Improving academic performance, as evidenced from pass rates at the primary leaving exams, was found to be one of the most frequently discussed issues in SMC meetings. Participation of clients in school governance is low, together with parental responsiveness to education programs. Increasing the effective participation of SMC members in school governance, providing space for the participation of clients (that is, parents and the community), and enhancing clients' involvement in local education delivery are the emerging challenges.

What Decisions Are Made at the School Level and Who Are Key Players?

School management involves decision making on a number of issues at the school level, depending on the degree of autonomy exercised by school management teams. Barrera-Osorio et al. (2009) stress that devolution of decision-making powers should ideally translate into greater efficiency, based on the idea that those involved in the day-to-day management of a school have greater knowledge of and management control over the needs of the school and therefore are better able to make decisions that are effective in terms of academic results and efficient spending. Bruns, Filmer, and Patrinos (2011) further reiterate that decentralization increases school autonomy and accountability for the use of inputs, with expected improvements in service delivery for the poor. This analytical work has explored the issue of who actually makes decisions at the school level and precisely which decision-making rights are held by school management teams, including SMCs and head teachers. The areas explored include distribution of financial support to allow needy children to continued attending school; providing infrastructure needs for schools, such as classrooms and teacher housing; providing learning materials, such as textbooks and chalk; repairs of broken items in the school; hiring, suspension, and transfer of teachers; and starting a school feeding program.

A two-pronged approach to the investigation of head teachers' school-level decision making was adopted to enable both the capture of the decision-making process and triangulation of results. The initial probe focused on initiators of decisions and/or decision makers on any of the issues listed above. The follow-up probe sought information on the approving authority for those decisions. Results of the analysis are presented in figures 4.14a–b.

School management teams have limited autonomy. Existing evidence shows that school-level decisions are influenced by a multiplicity of players, which mirrors the multiplicity of players in the education service delivery system in the country. These include the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) and District Education Officers (DEOs) at the national and district level, respectively;

Figure 4.14a–b Who Makes Decisions at the School Level on Any of the Following; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

a. Most important decision maker

(figure continues on next page)

Figure 4.14a–b Who Makes Decisions at the School Level on Any of the Following;
SBM Survey Uganda, 2011 (continued)

b. Most important actor to provide/approve

(figure continues on next page)

Figure 4.14a–b Who Makes Decisions at the School Level on Any of the Following; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011 (continued)

Source: World Bank data.

and SMCs, teachers, and parents at the school level. PTA executive members and faith-based organizations, where they play a founding role in a school, were also cited by head teachers as central to the initiation and approval of school-level decisions.

School-level decision making is nonuniform, which points to the complexity of school management. Key initiators of school-level decisions, together with approvers of respective decisions, significantly vary not only by issue being decided, but also geographically—as reflected in regional patterns. For example, should a school wish to provide financial support to a needy child, responses on who would make this decision were varied. Some 23 percent of head teachers reported that the key decision maker on this is the SMC, while another 18 percent reported that they were the main decision makers on this.

In addition, about half (54 percent) of head teachers reported that they were the main decision makers on issues to do with buying school items such as chalk, while another 21 percent cited the SMC. Only 20 percent of head teachers reported that they were the main decision makers on teacher transfers and/or suspensions, while 35 percent indicated the DEO and 24 percent indicated the SMC as the main decision makers on this issue. In regard to hiring an extra teacher, 27 percent of head teachers indicated that they were the main decision makers for this and an equal proportion cited the SMC. Of interest to note is that while 35 percent of head teachers reported the DEO as the main decision maker on teacher transfer and suspension, only 11 percent reported the same for the hiring of an extra teacher. The central ministry was frequently cited as key decision maker on housing (23 percent), classroom construction (34 percent), and textbooks (17 percent), which may be due to its lead role in the provision of key inputs that support the implementation of the universal education program.

Similarly, the authority that approved decisions made at the school level also varied by issue; most importantly, this was not consistent with the pattern observed for the initiators and/or decision makers (figure 4.14b). This could be due to a number of factors, including different decision-making processes at different schools, or the lack of clarity on who does what in school management. While decisions to undertake something can be made at the school level, documentation has to be generated and approved to ensure execution is consistent with management norms. However, it could also be that there is limited knowledge among head teachers on who actually does what, which could be the result of an omission in the law or lack of clarity on decision-making procedures.

How Are School Shortages and Requests for Supplies Handled?

At least three out of every five primary schools experience shortages of key inputs. This is based on evidence generated from head teachers in the SBM survey (figure 4.15). A shortage of textbooks was reported in 88 percent of schools, followed by shortages of staff, infrastructure, and furniture (about 70 percent for all three categories). Inadequate access to key inputs at the school level constrains effective school management. It is, however, impressive to note that delays in funds and payments to schools were the least reported (20 percent), which reflects the positive strides made by government in timely release of funds to schools, as earlier indicated.

The extent to which school management reacts proactively to address school shortages—by submitting requests for needed supplies—is mixed and greatly varies by region. For example, of the 88 percent of head teachers who reported shortages for textbooks, only 42 percent submitted requests for the same to the responsible authorities. Similarly, of the 59 percent who reported shortages for classrooms or toilets, about 40 percent reported having submitted requests for these inputs. However, relatively higher proactivity is registered in the

submission of requests for staff compared to other education inputs. The high proactivity on staff could thus be explained by the nearness of the responsibility centers to the schools, as opposed to other items for which the responsibility centers are spread across various organs. It is also evident from figure 4.15b that three-quarters of head teachers reported having submitted their requests for staff to DEOs.

Figures 4.15a–d School Shortages and Requests for Assistance; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

a. Head teachers reporting shortages, action taken and response;
SBM Survey Uganda 2011

b. Where do the head teachers submit their requests? SBM Survey Uganda 2011

(figure continues on next page)

Figures 4.15a–d School Shortages and Requests for Assistance; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011
(continued)

c. Percent head teachers submitting requests for inputs by region; SBM Survey Uganda 2011

d. Percent of school requests that were successfully responded to; SBM Survey Uganda 2011

Source: World Bank data.

Satisfactory response to school-level requests for various inputs is extremely low and varies by item requested and geographical region of the country. All in all, only 12 percent and 10 percent, respectively, of school requests for staff and textbooks were satisfactorily honored. The highest positive response to school requests for staff (26 percent) and textbooks (20 percent) was recorded in the southwestern region. Repeated nonresponses to school requests for key inputs are a disincentive to school management. They also yield resignation on part of management, which often results in steady compromises on quality on the part of implementers as they struggle to deliver with lower-than-projected levels of

supplies to meet actual needs—which may also explain the high number of schools that reported not having submitted any requests for support for the various shortages experienced.

The diversity of channels through which requests to schools are submitted, even for similar needs, signals not only weak coordination but also an absence, or unawareness, of established modalities and procedures, with likely duplication or omission. For example, 6 percent of the requests for textbooks made by schools in the western region were routed to MoES, while another 19 percent were sent to the DEO; the percentages for other regions were significantly different. A similarly nonuniform pattern is observed for requests for latrines. However, a more uniform pattern seems to emerge in regard to staff shortages, with more schools reporting having submitted requests to the DEO, which is consistent with the decentralized governance structure in Uganda. Substantially higher proportions of schools did not make any request for support, especially in the western and central regions.

In summary, the devolution of school management responsibilities to school-based committees has not translated into school autonomy. Decision-making powers rest with various organs outside the school, which may be due to the mostly centralized provision of key inputs for education service delivery. Schools experience shortages but proactivity, as reflected in the requests for these inputs from responsibility centers, is low. Nevertheless, successful response to requests from schools is also very low. The diversity of channels through which these requests are routed signals both weak coordination and lack of clarity on where these submissions should be made. This points to emerging policy imperatives.

How Are Schools Organized for Learning?

This chapter explores two areas that are central to school management: school-level teacher support and supervision and classroom environment.

School-level Teacher Support and Supervision—Who Does It?

In Uganda, teachers constitute a substantial share of the public service personnel. Teacher training, recruitment, and management cut across a number of ministries. Ongoing quality improvement efforts in education in the country have primarily focused on the provision of teachers, including their equitable spread across and within districts, together with intraschool allocation of teachers across various grades. MoES is in charge of teacher training, including in-service training, setting pedagogical standards for quality, provision of ongoing teacher support and mentoring through the outreach arm of the Primary Teacher Training Colleges (PTCs), known as Coordinating Centre Tutors (CCTs). The ministry also sets and reviews overall school-level teacher ceilings (that is, the maximum number of teachers a school should have), based on the overall wage resource envelope for the sector as provided and managed by the Ministry of Public Service (MoPS). Local governments under the overall management of

Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs) are the overall employers of teachers, consistent with the decentralized governance system in Uganda, based on regulations and procedures set by the public service management structure of MoPS.

Primary teacher recruitment is thus undertaken by the District Service Commissions (DSCs), and their deployment to respective schools by the District Education Office. Teachers are public servants, and teacher policies, including payroll management, are within the overall public service management structures set by MoPS. Ongoing improvements in the national payroll management system have yielded gains for teachers, and by 2011 all teacher salaries were directly paid to teachers' personal bank accounts by MoPS across the country, which enabled their prompt access to their salaries. The national public service performance management system has also been reformed, though results are yet to be realized.

Uganda's policy is clear on the roles of head teachers and teachers. Head teachers' responsibilities with regard to supervision and provision of pedagogical support to teachers are well articulated in the law (2008 Education Act) and are an integral part of their managerial and oversight role at schools on behalf of the SMCs. Similarly, what is expected of teachers with regard to teaching and learning is also well defined in the law. Legislated mandates for head teachers and teachers (in addition to the prescribed public service roles and performance standards of head teachers and teachers) point to a high-level commitment to ensure effective execution of service delivery functions from the policy side, although this may not be in sync with actual practice due to context-specific operational constraints.

<i>Head teachers</i>	<i>Teachers</i>
<p>Overall: Manages school on behalf of SMCs by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring school starts on time • Accounting for all school-level finances and other resources • Supervising teachers to ensure high-level performance • Being first-line inspector of schools • Providing first-line pedagogical support to teachers through mentoring and training programs • Allocating teacher timetables • Mobilizing and sensitizing community and parents around school-level activities • Providing ideas/advice to the SMCs • Planning for, and ensuring maintenance of, high-level standards in discipline, cocurricular activities, hygiene, infrastructure, and teaching-learning materials • Being secretary to the SMC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparing lesson plans to guide the teaching-learning process • Teaching both curricular and cocurricular activities • Providing all-round education programs for attracting pupils and parents (for example, concerts, science fairs) • Being exemplary leaders to pupils consistent with the Teachers' Code of Conduct • Being part of school subcommittees, as appointed by the head teacher and SMCs

As indicated above, head teachers, under the overall nominal management of the SMCs, are the first-line managers of teachers in all aspects. They are the initial administrative inspectors of teachers, charged with ensuring their regular attendance and performance, consistent with established standards and the teacher code of conduct. Head teachers are also pedagogical managers at the school level, mandated to identify and strengthen teacher competencies, and/or ensure existence of coaching and mentoring mechanisms for newly recruited teachers, for effective classroom performance. Their activities should be reinforced by the outreach arm of the Primary Teacher Training Colleges (PTC), which are in turn supported by the Coordinating Centre Tutors. These oversee school catchment areas (serving an average of 35–80 schools) based on the PTC zoning system for Coordinating Centers (CCs).

Provision of instructional support to teachers, including head teachers, is central to smooth school-level operations. Yet among public schools, 1 in every 3 had never received such support, while another quarter of schools reported having received instructional support in the last six months before the survey (figure 4.16). Private schools reported much less instructional support than public schools. Some 58 percent had never received such support, while 19 percent reported having received it six months prior to the survey. All in all, the proportion of schools that had never received instructional support was highest in the western region (68 percent and 50 percent in the west and south-west, respectively); the proportion of schools that had received instructional support around the time of the survey or a month before the survey was highest in the northern region.

Figure 4.16 Last Time Instructional Visit to School Was Provided by School Type and Region; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

a. Last time instructional visit

(figure continues on next page)

Figure 4.16 Last Time Instructional Visit to School Was Provided by School Type and Region; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011 (continued)

b. Last time instructional visit

Source: World Bank data.

Findings from the 2009/10 UNPS further confirm low levels of instructional support. Only 24 percent of schools reported to have ever been visited by the CCTs in the 12 months prior to the survey (figure 4.17).

Identified constraints met by some of the CCTs include understaffing of outreach tutors (CCTs) resulting from some CCs not being staffed and hence increasing the number of schools under the catchment areas for staffed CCs; logistical constraints, including insufficient fuel allowances for those with motorbikes or lack of transport facilities; the seemingly elastic scope of CCT operations (pedagogy, SMC training, inspection, and many more), which limits their ability to concentrate on the core functions of technical support to

Figure 4.17 Percent Schools Visited by CCTs in Last 12 Months UNHS 2009/10

Source: Uganda National Household Survey, 2009/10.

teachers; the uncoordinated manner of badly needed project- and NGO-based interventions; and the low capacity of teachers, especially in rural schools, who need more time than planned for effective supervision. The planned remapping of CCs and the ongoing filling of vacant CCT positions in the various PTCs are likely to ease some of these identified pressures.

The incidence of head teacher absence from school due to emergencies in the month prior to the SBM survey was reported at 38 percent; while official head teacher absences since the term began were estimated at 83 percent, with wide differentials between public and private schools (87 percent and 62 percent, respectively) as shown in figure 4.18. Most official absences arise from the need to attend workshops (38 percent), together with head teacher meetings (34 percent) at various locations; while a substantial proportion also reported other meetings (15 percent). According to MoES regulations, all training workshops involving teachers and head teachers have to be approved either at the district or central level, depending on the level at which they are convened. In addition, MoES is the only approving authority for all central-level meetings for school teams, including approval of respective participants. It is, however, surprising that official absences still constitute a big share of head teacher absences from school. This indicates either low compliance with this regulation or misreporting of the reasons for the absence of the respective head teachers in the survey. In his research on teachers in Anglophone Africa, Mulkeen (2010) found that too often, head teachers “look up rather than down,” implying that they tend to focus their efforts on dealing with the district and central administration, rather than on managing the school for which they are responsible, which is consistent with the above findings. Similarly, Habyarimana (2007) observed that head teacher absences in Uganda were 50 percent higher than teacher absences. Inspection reports for the years 2009 and 2010 also reported high head teacher absenteeism—at 24 percent and 36 percent, respectively.²

Figure 4.18 Head Teacher Absences from School; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

a. Percent of head teachers off from school by reason; SBM Survey Uganda 2011

Source: World Bank data.

b. Official work attended to by head teachers while away from school; SBM Survey, 2011

Teacher absenteeism is also high. By 2009/10, teacher absenteeism in public schools of Uganda was estimated at 21 percent, with no significant variations by grade (figure 4.19). This is, however, a noticeable decline from the 27 percent level observed in 2007 (Habyarimana 2007). Sector-specific microsurveys also indicate high levels of absenteeism (for example, the 2009 QEI survey estimated absences of 21 percent in the morning and 26 percent in the afternoon). Inspection reports for the years 2009 and 2010, however, report lower levels (15 percent) for both years. Work and personal health-related teacher absenteeism account for only 26 percent of teacher absences, however, and following decisions of the November 2011 joint annual education sector review, relief teachers will be hired to fill in for official absent teachers. Of importance to note

Figure 4.19 Teacher Absenteeism in Uganda by grade; UNPS 2009/10

a. Percent teacher absenteeism by grade in Uganda; UNPS 2009/10

Source: Uganda National Panel Survey, 2009/10.

b. Why are teachers absent; UNPS 2009/10

is that teacher absenteeism in private schools is about half of that in public schools, with the exception of P7, which may partly be attributed to the full control that head teachers in private schools have over their teaching staff—specifically, recruitment and payroll management—with regular nonattendance likely to attract disciplinary action, including salary cuts. In their use of panel survey data in Zambia, Das et al. (2007) observed that a 5 percent increase in a teacher's absence rate reduces learning by 4 to 8 percent of average gains over the year for both math and English; and that teacher illnesses and illness of family members accounted for more than 60 percent of teacher absences.

Pedagogical supervision of teachers is low. The extent to which teachers have curriculum outlines for the term and lesson plans for individual classes (for the various content areas to be covered in the teaching-learning process) is revealed here by proxy indicators that capture the pedagogical supervision for teachers (see figure 4.20). These enable head teachers to establish not only content mastery, but also curriculum coverage for the respective grades. Based on the QEI surveys of 2009/10, preparation of curriculum outlines/schemes of work to be delivered per term by teachers is very low (24 percent in 2009 and 56 percent in 2010), with dramatic improvements registered in one year as a result of the intensive teacher inspection and instructional support undertaken in the QEI target districts between 2009 and 2010.

As earlier indicated, head teachers are the first pedagogical managers of teachers and should also ensure that teachers undertake sufficient preparation for the teaching-learning process. Mulkeen (2010) reiterates that head teachers in Anglophone Africa do not see pedagogical leadership as part of their role, nor are

Figure 4.20 Percent P3 Teachers with Schemes of Work; QEI Survey 2009/10

Source: Uganda Education Quality Enhancement Initiative Survey data, 2009/10.

they trained for this role. As is the case in Uganda, leadership training for in-post head teachers is either provided through short courses (often financed through donor projects) provided for a limited period; or through existing university programs for one year (for diploma management courses) or two years (for the masters in education management program). The low frequency of external inspection of schools further points to low supervision of head teachers and hence their low motivation to supervise teachers. Recent improvements in the public service management system have placed head teacher supervision under the supervision of subcounty executives, while the organization of teachers' service, which attempts to institute a promotional career structure, is also under implementation, though improvements resulting from these efforts have yet to be realized.

Only 3 percent of head teachers in the 2009/10 UNPS cited teacher absenteeism as a challenge. Similarly, only 40 percent of SMC members reported ensuring teacher discipline as one of their central roles. In addition, teacher absenteeism did not feature among the four most important issues affecting schools reported by SMC members who participated in the survey. Further focus group discussions revealed SMC members' insistence that this was not within their purview, but rather the responsibility of the head teachers only, which points to the limited support from SMCs that head teachers have in this area. Further probes of constraints revealed other problems: low teacher motivation, large class sizes, and the need for teachers to engage in other community livelihood activities, such as farming, to enhance their incomes (box 4.4). Strong voices were articulated in regard to the SMCs noninvolvement in the recruitment of head teachers and teachers, which members said complicates their management functions.

The primary education systems analysis undertaken in 2011 highlights clientelism, with patronage networks dominating decision-making processes in the public human resource management system in place of formal systems and rules of procedure. Head teachers have reported that teachers use their links to local patronage networks, important families, or politicians to block any attempts by head teachers or SMCs to manage them in line with the rules of the system. This erodes the incentive for head teachers and SMC members to initiate action against nonperforming teachers in the school.

Although the above-mentioned constraints currently limit the impact of SMCs in improving education quality in Uganda, it is important to note the potential that SMCs have to impact the teaching-learning process, as shown by the experience of some other countries. Impact evaluations on school-based management reform programs conducted in Brazil, Guatemala, and Nicaragua indicate that involvement of school management committees in the hiring of head teachers and teachers significantly improved their performance, especially when coupled with training of school management councils on how to monitor their performance (Barrera-Orsorio et al. 2009). In Kenya, empowerment of school management committees through training in teacher management significantly increased teachers' likelihood of being in class at the time random visits were conducted (Duflo, Dupas, and Kremer 2009).

Box 4.4**Constraints to SMC Participation in Head Teacher and Teacher Supervision—Views from the Focus Group Discussions**

Noninvolvement in the recruitment of head teachers and teachers. Sample response: "...as SMCs, we are not the employers of teachers. Head teachers and teachers are employed by the district and sent to us. We have no control over them. They are civil servants managed by Government."

Low teacher motivation. Sample response: "...it is hard for SMCs to ensure teachers arrive on time and perform to their best because a number of them are still on probation. In addition, they do not have accommodation at the school so they all come in from outside and far from our school." "Our teachers do not have lunch at school due to lack of funds so they walk to the trading centre during lunch time and those without bicycles do not return after lunch because of the distance to and from the trading centre."

Large class sizes. Sample response: "supervising teachers is a challenge because the school is big and we have very few teachers; yet we do not have funds to hire our own to beef up the government- recruited teachers."

Seasonal factors as cited in rural farming communities. Sample response: "Fighting teacher absenteeism is impossible during sowing and harvesting seasons. Teachers in our community are largely farmers and therefore need to work in their gardens for better yields and improved incomes."

How Are Classrooms Organized for Learning?

The functionality of school-level management structures in the delivery of education services is also reflected in the classroom environment and its features. Availability and utilization of teaching-learning materials is fundamental to the readiness of learners and teachers to effectively engage in processes for the realization of anticipated outcomes. The UNPS survey observed classrooms to determine the presence (or not) of displayed learning materials and/or subject resource corners; learners' seating arrangements, together with availability of textbooks and other scholastic materials; and the presence of the teacher in the classroom at the time of the visit (figures 4.21 and 4.22).

On average, 47 percent of the classrooms in the observed schools had displays of various learning materials, with significantly higher proportions in private (68 percent) than in public schools (44 percent). Classrooms with adequate seating capacity for all learners were estimated at 73 percent, with no significant difference between public and private schools. However, in less than half of the observed schools did all learners have books and pens/pencils (49 percent), although the disaggregation by type of school shows a much higher proportion in private (70 percent) than in public (46 percent) schools. Textbooks are some of the key inputs in education service delivery, and their provision is one of the government priorities in the quality education

Figure 4.21 Percentage Classrooms with Displayed Learning Materials; UNPS 2009/10

Source: Uganda National Panel Survey, 2009/10.

Figure 4.22 Classroom Environment; UNPS 2009/10

Source: Uganda National Panel Survey, 2009/10.

enhancement drive. Classroom observations indicated that access to textbooks for at least half of the learners was estimated at 53 percent (60 percent private and 53 percent public); while schools with provisions for learners to borrow books were estimated at 55 percent (56 percent private and 50 percent public). Teachers were found teaching in 80 percent of the schools, with a higher incidence in private (90 percent) than in public (80 percent) schools. Ensuring adequate provision of materials is therefore an important aspect of quality, as a lack of these materials compromises the system's ability to hold school managers accountable.

On the whole, school-level systems, especially the offices of head teachers, have limited capacity to supervise teachers; nor do they have adequate support from the SMCs. Pedagogical support to teachers is at a low ebb, a situation also explained by rather high head teacher absenteeism. Support structures like the CCT framework exist, but are under-resourced in terms of personnel and logistics to effectively support school management teams. Teacher preparation of curriculum content to be delivered (work plans) is also low. Classroom

organization is, however, a little better, as shown by the moderate extent to which classrooms have displayed materials to facilitate teaching-learning processes and the availability of teaching materials and furniture.

Information for School-level Accountability

Improving accountability is one of the core objectives of devolving school management powers to SMCs. Information sharing is central to the enhancement of accountability. The World Bank (2008) identifies three types of accountability. Upward accountability is the obligation within the school hierarchy to report to those above school management; downward accountability is the obligation of the school system to report to learners and their families; and outward accountability is the responsibility that the school has to community members.

There are mainstreamed processes through which basic school-level information is provided to the national level to facilitate upward accountability. Schools' mandatory participation in the annual school census exercise is one of the information channels used by districts and the MoES. Data generated through this exercise enable regular updates to the education management information system (EMIS) and informs the resource allocation process for key inputs, such as capitation grants and teacher ceilings for the respective schools, together with provision of instructional materials and infrastructure, which are aggregated at the district level. Regular financial reporting through established decentralized systems that weave into the national public financial management system is also done quarterly, based on the financial disbursements to respective schools. The recently launched public service performance management system, including head teachers and their deputies under the overall management of the Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs), is another channel through which performance is assessed and information culled from subnational and national levels in a bid to hold head teachers fully accountable for school-level operations. Other initiatives, such as the Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards (BRMS) for schools, are intended to capture various points of information on school status in order to allow more strategic moves to improve their operations for quality education.

The persistently weak linkage in the upward accountability chain is the quality assurance function executed through school-level inspections. At the national level, the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) sets quality assurance standards for adoption by the district inspectors of schools in local governments. However, district inspectors report to the District Education Office under the overall management of the respective CAOs, and hence have no reporting responsibility to the DES. Technical oversight of the district inspection teams is provided through DES regional centers; yet by February 2012, the centers registered a 35 percent vacancy rate and insufficient logistics. These problems were compounded by the lack of a national inspection

tracking system, which precludes regular comprehensive assessments of school operations based on the established national inspection framework. The ever-increasing number of districts (from 56 in the early 2000s to 111 in 2011) further overstretches the regional centers. Currently, the “associate assessors” model of the DES is one of the ongoing efforts to beef up school inspection teams by drawing from retired teachers and public servants in local communities. The model has generated some positive results, especially in the 12 QEI districts, but would appear unsustainable if rolled out nationwide, since it would likely be inadequate to support the continuous and institutional nature of school inspection. Nevertheless, there is an animated ongoing dialogue on how to improve school inspection, with some of the strategies proposed including (1) disengaging the entire school inspection function from the local government structure and giving it to MoES under DES, by virtue of its quality assurance function; (2) separating DES from MoES for independence, as is the case in some countries; (3) linking DIS with the CCTs for comprehensive school monitoring without compromising the roles of either party; and (4) involving foundation bodies (faith based or community) in school inspection to further ground local participation in and ownership of school-level operations.

Information provision for downward accountability is mainly enabled by student participation in high-stakes, end-of-cycle national examinations, which also determine their transition to postprimary education. Some schools also participate in district- and/or municipal-level mock examinations for final grade pupils, which enable schools to communicate to learners about their performance. Learner performance on end-of-cycle exams is often discussed at the school level, since it attracts the interest of teachers, parents, and the wider community. It is also an easily visible indicator of overall school performance, including that of head teachers. Community pressure to transfer nonperforming head teachers has often been reported as a result of perpetual poor school performance on national exams, guided by the respective school performance ranking within a district. The results are also discussed at various school-level meetings, including the SMC and staff meetings, together with the open school days or annual parent meetings, whenever they are held.

Annual national assessment sample surveys of learning also provide feedback on student learning at primary 3 and 6, with a special focus on literacy and numeracy.³ Since 2010, the sample has been amplified to allow for district-specific results to advance the subnational relevance of this exercise, with anticipated gains in planning. Key informant interviews with head teachers revealed that they are aware of the national assessment of progress in education (NAPE) system; but they expressed limited knowledge of the relevance or utilization of the results in their day-to-day support of teachers or the provision of accountability to learners.

Of importance to note is that information provision by schools on end-of-cycle exams is considered more reactive than proactive. Public release of exam

results is largely enabled by the national publicity given to national results by the media, supported by MoES through the Uganda National Examination Board (UNEB).

Additional insights into other school-level activities, such as the issuance of report cards to individual learners at the end of every term, as well as the availability of information on learner performance for lower grades, were investigated by the QEI surveys. Based on 2010 QEI survey data, it is clear that not all schools issue child-specific performance report cards as required by law, with compliance in the first term of the year reported in only 40 percent of the sampled schools in the 12 QEI districts (see figure 4.23). It is, however, unclear whether the proportion improved in the second and third terms.

Learner performance at other levels, especially P1–P5, does not feature in any official school-level documentation, at least as far as evidence generated by the study of the school-level SMC minutes. Discussions with head teachers indicated that providing this information is up to class teachers, who are free to raise it with members of the academic steering committee. Since improvements in learning outcomes are not spontaneous, and build step by step on gradual progress by learners as they transit from one grade to another, information on grade-specific learner performance also requires attention. Lack of it prevents collective grade-by-grade assessment of school performance by head teachers together with SMCs and parents, which would enable timely identification of constraints to learning at the earlier grades for action. In addition, insights from the 2009/10 UNPS point to limited engagement of head teachers with staff—only one in four schools hold staff meetings through which information on grade-specific issues could be shared. Incidence of parent-class teacher meetings, together with student leaders-staff meetings, was also very low (figure 4.24); all of which signals

Figure 4.23 Percent Distribution of Schools with Class Reports for Term 1; Uganda QEI Survey 2010

Source: Uganda Education Quality Enhancement Initiative Survey data, 2010.

Figure 4.24 Type of Meetings Held at School; UNPS 2009/10

Source: Uganda National Panel Survey, 2009/10.

limited opportunities for interactive discussions and school-level information disclosure, thus weakening accountability of the school system.

Information for outward accountability has been greatly enabled by the dissemination of schools' performance on national end-of-cycle examinations, known as the Primary Leaving Exams (PLE), in the print media. This is undertaken annually by MoES in collaboration with the UNEB following the release of the PLE results. Most well-performing schools go further and display student-specific results on the school notice boards. The norm, however, is for an abridged chart on overall P7 performance by number of pupils in the respective grades to be put in the head teachers' offices, which implies that such information is accessible only to those with access to this office.

School management information-sharing events with parents and the wider community are greatly limited, which also constrains outward accountability. School-specific efforts through which information about the school can reach parents and the wider community include inviting parents to open school days, through which they get to know what is being done by the school, disseminating information on school performance through end-year circulars sent with pupils to deliver to their parents, and parent-class teacher meetings. Yet only 43 percent of the sampled schools in the 12 QEI districts reported having invited parents to school in 2009, and only 21 percent reported having issued an end-of-term circular to parents (see figure 4.25). In addition, the 2009/10 UNPS data revealed that parent-class teacher meetings, through which downward accountability could be enhanced, were only reported in 12 percent and 19 percent of the public and private schools, respectively.

Provision of information on school finances and staffing levels by school management is done at only a moderate level. Public display of capitation grants released to schools by quarter—a disclosure required by law—was observed in 65 percent of public schools (figure 4.26). Information on staffing levels and

Figure 4.25 Percent Distribution of Schools That Invited or Issued Information to Parents; Uganda QEI Survey 2009

Source: Uganda Education Quality Enhancement Initiative Survey data, 2010.

Figure 4.26 Posting of UPE Grants on School Notice Boards; SBM Survey Uganda, 2011

Source: World Bank data.

financial disbursements to schools for the current year is also provided in head teachers’ offices, suggesting again that access to this information is limited to those who have access to the these offices.

Civil society engagement in learning assessment initiatives has been central to the enhancement of the public’s appreciation of educational outcomes. Recent initiatives like UWEZO,⁴ which conducts household-based assessments of learning, have been key in informing the wider public about literacy and numeracy proficiencies of children 5–17 years of age; providing parents this complementary information aims to enable them to support their children’s learning at home.

It is evident that the information flow from schools to parents and the community is weak. Lack of information among parents and students about school performance and inputs weakens their ability to hold schools and teachers accountable (client power), limits their empirical basis to lobby both national

Figure 4.27 Percent Schools Sharing Financial Reports with SMCs in Uganda; QEI Baseline Survey 2009

Source: Uganda Education Quality Enhancement Initiative Survey data, 2010.

and local governments for improvements in public support for schools (citizens' voice), and also limits their choice (Bruns, Filmer, and Patrinos 2011; World Bank 2003).

Further validation of focus group discussion (FGD) information, based on the 2009 QEI data, painted a rather different picture. About half of the sampled schools in the QEI survey reported having annual budgets approved by SMCs, while end-of-term (three times a year) and annual financial reports to SMCs were reported by only 40 percent (term) and 27 percent (annual) of the schools, respectively (figure 4.27). Sharing of audit reports with the SMC was reported in 40 percent of schools. District-specific findings reveal even lower proportions than the overall average reported in this survey.

Also important is the lack of feedback to SMCs on respective school budget expenditures submitted to district authorities, which makes the entire process routine, as highlighted by focus group discussants (box 4.5). It is also evident that the negative perception of public resources also dominates SMCs thinking on their ability to hold head teachers financially accountable.

In conclusion, information systems that support upward accountability exist, including well-established channels through which data are routed to the center. This information is used for national-level planning and budgeting for schools. Accountability to learners and parents is largely enabled by schools' participation in high-stakes, end-of-cycle exams. However, compliance with the requirement to issue students report cards for other grades is low, and discussions of learner performance in other grades by the school management teams appears very limited. Nevertheless, 65 percent of schools display quarterly financial disbursements from MoES in their schools. Nonprovision of feedback to SMCs

Box 4.5**Why SMCs Cannot Hold Head Teachers Financially Accountable—Responses from FGDs**

Nonprovision of feedback to schools on budget returns. Sample response: "...monthly returns from schools to the educational officers are never reviewed and neither does the district education office nor the Ministry of Education provide feedback to SMCs, which undermines our involvement in budgeting and entire financial management process for schools".

A more telling question and explanation in this regard is captured by one of the questions raised in the focus group discussions by an SMC member; "who actually ensures government funds are well used in the schools today? In the past, parents were very strict on their funds, but today since everything comes from government, parents do not care and head teachers seem not to care about this anymore because no one cares"!

on school financial audits, together with the lack of a neutral executive arm (PTAs), featured as constraints to effective school-level accountability.

Elsewhere (for example, Brazil, India, Ukraine and the Philippines—see Bruns, Filmer, and Patrinos 2011), school-level report card initiatives have been identified as useful in providing information to parents that can inform their choices and effective participation in school management, including lobbying local governments for action.

The summary of key findings for this section are presented in box 4.6 below.

Box 4.6**Summary of Findings**

School improvement plans exist in 3 out of every 4 public primary schools and participation in school management meetings is high with seven out of every 10 SMC members reporting to have attended the most recent meeting.

Participation of SMC members in the development of school-level plans and the school-level budgeting process is, however, very low. Lack of clear and simple guidelines on the planning and budgeting procedures, the routine nature of the processes in light of schools' inability to raise additional funds to cater for unfunded priorities, limited support from the district level, and the nonconsultative manner in which head teachers execute the functions were some of the reported constraints.

Parental participation in school governance is limited by law, resulting from the outlawing of the PTAs in 2008, while the one representative of parents on the SMCs is considered insufficient to represent the beneficiary constituency. SMC members openly indicated their inability to oversee the budgeting and financial management functions, which they feel are core responsibilities of parents.

(box continues on next page)

Box 4.6 Summary of Findings *(continued)*

School management systems are still ineffectual in mobilizing parents and the community to support education programs. Indicators of parental response to education vis-à-vis their legislated responsibilities are still very poor.

School management teams (SMCs and head teachers) have limited decision-making powers. School-level decisions are influenced and approved by various stakeholders outside the school.

Three out of every five schools experience shortages of key inputs. Response to requests made for various inputs is, however, very low—for example, only 12 percent and 10 percent, respectively, of requests for staff and textbooks were honored; compounded by a multiplicity of channels through which the requests are routed.

Head teacher absenteeism due to emergencies was estimated at 38 percent, with official absences accounting for most of the time away. Teacher absenteeism was 21 percent. SMC members were more sympathetic to the plight of teachers. This implies that SMCs may be less ready to discipline absent teachers than might be expected.

Pedagogical supervision and support to teachers is low with prevalence of schemes of work ranging between 24 and 56 percent between 2009 and 2010; while display of visual aids was only 47 percent.

Upward information flow channels are functional, enabled by mainstreamed processes like the annual school census and the end-of-cycle examination results provision by UNEB. Downward and outward information flow to learners/parents and community is, however very limited. Learner performance at levels P1–P5 does not feature in any of the school-level discussions, while required issuance of end-of-term/year circulars to parents is not always done.

Nonprovision of feedback to schools on budget returns and audit reports featured as a major gap in the financial information provision to schools by districts and higher authorities.

Notes

1. Through the grant, the government pays annual tuition fees for all pupils in government-aided schools based on the following allocation formula: (1) projected population computed by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) by applying a given annual growth rate, or otherwise the annual school census data generated through the education management information system (EMIS); (2) the fixed grant per month for nine months per school per annum; (3) the variable grant calculated by: total budget ceiling – total fixed grant/total enrollment * respective local governments). Thus the total allocation = total fixed grant + total variable grant.
2. District inspection reports were reviewed for 25 districts (7 in the central region; 8 in the eastern region, 2 in the northern, 7 in the western, and 1 from west Nile region).
3. The national assessment of progress in education (NAPE) program managed by the Uganda National Examination Board (UNEB) undertakes annual sample surveys to assess learning achievement in literacy and numeracy based on a sample of learners in primary grades 3 and 6, as well as senior 2 (S2) at the lower secondary level.
4. UWEZO is a Swahili word for “capability.”

School Management and School-Level Results

The central question here is whether the observed school-level management practices, as well as the characteristics of head teachers, have any bearing on school-level indicators, especially students' pass rates at primary 7, school-level financial accountability, and teacher absenteeism.

School Management and Learning Outcomes

The results of the multivariate analysis on school management and learning outcomes are presented in table 5.1. Head teacher characteristics explain the likelihood of schools registering high pass rates. Schools served by experienced head teachers (at least four years of service) have a 77 percent chance of their P7 candidates passing with grades I–III. This is likely a result of their experience and acquisition of a management style that generates influence, power, and the legitimate authority necessary for the effective transformation of schools, as well as their strategic direction of staff. Average head teacher absenteeism was estimated at 2.6 days in a month. Schools with head teachers who are absent for more than the average register only a 23 percent chance of their students passing well. Experienced head teachers may also have greater exposure to better classroom organization and pedagogical skills, which they impart to teachers under their supervision for effective teaching and better learning outcomes.

Support to schools through inspections also has a significant effect on pass rates on the Primary Leaving Exam (PLE). Schools that were inspected at least once a year had a 58 percent chance of recording at least a 50 percent pass rate among their P7 candidates. The mechanism through which school inspection affects learning could be enhanced supervision of head teachers, who in turn exert positive influence on teachers and other school-level actors, with a likely increase in teacher time on task. Studies in other countries also show that school inspection statistics inform policy improvements in learning.

Equipping School Management Committee (SMC) members with appropriate knowledge and skills to execute their functions is central to the running of schools. Evidence suggests that schools with SMC members who are familiar

with the 2008 Education Act, and who know at least three core functions of the SMCs, increase a school's chances of students passing the PLE with good grades by 46 percent. This could be through their increased ability to dialogue with head teachers and better undertake mandated functions, which in turn generate a positive influence on learning. The knowledge could also contribute to their appreciation of the shared vision that they and head teachers have for their school, which may not be the case with members who have no idea of the law and the roles expected of them.

Participation of SMCs in planning and budgeting is one of the expected results of well-functioning school systems. This enables articulation of school missions and strategies in a consultative manner, including efficient school resource allocation and management. SMC members' satisfaction with school-level planning and budgeting processes increases the chances of schools registering higher pass rates by 52 percent and 25 percent, respectively. Chances are further increased based on the updated nature of the school plan and the strategies therein. For example, having a school plan that focuses on students' performance, staffing levels, and instructional materials provision as some of its school improvement strategies increases chances of children passing well by 18 percent.

Equally important are good school management practices as reflected in consistency of discussions (measured by the review of previous minutes as an integral part of the agenda for management meetings); head teachers who inform SMC chairpersons or their representatives about their absence from school; and open discussions on the school plan or budget that allow SMC members to reject some aspects considered unviable or not worth supporting at the school level. Schools that were observed to have such practices increase students' chances of passing the PLE with good grades substantially.

Table 5.1 Covariates of Good Primary Education Pass Rates for Schools—At Least 50 Percent of Candidates Passing with Grades I–III in Public Schools; Uganda SBM Survey 2011

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Probability</i>
Experience of at least of an average of four years head teacher	0.7723
Average at least 2.6 days head teacher was off	0.2364
School visited at least once in 2011 by district representative/inspectors	0.5829
SMC awareness of supportive materials	0.1690
SMC read the 2008 Education Act	0.4635
SMC knowledge of at least three functions of SMC	0.4651
School having most recent school plan	0.1636
School has school plan focusing on performance, staff, & materials	0.1846
Consistency of management discussions	0.3542
Empowered SMC team	0.4154
SMC satisfied with the school planning process	0.5213
SMC satisfied with school budgeting process	0.2513
Head teacher informing SMC of absence	0.4528

Source: World Bank data.

Note: SMC = School Management Committee.

School-Based Management and Teacher Absenteeism

School systems are heavily dependent on—and driven by—teachers, hence their presence and performance at school is central to effective and efficient education service delivery. Teacher absenteeism negatively affects learning through reduced time on task, lower curriculum coverage, and intermittent disruptions on learning. Longer periods of teacher absence also negatively impact student scores, notwithstanding other contributors to learning achievement. Given the previously mentioned teacher absenteeism level of 21 percent in Uganda, current sector efforts are focusing on a wide range of strategies to ensure further reductions in this level. Variable sensitivity analysis using the SBM data generated some variables from the head teacher and the SMC angles that could help explain teacher absenteeism and results are presented in table 5.2.

School visits by district representatives, including inspectors, reduces chances of teacher absenteeism to almost zero! This is a major finding that brings to the fore the importance of school inspections as quality assurance mechanisms in education service delivery. Ongoing initiatives need to be heightened, including continued exploration of more efficient ways of conducting school inspections.

Having an School Improvement Plan (SIP) that includes the following three strategic objectives also lowers the chances of teacher absenteeism for such schools: improving student performance, welfare of staff, and provision of instructional materials. This could be due to the increased focus of management and teachers on student performance, which enables clearer strategies on staffing and instructional materials, which are key inputs into quality learning. The message from this finding is that schools should not aspire to have SIPs just for the sake of having them, but to try to direct the focus of such plans toward improving learning, teacher quality, and instructional materials, which appear to ignite positive action from teachers, as measured by reduced absenteeism.

Head teacher characteristics identified through the sensitivity test include experience, hours taught, their own absenteeism, and reporting to their SMC on their upcoming absences. Having experienced head teachers (with at least four

Table 5.2 Covariates of Teacher Absenteeism in Public Schools; Uganda SBM Survey 2011

Explanatory variable	Probability
Head teacher experience—at least four years as head teacher	0.2334
Average at least 2.7 hours taught by head teacher	0.3127
Average at least 2.6 days head teacher was off a month	0.3203
School visited in 2011 by district representative	0.0919
Head teacher informing SMC of absence	0.4721
School has school plan focusing on performance, staff, & materials	0.1442
SMC members read the 2008 Education Act	0.1764

Source: World Bank data.

Note: SMC = School Management Committee.

years of head teacher service) reduces the likelihood of teacher absenteeism by 23 percent. Other variables do not, however, seem to provide schools with lower chances of teacher absenteeism.

School Management and Information for Accountability

Regular provision of information to clients on financial disbursements to school is one of the necessary strategies recommended by the government that enhances transparency at the school level, with anticipated positive gains on school-level accountability. The sensitivity test generated a number of school management variables that help explain the probability that a school will provide information on the quarterly disbursements it receives on the public notice board. The key message from these results (see table 5.3) is that good school management processes enhance the chances of school compliance with the requirement to display financial information for public viewing, thereby improving school-level financial accountability practices.

School development planning thus emerges as a very strong accountability tool, as measured by the likelihood of schools posting quarterly disbursements on notice boards for public viewing. Having a recent SIP, for example, creates a 92 percent chance that a school will be accountable. Similarly, ensuring planning processes that SMCs are satisfied with, including plans that focus on key aspects central to learning, ensures high chances of public access to information through the publication of financial releases on notice boards. Equally important is SMCs' satisfaction with the budgeting process, including physical access to the budget.

Other explanatory variables for school-level accountability as measured by the display of school-level quarterly disbursements include consistency of

Table 5.3 Predictors of School-level Accountability; Uganda SBM Survey 2011

<i>Explanatory variables</i>	<i>Probability</i>
Head teachers' experience—at least four years of service as head teacher	0.4231
SMC members awareness of supportive materials, guidelines, and manuals	0.6684
SMC members read the 2008 Education Act	0.6690
SMC members with knowledge of at least three functions of SMC	0.6085
School with school plan focusing on performance, staff, & materials	0.6447
SMC members attending last SMC meeting in 2011	0.5452
Consistency of management discussions	0.7917
Empowered SMC team	0.5300
SMC satisfaction with the school planning process	0.7216
SMC physically seeing the plan	0.6212
School with most recent school plan	0.9193
SMC satisfied with school budgeting process	0.7523
SMC members seen the budget	0.7636

Source: World Bank data.

Note: SMC = School Management Committee.

discussions at SMC meetings, regular attendance of meetings by SMC members, knowledgeable SMC members (as indicated by their having read key policy documents on education, including the 2008 Education Act, and knowledge of at least three core functions of SMCs).

In conclusion, good management practices that enable participatory development of a SIP, consistency of management discussions, and appropriate knowledge about the roles and responsibilities of SMCs give a school better chances of registering higher pass rates at the P7 level, reducing teacher absenteeism, and improving school-level accountability. Similarly, inspections reduce teacher absenteeism to almost zero. They also improve the chance that schools will register high pass rates and have improved school-level accountability.

Performance Monitoring and Evaluation of School-Based Management

The institution of school-level management structures with clearly legislated roles and responsibilities is indicative of the government's realization of the complex and demanding nature of education service delivery, together with its inability to provide this service in a centralized manner. It is evident that management processes, including planning, decision making, resource allocation, and accountability, are central to effective school operations. There are, however, no clear monitoring and evaluation systems for school-level operations, most especially the key organ mandated to ensure the running of schools—the School Management Committee (SMC). The key question here is how do school-level management operations get monitored or evaluated and whose responsibility is this? Institution of a national- or even district-specific inspection tracking system that is regularly updated to enable performance monitoring of schools based on the established national inspection framework would be a good entry point.

The newly established performance monitoring system for head teachers, while good, is silent on the performance of the broader management structure of the school, which tends to let the SMCs off the hook. In addition, there are neither rewards for well-performing schools nor sanctions for poorly performing schools. Institution of such mechanisms would probably trigger lesson learning and other performance enhancement actions from poorly performing schools with good leadership, drawing on the inspection monitoring and evaluation system. It is also probable that such a mechanism would ignite a demand-driven desire for improvement from the school-level end, which would be cyclic or reactionary in a manner that triggers change in the upward systems.

The other challenge is that school-level operations are comprehensive, stretching from community engagement to decision making, with each facet essential for overall school operations and effectiveness. In cognizance of this, the Joint Budget Support Framework (JBSF) made the initial attempt by operationalizing functional SMCs, which it defined? as SMCs that: take decisions on

management and finance; publicly share/disclose minutes of the decisions made; follow up with school administration to ensure effective and timely implementation of decisions made; develop and endorse the school development plan; and have agreed strategies for feeding children at school. Further unpacking of these elements into measurable indicators based on the various dimensions of functionality explored in this analysis is still necessary. Also missing is a voice for SMCs, should there be systemic operational challenges that need to be addressed for effective school operations.

Strategic Options for the Government Going Forward

This chapter concludes by highlighting emerging issues from the analytical work and proposes possible policy and programmatic actions for the government to consider in a bid to strengthen school-based management (see table 7.1). Further research on the political economy of school-level decision making and parental participation in school governance could also be undertaken to inform policy improvements in this area.

Table 7.1 Emerging Issues, Strategic Policy, and Programmatic Options

<i>Number</i>	<i>Emerging Issues</i>	<i>Strategic Policy and Programmatic Options</i>
1.	Low capacity of SMCs to deliver against mandated roles arising from low appreciation of their roles, limited support from legislated organs, and low demand for accountability from beneficiaries	1. Strengthen school-based management through a three-pronged approach that embraces the following elements: (a) Train SMCs on their roles and responsibilities using a consolidated training package that draws from existing materials supplemented by <ul style="list-style-type: none">• simple school-level planning and budget monitoring guidelines• more insights on “how” to execute the functions beyond the “what.” (b) Improve school support systems, most especially inspections and the outreach teacher support system (c) Institute school report cards to enable information flow to parents and the wider community for improved accountability. Past and existing initiatives should inform this initiative.
2.	Low participation of clients/parents in school governance, and low response to education	1. Either (a) Revitalize PTAs, which should not be seen as synonymous with parental contributions, but rather as organs central to the enhancement of the accountability function of the SMCs and school administration, itself is central to effective school operations; or (b) Expand the current membership of SMCs to increase the representation of parents/clients by an equal number (6), like the other constituencies, with distinct roles to safeguard against abuse.

(table continues on next page)

Table 7.1 Emerging Issues, Strategic Policy, and Programmatic Options (*continued*)

<i>Number</i>	<i>Emerging Issues</i>	<i>Strategic Policy and Programmatic Options</i>
		2. Provide political guidance on measures schools need to institute against noncompliant parents, including providing school management full powers to ensure adherence for greater efficiency in the education system.
3.	Lack of clarity on school management decision-making rights and the system through which school requests for shortages could be addressed in a coordinated and timely manner	1. Clarify decision-making roles and responsibilities at the school level. 2. Establish and disseminate a system of addressing school requests for key inputs.
4.	Weak supervision of head teachers and teachers	1. Continue to explore efficient and sustainable mechanisms for improving school inspections beyond the provision of logistical support to district inspectors. Efficient modalities should enable extension of the powers of the DES beyond the regional centers to the district inspectorate divisions for effective and efficient execution of the quality assurance function for schools. 2. Expedite the planned remapping exercise for CCs, including alignment with district administrative borders for greater synergies with district inspection teams. 3. Address CCT staffing and logistical requirements.
5.	Low provision of school-level information resulting in weak downward and outward accountability	1. Institute school report cards, building on the “school profiles” initiative. This implies two report cards would be generated, one based on EMIS information including school characteristics; and the other drawing from school-based operational data on student flows (for example, promotions, retentions, and dropouts by grade) and test performance scores for at least three key grades across the cycle. A few performance areas for head teachers, SMCs, parents, and community would also be added to the report card for objective assessment, transparency, and accountability of all players involved in school-level operations. 2. Ensure adherence with the requirement to postfinancial disbursements at schools. 3. Provide postaudit feedback to schools for increased transparency and accountability, including empowerment of the SMCs and wider community to engage head teachers.
6.	Weak monitoring and evaluation of SMC operations	1. Performance monitoring of the SMCs and development of other performance-based indicators for SMCs to deepen local governments’ sensitivity to operational units. 2. Establishment of a national data tracking system of school inspections to enable performance monitoring of school-level management organs, together with a capacity-needs assessment for more strategic and evidence-based school improvement programming.

APPENDIX A

Data Sources

This analytical work used various data sources for comprehensive analysis of school-level management operations including document reviews, analysis of existing data, and sample surveys.

Document reviews. Desk reviews conducted under this analytical work took two forms. The first form was constituted by document reviews to establish the policy and regulatory framework of school-based management in Uganda. Key documents reviewed include the 1995 Uganda Constitution, the 2008 Education Act, and other regulatory documents and guidelines, especially for School Management Committees (SMCs) in Uganda.

The second form was aimed at mapping national-level capacity development initiatives. After consultations with identified actors, this phase consisted in a review of respective program documents to establish scope of operations. The purpose of this exercise was to provide insights into ongoing capacity development initiatives, especially for SMCs in Uganda.

Analysis of existing data sets. Two sample survey datasets were also analyzed: the 2009/10 Uganda National Panel Survey (UNPS) data set, together with the Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS); and the Quality Enhancement Initiatives (QEI) data set for 12 districts.

The 2009/10 UNHS sample was designed to allow reliable estimation of key indicators for Uganda. A two-stage stratified sampling design was used. In the first stage, enumeration areas were grouped by district and rural-urban location, drawing from Probability Proportion to Size (PPS). In the second stage, households—the ultimate sampling units—were drawn using systematic sampling. A total of 712 enumeration areas representing the general household population were selected using the Uganda population and housing census frame for 2002. This generated a sample size of 6,800 households. The 2009/10 UNHS was undertaken in a bid to track key outcome indicators on an annual basis, using the 2005/06 UNHS as its baseline. A sample of 3,200 households was selected out of the 7,200 households in the 2005/06 UNHS. The survey was constituted of five modules, which included a territory in which an investigation into education was undertaken, drawing from a sample of about 280 schools. For purposes of this analysis, this data set has been used for

supplementary information to the School-based management (SBM) survey, especially administrative and technical support supervision to schools, teacher absenteeism levels, organization of schools for learning, and parental support to education.

The QEI surveys were undertaken in 2009 and 2010 with the former serving as a baseline. The main goal of the baseline survey is to provide key information on selected critical performance indicators derived from targeted interventions by the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) to improve the quality of primary education and pupil completion rates in 12 poorly performing districts. A longitudinal study consisting of a panel of primary schools under Universal Primary Education (UPE) was selected from 12 least performing districts in Uganda. The districts, identified by the Ministry of Education are Nakapiripirit, Kaabong, Oyam, Amuru, Arua, Nebbi, Bududa, Bukedea, Kyenjojo, Bulisa, Lyantonde, and Mubende. The total number of targeted schools was 406, selected using systematic random sampling procedures. This data set complemented the results on teacher pedagogical practices and information for accountability.

A review of district inspection reports for SMC performance and existing training programs for SMCs. A qualitative review of inspection reports held at the Education Standards Agency (ESA) was commissioned by the Bank and undertaken by John-Bosco Asiimwe. The purpose of this exercise was to provide insights into SMC performance as established by district inspection divisions. Training programs in place were also reviewed based on existing reports from various providers. The findings of this work are summarized in the appendix and a detailed report exists at the World Bank offices for interested users. A copy has also been provided to ESA.

School-based Management sample (SBM) survey. A School-based management survey was undertaken in 2011 for purposes of getting insights into the school-level management processes and their functionality, with special focus on members of the SMCs and head teachers, information that is not obtainable through existing data sets. That data set exists at the World Bank for use by interested users.

Sampling Procedures

A. Sampling Criteria:

Several sampling objectives were taken into consideration before drawing the sample of schools per district as presented in table A.1.

- A.1 Sample had to cover all six regions of Uganda.
- A.2 Sample needed to include a considerable number of private schools in order to precisely measure differences between government and private schools.
- A.3 Sample had to be concentrated in order to minimize both monetary and time costs.

Data from the 2010 School Census, explained below, were used to generate the sampling frame used.

B. *The EMIS Data*

An annual school census has been carried out by the Ministry of Education since 1999. The school census data (henceforth Education Management Information System [EMIS] data) provides, among others, data on A.1–A.3, for every primary school.

The EMIS data come from the universe of primary schools from which, after applying supply-capacity criteria A.1–A.3, the sampling frame is identified.

The sampling was done in several stages.

1. Two districts were drawn from each of the six regions in Uganda with probability proportional to the total enrollment of primary school children within each district.
2. For each district sampled, the share of primary pupils enrolled in private schools is used as the sampling probability for the private schools in that district.
3. A total of 17 schools were randomly sampled from each selected district. The composition of the schools sampled was defined by the share of private enrollment in the district, outlined in 2 above.

C. *School Identification*

Selected schools were assigned automatically generated district and school codes to allow easy identification of the electronic data (see the two files with both sampled and replacement schools).

D. *Replacement*

A total of five schools were sampled from each of the selected districts above to provide a pool of schools in case sampled schools needed to be replaced. The protocol for replacement is akin to the nearest neighbor replacement method,

Table A.1 Number of Schools Sampled by District and Ownership Status

<i>District</i>	<i>Government</i>	<i>Private</i>	<i>Grand total</i>
Alebtong	16	1	17
Buikwe	11	6	17
Butaleja	15	2	17
Gulu	16	1	17
Kaabong	17	0	17
Kabale	16	1	17
Kalungu	13	4	17
Kapchorwa	12	5	17
Kasese	12	5	17
Kotido	15	2	17
Kyegegwa	12	5	17
Mbarara	11	6	17
Grand Total	166	38	204

Source: World Bank data.

where proximity is defined along the dimensions of district and ownership status of the school. In the case the set of eligible replacements in a district is null, we draw a replacement from the first school at the top of the list of all replacement schools in that district.

E. Survey Tools

The survey tools were drawn from standard school survey modules with special care to collect information relevant to decision-making at the school level. The survey tools contain three main components:

- A head teacher survey—this instrument collects information about the school, including structural quality measures, teacher and pupil enrollment, and receipts for educational inputs
- A School-Based Management Committee (SBMC) roster—this instrument collects information about SBMC members including demographic attributes, knowledge of SMC guidelines and operation and participation in SMC activities
- A district survey—this instrument collects information from the district education official who sits on the SMCs of the sampled schools.

In addition, focus group discussions were held in about twenty schools to supplement the structured responses collected using the instruments above.

Table A.2 presents a summary of the background characteristics of respondents by gender, to enable contextualization of the findings. Results indicate that SMC members in Uganda are predominantly above 34 years of age, and 7 out of every 10 live within the Parish/Local Council II, of the school that they represent. In regard to education attainment, the majority reported to have attained at least secondary education (70 percent) irrespective of gender. Results also indicate that 48 percent were farmers and a substantial proportion reported to be government employees (22 percent). Whether or not SMC members have children in the schools they represent, together with their membership in organized groups, was also probed. Results indicate that 68 percent had children attending primary schools that they represented and 53 percent were also members of other community groups.

Table A.2 Sociodemographic Characteristics of SMC Members, Uganda 2011
in percentage

<i>Age</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>
15–34	14.8	21.7	16.5
35–44	35.0	37.6	35.6
45+	50.2	40.8	47.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

(table continues on next page)

Table A.2 Sociodemographic Characteristics of SMC Members, Uganda 2011*(continued)*

<i>Age</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Residence</i>			
Within parish	72.5	71.6	72.3
Within subcounty	15.3	12.0	14.5
Within district	11.9	15.3	12.7
Elsewhere	0.2	1.1	0.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Education attainment</i>			
None	5.7	2.6	4.9
Primary	23.4	28.2	24.6
Secondary	34.5	32.6	34.0
Tertiary	36.4	36.7	36.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Occupation</i>			
Farmer	49.5	44.0	48.2
Private sector employee	8.1	10.9	8.8
Small business owner	7.2	5.1	6.7
Government employee	21.7	22.2	21.8
Other	13.4	17.8	14.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Children in this school</i>			
Yes	67.1	72.1	68.4
No	32.9	28.0	31.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Membership to community organizations</i>			
Yes	53.1	50.9	52.6
No	46.9	49.1	47.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: World Bank data.

APPENDIX B

Estimation of the Likelihood of SMC Members Participating in Key School-Based Management Activities

Table B.1 Likelihood of Discussing with Parents in the School Development Planning Process, by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	0.97	−3.0	0.847
Female ^a			
35–44	1.09	9.1	0.676
45+	1.44	43.9	0.065
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	0.96	−4.4	0.759
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	1.52	52.1	0.010
Has tertiary education level	1.09	9.3	0.648
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	1.31	31.3	0.149
Private sector & small business	1.13	12.7	0.554
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	0.41	−59.2	0.000
Western region	0.45	−55.5	0.000
Eastern region	0.52	−47.5	0.000
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	1.18	18.4	0.281
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	1.00	0.0	0.998
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	0.57	−43.2	0.014
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

Table B.2 Likelihood of Participating in the Identification of School Needs in School Development Planning Process by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	0.90	−9.9	0.493
Female ^a			
35–44	0.82	−18.3	0.304
45+	1.06	5.7	0.766
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	1.10	10.2	0.495
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	1.55	55.0	0.006
Has tertiary education level	1.95	95.1	0.000
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	1.36	35.6	0.092
Private sector & small business	0.73	−26.7	0.127
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	0.31	−69.4	0.000
Western region	0.46	−53.7	0.000
Eastern region	1.60	60.1	0.005
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	1.02	2.0	0.895
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	1.09	8.7	0.556
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	0.77	−23.4	0.197
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

Table B.3 Likelihood of Participating in the School Plan Endorsement Process, by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	1.16	16.1	0.540
Female ^a			
35–44	0.80	−20.1	0.445
45+	0.82	−17.9	0.485
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	1.04	3.9	0.860
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	1.35	35.2	0.270
Has tertiary education level	2.79	179.4	0.000
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	1.40	40.3	0.188
Private sector & small business	0.72	−27.9	0.311
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	0.56	−44.4	0.097
Western region	0.87	−13.2	0.576
Eastern region	0.60	−39.7	0.078
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	0.67	−32.7	0.063

(table continues on next page)

Table B.3 Likelihood of Participating in the School Plan Endorsement Process, by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011 (continued)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	1.14	14.1	0.550
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	1.80	80.1	0.048
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

Table B.4 Likelihood of Playing No Role in the School Planning Process by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	0.80	−20.4	0.2640
Female ^a			
35–44	0.72	−28.4	0.2070
45+	0.71	−29.2	0.1690
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	0.76	−24.2	0.1640
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	0.64	−36.5	0.0410
Has tertiary education level	0.71	−28.9	0.1910
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	0.45	−55.2	0.0060
Private sector & small business	0.82	−18.3	0.4560
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	1.12	11.7	0.7100
Western region	1.40	39.9	0.1540
Eastern region	0.83	−17.1	0.4900
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	0.77	−23.3	0.2000
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	1.02	2.2	0.9130
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	0.92	−7.8	0.7810
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

Table B.5 Likelihood of Being Satisfied with the School Planning Process by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	1.09	9.3	0.678
Female ^a			
35–44	1.14	13.7	0.635
45+	1.42	42.2	0.180
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	1.27	26.9	0.248
Has no child in school ^a			

(table continues on next page)

Table B.5 Likelihood of Being Satisfied with the School Planning Process by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011 (continued)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Has secondary education level	1.04	4.4	0.847
Has tertiary education level	0.88	–11.6	0.643
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	1.71	70.8	0.055
Private sector & small business	1.56	56.2	0.153
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	0.87	–13.4	0.642
Western region	0.86	–13.9	0.543
Eastern region	1.12	11.9	0.657
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	0.83	–17.2	0.405
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	1.16	16.3	0.466
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	0.89	–10.8	0.699
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

Table B.6 Likelihood of Ever Rejecting Aspects of the School Plan by SMC Members' Attributes; SBM Survey, 2011

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Odds ratio</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>P > z</i>
Male	1.63	63.3	0.015
Female ^a			
35–44	0.66	–34.5	0.080
45+	0.66	–34.3	0.064
15–34 ^a			
Has child in school	0.98	–2.4	0.895
Has no child in school ^a			
Has secondary education level	0.77	–22.8	0.192
Has tertiary education level	0.83	–17.1	0.413
Primary level and below ^a			
Government employee	1.44	43.9	0.111
Private sector & small business	0.96	–4.1	0.872
Farmer & others ^a			
Central region	1.41	41.3	0.218
Western region	1.44	44.1	0.118
Eastern region	3.35	235.2	0.000
Northern region ^a			
Within the parish	1.93	92.9	0.001
Elsewhere ^a			
Member of community organ	1.97	97.1	0.000
Not member ^a			
Member of community organ & also LC member	0.58	–41.6	0.033
Member of community organ & but not LC member ^a			

Source: World Bank data.

a. Reference category.

Some of the Documented Capacity Development Programs for SMCs in Uganda

With support from development partners like United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the 9th European Development Fund (EDF), and United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) has been carrying out training of School Management Committees (SMCs). For instance with support from the UNITY/USAID project, the MoES organized and trained a total of 23,462 SMC members in 2009 from 15 districts.¹ The training used the following methodologies; brainstorming, role-play, case studies, group work, and plenary presentations. The training was delivered through a cascade model involving three levels, namely national-level through training of facilitators, college/regional-level through training-of-trainers (TOT), and finally the coordinating center level that were then expected to train the SMCs. Only four members of the SMC from each school were involved in the training, and these were expected to pass on knowledge and skills gained to the rest of the members. Some SMC members talked to felt that the approach may not necessarily transfer knowledge due to the limited training time (not more than two days were reported) coupled with lack of reference materials for members. As the education guidelines indicate, the CCTs acknowledged their being able to undertake this activity, although it is not yet financed by the MoES; but they reiterated its infinite nature since SMC operations are broad in scope yet membership is voluntary with a high.

Different Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in the country have been offering either training or sensitization to SMCs. CSOs that have been playing a key role in the training of SMCs include PAMOJA, ActionAID (Uganda), UNITY Project, Link, SNV, LABE, AMREF, World Vision (Uganda), and Save the Children. Table C.1 provides the areas/districts of operation and the magnitude of SMCs training or sensitization.

Table C.1 Some Ongoing Capacity-Development Initiatives by NGOs and CSOs with Support from Various Development Partners in Uganda

<i>CSOs</i>	<i>Areas of operation</i>	<i>Results/impact of support</i>	<i>Comments</i>
PAMOJA	In 13 districts: Jinja, Kamuli, Mayuge, Katakwi, Mbale, Budaka, Pallisa, Butaleja, Busia, Masindi, Kiryandongo, Kamwenge, and Kabarole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School drop-out rates have decreased where PAMOJA activities are carried out by involving pupils committees at school to identify pupils with problems and report to school authorities including SMCs² 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coverage within districts was limited
AMREF	Katine subcounty in Soroti district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each school within the project area was left with a functional SMC³ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training of SMCs focused on the various government grants and on financial management at the school level
UPHOLD and Kyambogo University	Offered training in 36 districts ⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SMCs were found to make major impact on schools just by monitoring the attendance of head teachers at schools, which is often cited as a critical weakness in primary schools as well as a critical element to a school's success⁵ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trained SMCs on their roles and responsibilities in the project districts but project ended and the university had no funds to sustain the initiative.
UNITY Project	Training of SMCs in 15 districts: Soroti, Amuria, Katakwi, Kaberamaido, Bukedea, Lira, Apac, Dokolo, Amolator, Oyam, Amuru, Gulu, Kitgum, Pader, and Bududa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SMCs were trained in the identified project districts and the school plans development process was reported to be ongoing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four SMC members from each school attended the training Used cascade model (National as Training facilitators, Regional as TOT, and coordinating center level as trainers of SMCs) UNITY sensitized 6,962 SMCs and stakeholders on Education Act 2008 in 12 districts: Lyantonde, Mubende, Bududa, Bukedea, Nakapiripirit, Amuru, Arua, Kaabong, Nebbi, Oyam, Buliisa, and Kyenjojo
World Vision Uganda	Operates in 23 districts ⁶ of Uganda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> World Vision worked closely with local governments and SMCs in supervising primary schools to ensure quality education in districts of operation⁷ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has been supporting the education sector for more than 20 years
SNV in partnership with LINK	Operates in 17 districts ⁸	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased SMC functionality with support from SNV has led to removal of "ghost" teachers from payroll⁹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involved in capacity strengthening programs for SMCs, PTAs, and teachers, aimed at increasing pupil and teacher attendance

(table continues on next page)

Table C.1 Some Ongoing Capacity-Development Initiatives by NGOs and CSOs with Support from Various Development Partners in Uganda (continued)

CSOs	Areas of operation	Results/impact of support	Comments
Literacy and Adult Basic Education, Uganda (LABE) in conjunction with Literacy Network Uganda (LitNet)	Offered support in the districts of; Arua, Yumbe, Moyo, Adjumani in West Nile region, Kitgum, Gulu, Pader in Northern region, and Jinja, Kamuli, Iganga, Bugiri, and Mayuge in eastern region by 2005 Offered support in the districts of: Gulu, Amuru, Koboko, Yumbe, Arua, and Adjumani by April, 2008 ¹⁰	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trained SMCs. SMCs have increased sensitization and mobilization of parents to participate in school activities¹¹ • SMCs were developing annual school plans and were monitoring the utilization of school funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training focused mainly on pupils performance and effective learning • However, some members of the SMCs are semi-illiterate and require rigorous training in order to initiate activities on their own.
Save the Children Uganda	Offered training of SMCs in the districts of Nakasongola, Luwero, and Wakiso by July, 2006 ¹²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved coordination between SMCs and teachers. SMCs also know their roles and responsibilities. There is improved community mobilization contributing to increased enrollment in school¹³ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training included SMC roles, school management governance and leadership skills, community mobilization, basic facilitation, and communication skills

Source: World Bank data.

Table C.2 Summary of Existing Training Materials/Guidelines for SMCs in Uganda Developed/Used by Various Actors

Actor	Ref. Period	Content/Relevance (Topic coverage and conformity)	Delivery Methods	Gaps in the manual
MoES	2010 ¹⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A handbook was developed with support from BEPS/SUPER/USAID, in line with the Education Act of 2008. Utilized information from the SMCs training manual of 1999 developed by MoES • The modules covered in the handbook include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration • Supervising/monitoring roles of SMC • The consultative role of the SMC • The handbook is less voluminous than previous one, with only 31 pages; easy to read in a short period of time • Has good illustrative pictures and is easy to follow • It gives simple examples, for example a school workplan is provided • The handbook is a reference document for SMCs to clearly show them their roles and responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is more of a handbook for an SMC to read but not a training manual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides information on the various conditional and unconditional grants from government but does not explain, for instance, how the UPE grant is allocated

(table continues on next page)

Table C.2 Summary of Existing Training Materials/Guidelines for SMCs in Uganda Developed/Used by Various Actors (continued)

Actor	Ref. Period	Content/Relevance (Topic coverage and conformity)	Delivery Methods	Gaps in the manual
MoES	2010 ¹⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Community Participation Manual was developed with support from UNESCO, more relevant to the school administrators and managers like head teachers, deputy head teacher and teachers The modules covered include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management for quality education Methods for effective teaching and learning Monitoring basic education Assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though presented as a manual, it appears more of a handbook for school administrators and managers to read by themselves Questions are provided in each module in the form of an activity. The manual uses pictorial illustrations in the form of diagrams The manual also uses two self-evaluations that are easy to fill out with "Yes" or "No" answers, for example "I can now plan all my lessons properly" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though the manual highlights the importance of community participation and SMCs, it is more tailored to guide the head teachers, deputy head teachers and the teachers than the SMCs.
MoES	2005 ¹⁶⁻¹⁹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four training manuals were developed in collaboration with the MoES with support from USAID, UPHOLD and BEPS The manuals were developed targeting the managers in education like Head teachers, DEOs, DISs and CCTs The training manuals focus on building knowledge, skills, attitudes and professional networks <p><i>The key topics in each manuals are as follow;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Module 1: Leadership in education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job expectations of education managers, being an effective leader, team building, creating a mission statement, holding effective meetings, managing time, and developing a professional development plan Module 2: Managing school improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is a good school, reviewing your mission statement, conducting a school self-assessment, using and analyzing data, prioritizing problems for action, designing strategies and solutions, drafting a plan of action, monitoring & reviewing an SDP, understanding and managing change and district development plans Module 3: Managing school finances <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnerships and managing finances, Understanding Government Grants, Local fund-raising, drafting a budget, receiving and banking money, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation by the facilitator Participants use handbook but space for making their own notes is provided Through group work Uses case studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuals are exhaustive but information about the school management teams reached and the impact of the training could not be ascertained in follow up to project closure.

(table continues on next page)

Table C.2 Summary of Existing Training Materials/Guidelines for SMCs in Uganda Developed/Used by Various Actors (continued)

Actor	Ref. Period	Content/Relevance (Topic coverage and conformity)	Delivery Methods	Gaps in the manual
		managing payments, maintaining a cashbook petty cash, bank statements and, reconciliation, reporting requirements, drafting school finance procedures and moving forward		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module 4: Managing the school curriculum • Defining the purpose of curriculum management, teacher utilization and timetabling, managing learning resources, supervision of planning to teach, supporting the teaching and learning process, monitoring of pupil Assessment and Professional development of staff. 		
AFARD ²⁰	2004 ²¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manual provides background on UPE Policy. Clearly spells out, for instance, the role of SMCs in the UPE grant. The manual also provides details of how funds for the UPE are supposed to be allocated, especially the conditional grants. • It provides a link between PTA and SMC • The training manual emphasizes the evaluation or assessment of the trainer at the end of the training. • The content on the SFG covers the following topics: what is the SFG; how to carry out needs assessment; procedure followed in the selection criteria; what are the community contributions; the scope of the SFG programme; procurement, required supervision; payment processes and maintenance for the SFG facilities that are put in place. The time period allocated in the training period is inadequate for the numerous items to be discussed. <p><i>The key topics in the manual are as follows;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UPE policy guidelines, SMC (composition, legal status, roles & responsibilities), a new way of procuring instructional materials for primary school, and School Facilities Grant (SFG) guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation by the facilitator • Brainstorming • Question and answer • Group work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time interval is too short for members to internalize the concepts. For instance, to discuss school facility grant (SFG) guidelines, the session was allocated a total of one hour and five minutes. It is expected in such a period of time, an SMC will be able to comprehend the following: What is SFG, carrying out needs assessment, selection criteria, community contributions, scope of the programme, procurement, supervision, payment and maintenance. This is a rather short period of time given SMCs' low level of education • Does not show how the SMC should develop a plan as one of its key roles • Does not show how/when a member of the SMC can be removed from his/her office • The evaluation form is difficult to quickly analyze since it allows the trainee to fill in narratives instead of using precoded responses that are easy to analyze • Manual is out of date with the Education Act 2008

(table continues on next page)

Table C.2 Summary of Existing Training Materials/Guidelines for SMCs in Uganda Developed/Used by Various Actors (continued)

Actor	Ref. Period	Content/Relevance (Topic coverage and conformity)	Delivery Methods	Gaps in the manual
LINK	2009 ²²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In its thorough discussion of the roles and responsibilities of the SMC, the manual refers to the SMC handbook by the MoES, 2005, and the Education Act 2008. Guides participants on how to conduct a meeting: opening a meeting (prayer, recording attendance, communications from the chairperson), review of previous minutes, developing and adopting the agenda and closure. The manual provides discussion on the various grants primary schools are expected to receive, like: the School Facilities Grant (SFG), the Local Government Development Programme (LGDP), Decentralized Instruction Materials Procurement (DIMP), and the UPE Capitation Grant. LINK also developed a TOT manual targeting Local Capacity Builders (LCBs) who in turn train the SMCs <p><i>The key topics in the manual are as follows;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction to training of SMC trainers What is a SMC, administrative role of the SMC, holding effective meetings, school development plan, school finances (management, government grants & school budgets), consultative role of SMC, supervisory/monitoring role of the SMC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The training activity ensures that learning takes place in a triangular way; where the learners learn from their own experiences and knowledge of other learners, and from the facilitator. Manuals were translated into local languages <p><i>Methods of delivery include</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation by the facilitator Uses principles of adult learning and trains SMCs to be able to train other SMCs Manual is expected to be given to the trainees to internalize and thereafter train other SMCs Questions and answers Group work and presentations and feedback Case studies, Role-playing, demonstration and practice, games, quizzes, plenary discussions and brainstorming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion material with a voluminous document of over 100 pages to be covered in two days appears to be an "uphill task." There are severe time constraints in sessions; for instance, discussion on the substantive item of the UPE capitation grant is allocated less than 30 minutes.
PAMOJA	2005 ²³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manual is more generalized so that it could work in different countries of Africa <p><i>The key topics in the manual are as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building links between the school and the local community, working toward change of school environment, leadership & management of schools, planning & budgeting for school development and advocacy for good governance of schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses the reflect method in which the trainees are enabled to identify problems affecting them and use local means to solve their problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not localized to suit Uganda's case; examples need to be particular to the countries' setting. for example. the different grants received by UPE schools Modules not allocated time limits Not in line with Education Act 2008; for instance does not show clearly the roles of SMCs in line with the Act

Source: World Bank data.

Notes

1. *Soroti, Amuria, Katakwi, Kaberamaido, Bukedea, Lira, Apac, Dokolo, Amolator, Oyam, Amuru, Gulu, Kitgum, Pader, and Bududa.*
2. PAMOJA (2010). School Performance Report for Kabarole District, Uganda.
3. AMREF (2010). Katine Community Partnership Project Annual Narrative Report—for year three; October 2009–September 2010, Kampala, Uganda.
4. Amolator, Amuria, Amuru, Arua, Budaka, Bugiri, Bundibugyo, Bushenyi, Butaleja, Dokolo, Gulu, Ibanda, Isingiro, Kaliro, Kampala, Kamuli, Katakwi, Kiruhura, Kitgum, Koboko, Kyenjojo, Lira, Luwero, Lyantonde, Maracha-Terego, Mayuge, Mbarara, Mityana, Mubende, Nakapiripirit, Nakaseke, Pallisa, Rakai, Rukungiri, Wakiso, and Yumbe.
5. UPHOLD (2003). UPHOLD'S integrated education strategy. Uganda Programme for Human and Holistic Development (UPHOLD). Kampala, Uganda.
6. Mpigi, Nakaseke, Buikwe, Nakasongola, Mukono, Kabale, Rakai, Masaka, undibugyo, Kibale, Hoima, Kiboga, Kyankwanzi, Buliisa, Arua, Gulu, Oyam, Kole, Soroti, Mbale, Butaleja, Tororo, and Busia.
7. World Vision (2009). Annual Report, Kampala, Uganda.
8. Mpigi, Rakai, Kiboga, Adjumani, Koboko, Yumbe, Nebbi, Arua, Mbale, Kumi, soroti, Kapchorwa, Kamwenge, Kabarole, Kyenjojo, Bundibugyo, and Kasese.
9. SNV Uganda (2010). Finding Solutions Together, Kampala, Uganda.
10. LABE (2008). Strengthening girl child education in Northern Uganda. Literacy and Adult Basic Education, Uganda (LABE). Kampala, Uganda.
11. LABE (2005). Report of the final evaluation of Literacy and Continuing Education in Uganda 2000–2005 and Family Basic Education in Uganda 2003–2005 Programmes. Literacy and adult education (LABE) Kampala, Uganda.
12. Save the Children (2006). Chance schools Project End of Project Report. Kampala, Uganda.
13. Key informant interview with Programme Manager.
14. MoES (2010a). School Management Committee Handbook. Revised Edition. Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). Kampala, Uganda.
15. MoES (2010b). Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Basic Education in Uganda. Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). Kampala, Uganda.
16. MoES (2005b). Education Management Strengthening Initiative: Managing for Quality. Module 1-Leadership in Education. Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). Kampala, Uganda.
17. MoES (2005c). Education Management Strengthening Initiative: Managing for Quality. Module 2-Managing School Improvement. Second Edition. Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). Kampala, Uganda.
18. MoES (2005d). Education Management Strengthening Initiative: Managing for Quality. Module 3-Managing School finances. Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). Kampala, Uganda.
19. MoES (2005e). Education Management Strengthening Initiative: Managing for Quality. Module 4-Managing the School Curriculum. Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). Kampala, Uganda.

20. Was developed with support from ActionAid, Uganda.
21. AFARD (2004). Improving School-based Management: School Management Committee Training Handbook. Agency for Accelerated Regional Development (AFARD), Nebbi, Uganda.
22. Link (2009). Strengthening School Management Committee Capacity to Perform their Roles and Responsibilities. Training of LCBs as SMC Trainer's Manual. Kampala-Uganda.
23. PAMOJA (2005). Managing our schools today: A practical guide to participatory School governance.

Description of the Sensitivity Tests Model for the Multivariate Analysis

The multivariate analysis was supported by Sensitivity Tests, which enabled decisions on whether or not the selected variables for the various models accurately fit the observations in each category. The tests were run using the “linktest” and “ulogit” model curves. A presentation of sensitivity and specification of classifications, false positive rate and the proportion of correctly classified observations was made using a classification criterion as suggested by Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000) and is shown in Table D.1. Figure D.1 displays the Receive Operating Curve (ROC), which is a plot of sensitivity against the false positive rate. Conclusions on which explanatory variables to drop or pick were thus made based on the area under the curve (AUC). Logistic regression was used to establish the relationship and coefficients were used to compute the probability of an event happening.

Table D.1 Suggested Guidelines Regarding the Area under ROC Curve

<i>AUC range</i>	<i>Comment</i>
AUC = 0.5	Model has no discriminatory power
0.7 < AUC < 0.8	Model has acceptable discriminatory power
0.8 < AUC < 0.9	Model has excellent discriminatory power
AUC > 0.9	Model has outstanding discriminatory power

Source: World Bank data.

Figure D.1 ROC Curve

REFERENCES

- Barrera-Osorio, F., T. Fasih, H. A. Patrinos, and L. Santibanez. 2009. *Decentralised Decision Making in Schools. The Theory and Evidence on School-based Management*. Directions in Development. Human Development. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Bruns, B., D. Filmer, and H. A. Patrinos. 2011. *Making Schools Work. New Evidence on Accountability Reforms*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Das, J., S. Dercon, J. Habyarimana, and P. Krishnan. 2007. "Teacher Shocks and Student Learning: Evidence from Zambia." *Journal of Human Resources* 42 (4): 820–62.
- Duflo, E., P. Dupas, and M. Kremer. 2009. *Additional Resources versus Organizational Changes in Education: Experimental Evidence from Kenya*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- The Education (Pre-primary, Primary and Post-primary) Act. 2008. The Uganda Gazette No. 44. Volume CI dated 29th August 2008.
- Finn, J. D. 1989. "Withdrawing from School." *In Review of Educational Research* 59 (2): 117–142.
- Habyarimana, J. 2007. "Characterizing Teacher Absence in Uganda: Evidence from 2006 Unit Cost Study." Draft Report.
- Heneveld, W., with A. Ndidde, L. Rajonhson, and F. Swai. 2006. "Synthesis Report: Local Studies on the Quality of Primary Education in Four Countries. Effective Schools and Quality Improvement." Working document for the ADEA Biennial on Education in Africa, Libreville, Gabon, March 27–31.
- King, E. M., B. Ozler, and L. B. Rawlings. 1999. "Nicaragua's School Autonomy Reform: Fact or Fiction?" World Bank Working Paper on Impact Evaluation of Education Reforms No. 19, Development Research Group, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- The Local Governments Act CAP 243. Uganda
- Marphatia, A. A., K. Edge, E. Legaut, and D. Archer. 2010. "Politics of Participation: Parental Support for Children's Learning and School Governance in Burundi, Malawi, Senegal and Uganda." Improving learning outcomes in Primary schools (ILOPS) Project. Research Report on Parental Participation, Action Aid, London.
- Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). 2007. the School Management Committee Handbook, Uganda.
- Mulkeen, A. 2010. *Teachers in Anglophone Africa. Issues in Teacher Supply, Training and Management*. Development Practice in Education. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Patrinos, H. A., T. Fasih, F. Barrera, A. Garcia-Moreno, R. Bentaouet-Kattan, S. Baksh, and I. Wickramasekera. 2007. *What Do We Know about School-Based Management*. Education. Human Development Network. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Reinikka, R., and J. Svensson. 2005. "Fighting Corruption to Improve Schooling: Evidence from a Newspaper Campaign in Uganda." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 3 (2–3): 256–67.

- Skoufias, E., and J. Shapiro. 2006. "Evaluating the Impact of Mexico's Quality Schools Program: The Pitfalls of Using Non experimental Data (October 1, 2006)." World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4036, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- World Bank (2003); World Development Report 2004. Making Services Work for Poor People. New York. Oxford University Press.
- . 2007a. *What is School-Based Management*. Education. Human Development Network. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2007b. *Guiding Principles for Implementing School-based Management Programs*. Education. Human Development Network. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2008. *Governance, Management and Accountability in Secondary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa*. World Bank Working Paper No. 127. Africa Human Development Series. Washington, DC: World Bank.

ECO-AUDIT
Environmental Benefits Statement

The World Bank is committed to preserving endangered forests and natural resources. The Office of the Publisher has chosen to print World Bank Studies and Working Papers on recycled paper with 30 percent postconsumer fiber in accordance with the recommended standards for paper usage set by the Green Press Initiative, a non-profit program supporting publishers in using fiber that is not sourced from endangered forests. For more information, visit www.greenpressinitiative.org.

In 2010, the printing of this book on recycled paper saved the following:

- 11 trees*
- 3 million Btu of total energy
- 1,045 lb. of net greenhouse gases
- 5,035 gal. of waste water
- 306 lb. of solid waste

* 40 feet in height and 6–8 inches in diameter

Improving Learning in Uganda Vol. III: School-Based Management: Policy and Functionality is part of the World Bank Studies series. These papers are published to communicate the results of the Bank's ongoing research and to stimulate public discussion.

The expansion of school systems through ongoing mass education reform in many developing countries translates into not only increased school enrollments but also increased human and financial resources at the school level. How these resources are managed is therefore central to the quest for quality and efficiency. This book is an attempt to provide insights on how schools are managed in Uganda in terms of policy and practice.

The book shows that Uganda's primary education reform program is anchored on a clearly legislated policy framework that is supported by intensive provision of key inputs but is undermined by weak school management practices. This conclusion is based on an in-depth analysis of the policy evolution; the capacity of School Management Committees (SMCs), including their autonomy and participation in school-based management; support systems for SMCs and their functionality; beneficiary participation in school governance and response to education; information availability for accountability; and how schools are organized for learning.

This book clarifies the centrality of school-based management to education quality and efficiency, including the existing gap in policy with respect to beneficiary representation on SMCs. A three-pronged approach to strengthen school-based management is also proposed for the government to consider. This would include developing the capacity of SMCs, improving the functionality of support structures, and enabling a greater flow of information to beneficiaries for accountability.

The results are of relevance to policy makers, government officials at the national and local levels, and all actors in education, including head teachers, teachers, school management committees, and parents.

World Bank Studies are available individually or on standing order. This World Bank Studies series is also available online through the World Bank e-library (www.worldbank.org/elibrary).

THE WORLD BANK

ISBN 978-0-8213-9847-0

SKU 19847