

2 Arua MLG

2.1 Performance on Health Sector Performance Measures

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(A) Human resource planning and management <i>(Maximum 26 points)</i>	1.	LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage <i>(Maximum 8 points)</i>	Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY (2018/2019) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 8 points, • 60 – 80% - score 4 points • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the LG Performance Contract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Check the LG approved structure ✓ Check wage bill provision ✓ Establish the positions filled ▪ <i>If there is evidence of effort to recruit (e.g. advertisement etc.) but LG has failed to attract provide the score.</i> 	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was evidence that the LG filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY (2018/19). ▪ Arua Municipal council has one health facility; Ollif health centre IV. As per Ministry of health staffing norms, a health centre at this level of care should have 44 primary health workers. ▪ The Municipal council has provided a staffing structure for Arua municipal council submitted to the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Local Government dated 8th May 2018 and titled, “Arua Municipal Council staffing levels as at 30th April 2018.” ▪ According to Human Resource officer, 37 positions are currently filled leading to 84.1% (37/44) position filled, according to the wage bill provision.
	2.	The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department <i>(Maximum 6 points)</i>	Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY (2018/2019), covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 6 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the Performance Contract, review recruitment plan to determine whether the vacant positions of primary health care workers have been included in the current FY (2018/2019) 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was no evidence that the Health department submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY (2018/19). ▪ The HR department claimed that the recruitment request for 2017/18 was approved late, therefore, the MLG plans to implement the 2017/18 recruitment request in 2018/19.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	3.	The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital in-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted.	Evidence that all health facility in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY (2017/18): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100%: score 8 points 70 – 99%: score 4 points Below 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the LG HR department, obtain and review a sample of in-charge personnel files to determine whether they were appraised during the previous FY (2017/18). 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Municipal HR office did not provide the personal file for the person who was in-charge of the only health facility in the MLG during FY 2017/18, hence it was not possible to assess whether this official was appraised or not.
	4.	The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY (2018/2019). (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY 2018/2019, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MHO, obtain and review a sample of health facilities (rural and urban) verify whether the health workers as indicated in the staff lists are actually deployed in the health facilities. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that the MLG Health department deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY 2018/19. The MLG has one health facility. We compared health facility staff list provided by the Municipal HR office to the staff list provided by the Health facility in-charge. The staff list provided by LG health department at the time of the assessment had 37 health workers attached to Olli HCIV, however 05 health workers did not appear on the health facility staff list provided. Specific details include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ayikoru V.Dema - Enrolled nurse 2. Inzikuru Doris - Nursing assistant 3. Acidri B Francis - Guard 4. Aijonzi Bayo Peter - Guard 5. Onzima Isaac - Guard

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(B) Monitoring and supervision (Maximum 32 points)	5.	The MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities (Maximum 6 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From MoH obtain guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities (MoH to prioritize the documents to be reviewed) From the MHO obtain evidence that s/he communicated guidelines, policies, circulars to health facilities (e.g. through meetings, submission letters, etc). From the sample of health facilities, check whether the guidelines, policies, circulars were received. <i>If all guidelines of the previous year are still applicable and no new ones have been issued, then score 3</i> From the MHO obtain and review minutes and/or other 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that the MHO communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18). None of the circulars, guidelines and policies issued by Ministry of Health in the previous FY (2017/18) were found at the MLG or at the health facility. The following guidelines, policies and circulars were found at the municipality, and at the health unit, none of which was issued in 2017/2018 by MoH: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Public finance management regulations, 2016 b) Uganda National Guidelines for the Programmatic Management of Drug-resistant TB 2nd edition 2016. Discussions with the Health Facility Administrator revealed that the guidelines, policies and circulars were received from the District Health Office and others directly from the implementing partners and not the municipal health office.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the MHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MHO obtain and review minutes and/or other 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that Municipal Health Office met with health facility in-charge and among others

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
			and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence of meetings with health facility in-charges in the previous FY (2017/18). Check from a sample of 5 health facilities 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> explained Guidelines, policies and circulars. Municipal Health Office did not have scheduled meetings with health facility in-charge, therefore, there was no evidence provided of meetings with the health facility in-charges.
	6.	The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services (Maximum 6 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3 points 	<p>From the MHO obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG support supervision reports (quarterly) Minutes of MHT meeting. Facility records 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that MHT supervised 100% of HC IVs in FY 2017/18, at least once a quarter. At the time of the assessment they were only two supervision reports on file. Specific details are shown below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The first supervision report dated 14th September 2017 looked exactly like the supervision report for the fourth quarter of 2016/17 dated 11th July 2017. b) The second supervision report dated 21st February 2018 was not acknowledged by the MHO. In this supervision report both public and private health facilities were supervised The MLG has no functional Municipal Health Team, therefore, there were no meeting minutes for the MHT The Health facility records for FY 2017/18 did not show evidence of supervision by the Municipal Health Office.
			<p>Evidence that MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY (2017/18):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% supervised: 	<p>From the MHO obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG support supervision reports (quarterly) Minutes of MHT meetings 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MLG does not have lower health facilities hence this performance measure is not applicable.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 points • 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 point • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facility records ▪ Review and check a sample of minimum 5 facilities 		
	7.	The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/ reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow up (Maximum 10 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous financial year (2017/18): score 4 points • Evidence that the recommendations are followed up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the MHO obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support supervision and monitoring visit reports ▪ Minutes of quarterly meetings ▪ Minutes of monthly MHT meetings ▪ From the sampled health facilities, determine whether the Health department provided recommendations from the supervision visits and followed up. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was no evidence that support supervision reports were discussed to make recommendations. There were no quarterly and monthly MHT meetings minutes.
					0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was no evidence provided indicating that recommendations were followed up and specific activities undertaken for correction.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings						
	8.	The LG Health department has submitted accurate/ consistent reports/ data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH (Maximum 10 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/ consistent data regarding list of facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS - score 10 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MoH obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HMIS reports for the current FY (2018/2019) The performance contract for the current FY (2018/2019) Check whether the lists of health facilities submitted are consistent/ similar 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The performance contract for 2018/19 indicates only 1 health facility, Olli Health HCIV The HMIS reports for the current FY (2018/2019) from MoH were not availed for review, and as result, we could not check whether the lists of health facilities submitted are consistent/ similar. 						
(C) Governance, transparency and accountability (Maximum 14 points)	9.	The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY (2017/18) - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health sector standing committee meeting minutes – check if the Council has approved the sector implementation plan and discussions by the committee Review the MHO's reports to the committee 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that the “Technical, Works and Social Services committee discussed supervision, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports. The municipal council has a “Technical, Works, and Social Services” committee to which the health sector reports. Clerk to council provided a file with minutes for the meetings, specific meeting minutes and the contents for discussion are shown below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Meeting date</th> <th>Contents of discussion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>15th August 2017</td> <td>Municipal water quality assessment, school inspection, waste management and house hold waste disposal management</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27th September 2017</td> <td>Renovation of general ward at Oll HCIV, Ambulance purchase, and construction of land fill</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Meeting date	Contents of discussion	15 th August 2017	Municipal water quality assessment, school inspection, waste management and house hold waste disposal management	27 th September 2017	Renovation of general ward at Oll HCIV, Ambulance purchase, and construction of land fill
Meeting date	Contents of discussion											
15 th August 2017	Municipal water quality assessment, school inspection, waste management and house hold waste disposal management											
27 th September 2017	Renovation of general ward at Oll HCIV, Ambulance purchase, and construction of land fill											

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings				
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council obtain and review health sector standing committee meeting minutes – check if the sector committee has presented issues that require approval. 	2	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>16th February 2018</td> <td>Health sector work plan and budget</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27th April 2018</td> <td>Budgets</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the meeting held on 15th August 2017, a report to close and treat some water sources within the MLG was forwarded to council for approval. In the meeting held on 27th September 2017, the renovation of the general ward at Oli HCIV was forwarded to council for approval. 	16 th February 2018	Health sector work plan and budget	27 th April 2018	Budgets
16 th February 2018	Health sector work plan and budget									
27 th April 2018	Budgets									
	10.	The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/ functioning (Maximum 6 points)	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6 points If 80-99 %: score 4 points If 70-79: %: score 2 point If less than 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check files of HUMCs and minutes of HUMCs (Check list for all and sample 5 to review) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study files from 5 randomly sampled health facilities to confirm whether they have HUMCs and review whether they have held 4 mandatory meetings 	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence that health facility has a functional HUMC. The HUMC met and discussed health related issues on the dates indicated below. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1st meeting 22nd September 2017 2nd meeting 21st December 2017 3rd Meeting 13th March 2018 4th meeting 19th June 2018 				

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	11.	The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check the LG Notice Boards and LG budget website to establish if the Health department publicised all health facilities receiving non-wage recurrent grants Check a sample of health facilities 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that the LG had displayed PHC non-wage recurrent grants of Ollii health centre IV on the LG public notice board. However, the notice board at Ollii HCIV has PHC non-wage recurrent grants publicized for FY 2017/18. Since the noticeboard at the MLG did not have a display of the grants, the score is zero.
(D) Procurement and contract management (Maximum 8 points)	12	The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30, 2018 for the current FY (2018/2019) - score 2 points Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY 2018/2019 - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Municipal Health Officer (MHO) obtain and review submissions to DPU; From PDU crosscheck submission from MHO 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At time of the assessment, there was no evidence of submission of input to procurement plan to PDU that covered all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget by April 30, 2018 for the current FY (2018/19). At time of the assessment, there was no evidence that the health department had submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY (2018/19)
	13	The LG Health department has certified and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the MHO (as per contract) certified and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the CFO obtain a sample of contracts, review and determine 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We reviewed two contracts and these included Excavation of borrow pit at Dumpsite in Arua Municipal Council. Contract was signed on 15th May

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
		initiated payment for suppliers on time (Maximum 4 points)	recommended suppliers timely for payment- score 4 points	whether payment requests were certified and recommended on time		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2018 and the contract sum was Ushs. 30,000,000 inclusive of VAT. The contract was silent on the payment terms. However according to the SPO, payments are done within 30 days after certification by the supervising engineer. At the time of the assessment, certification of the works had not been done. Renovation of the General Ward at Olii Health Centre IV-Contract was signed 1st March 2018 at Ushs. 25,988,250. For the Renovation of General ward at Olii Health Centre IV, the contractor M/s True stars Investments (U) Ltd requested for payment on 19 June 2018, amounting Ushs. 25,988,250. An interim payment was raised on 20 June 2018 by Acema Donato – Senior Supervising engineer of the Municipality where he certified the works and recommended for payment. Payment hadn't been made at the time of assessment.
(E) Financial management and reporting (Maximum 8 points)	14	The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY - 2017/18 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Planning Unit, obtain and review performance report files From the MHO check annual and quarterly reports for the previous FY (2017/18) 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence that the Health department submitted the 2017/18 quarterly reports and annual performance report that included progress in the execution of the planned activities to the Planning Unit for consolidation. Discussion with the Municipal Economic Planner indicated that the performance reports were prepared using the PBS system where each Sector populated its section in the system and the planning unit made the consolidation. Online submission of the consolidated quarterly reports were then done by the Municipal Economic Planner. Our review of the submitted reports indicated that the performance reports contained sections on the health sector. However the Economic Planner had no record

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings						
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> of the date on which the health sector completed populating its section in the system. Nevertheless we confirmed that the online submission of the quarter 1 and quarter 2 reports were done on the dates indicated in the table below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Online Submission date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>02/04/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>16/04/2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	Online Submission date	1	02/04/2018	2	16/04/2018
Quarter	Online Submission date											
1	02/04/2018											
2	16/04/2018											
	15	LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendations (if any) (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year If sector has no audit query - score 4 points If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous FY - score 2 points If all queries are not responded to - score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Internal Auditor obtain copies of sector audit reports from the internal audit and Management responses for the previous FY (2017/18) 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During our review we noted that the internal audit raised queries relating to delays in accounting for business advances received by the Health department. Our review of the subsequent internal audit reports and discussion with the internal auditor indicated that the health department later provided information to the internal auditor relating to the delayed accountabilities. 						
(F) Social and environment safeguards	16	Compliance with gender composition of Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that HUMC meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30% women) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the number and gender of committee 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anua MLG has only one health facility, Oli Health Center IV. The HUMC at this facility comprised of 6 members, 2 of whom were women. This gives a percentage of 33.3%, which meets the minimum requirement. 						

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(Maximum 12 points)	17	and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities. (Maximum 4 points)	- score 2 points	members is as per required composition	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were guidelines on sanitation displayed at the health facility (Oti Health Center IV), and facilities for men and women are well separated.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women 		
		LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with. (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: score 2 points The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Environmental officer obtain and review filled screening forms to ascertain whether screening was done and whether risks mitigation plans were developed. From the Environmental officer and CDO obtain and review Site visit reports to establish whether they checked compliance to the risk mitigation plans 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were screening forms for health projects for the financial year 2017/18. From the screening forms, risk mitigation actions were included. Although the health projects were screened, no health projects were implemented in the year 2017/18. Therefore no site visits were made.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	18	The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal - score 4 points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the sampled health facility, there were medical waste management guidelines displayed at various locations around the facility.
Total					40	

2.2 Performance on Education Sector Performance Measures

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings														
(A) Human resource planning and management <i>(Maximum 30 points)</i>	1.	The Municipal LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school) <i>(Maximum 8 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY (2018/2019) - score 4 points 	<p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract: (i) review the list of schools; and (ii) the staff lists and validate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Municipal LG has budgeted for at least a Head Teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school. 	4	<p>There was evidence that the Arua MLG had budgeted for at least a head teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance contracts vote 751, Arua MLG was obtained from the MLG Senior Planner and was reviewed. From the performance contract we established that Arua MLG has a total of 340 teachers for FY 2018/2019. It was verified that Arua MLG has a total of sixteen primary schools. 														
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY (2018/2019) - score 4 points 	<p>From the MEO obtain and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers' lists to determine whether MLG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) per school for the current FY From the sampled schools (urban and rural) verify whether the teachers as indicated in the staff lists are actually deployed in the schools. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence that the MLG had deployed a head teacher and minimum 7 teachers per school for current FY 2018/19. Verification was done in five sampled government aided schools and the following was established as per the list from MEO: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>Staff List</th> <th>Actual Deployed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Anyafio P/S</td> <td>16</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Arua Public</td> <td>27</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Arua Prisons</td> <td>22</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mvura P/s</td> <td>14</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Niva</td> <td>20</td> <td>20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It was validated that the teachers as indicated in the staff lists are actually deployed in the schools.</p>	School	Staff List	Actual Deployed	Anyafio P/S	16	16	Arua Public	27	27	Arua Prisons	22	21	Mvura P/s
School	Staff List	Actual Deployed																		
Anyafio P/S	16	16																		
Arua Public	27	27																		
Arua Prisons	22	21																		
Mvura P/s	14	14																		
Niva	20	20																		

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	2.	Municipal LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision (Maximum 6 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the Municipal LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision ✓ If 100% - score 6 points ✓ If 80 - 99% - score 3 points ✓ If below 80% - score 0 points 	<p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Check the Municipal LG approved structure ▪ Check wage bill provision ▪ Positions filled. <p><i>If there is evidence of effort to recruit (e.g. advertisement etc.) but Municipal LG has failed to attract, provide the score.</i></p>	3	<p>Arua MLG approved structure for teachers in FY 2018/2019 is 361 as per the wage bill provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wage bill provision is Ushs. 2,334,792,000 • From the HRM registers the MLG in 2017/2018 filled the approved structure for teachers with 340 which is 94% (340/361)
	3.	Municipal LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision. (Maximum 6 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the Municipal LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision - score 6 points 	<p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Check the Municipal LG approved structure ▪ Positions filled. 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the Performance Contract Vote751 Arua MLG, approved structure for Inspectors of schools had two positions; the Municipal Inspector of Schools (MIS) and Assistant Inspector of Schools (AIS). • As per the wage bill provision it was validated that the MLG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors. The two Inspectors of Schools include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Mr Ovua Shem – MIS b) Ms Buza Zilly – AIS
	4.	The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY (Maximum 4 points)	<p>Evidence that the MLG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Primary Teachers - score 2 points ▪ School Inspectors - score 2 points 	<p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review recruitment plan to determine whether the vacant positions of teachers and inspectors have been included. 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the staff recruitment plan for the FY 2018/19, the recruitment plan was reviewed from HRM and the assessment team validated that the vacant positions of the two teachers had been included. • The assessment team noted that all the positions of the school inspectors were 100% filled, and so there was vacancy to include on the recruitment plan.

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	5.	The Municipal LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY (2017/18). (Maximum 6 points)	Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY (2017/18) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% school inspectors - score 3 points ▪ Primary school head teachers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 90 - 100% - score 3 points ✓ 70% and 89% - score 2 points ✓ Below 70% - score 0 	From the Municipal HR department obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel files for school inspectors and a sample of head teachers to determine whether they were appraised during the previous FY (2017/18). 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel files for School inspectors were reviewed and the assessment team noted that only Ms Buza Zilly (AIS) had been appraised in the previous FY 2017/18. • There was no evidence of appraisal of the sampled head teachers during the FY 2017/2018.
(B) Monitoring and inspection (Maximum 35 points)	6.	The Municipal LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools (Maximum 3 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools - score 1 point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From MoES obtain guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools ▪ From the MEO obtain evidence that s/he communicated guidelines, policies, circulars to schools. ▪ From the sampled schools, check whether the 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the time of the assessment the MEO indicated that he had verbally communicated the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level on phone and SMS, and he had also written letters to some head teachers. However, no evidence was presented to support the claim. • At the sampled schools, there was no evidence that the MEO communicated policies, guidelines and circulars issued by MoES in the previous FY 2017/18.

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings											
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO obtain and review minutes and/or other evidence of the meetings with Head Teachers guidelines, policies, circulars were received. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From MLG Education department there was no evidence of the minutes of the meetings when the Education department explained and sensitised on guidelines, policies and circulars issued by national level. 											
	7.	The Municipal LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered schools (Maximum 12 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 100% - score 12 ✓ 90 to 99% - score 10 ✓ 80 to 89% - score 8 ✓ 70 to 79% - score 6 ✓ 60 to 69% - score 3 ✓ 50 to 59 % - score 1 ✓ Below 50% - score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO, obtain and review school inspection reports and inventory of schools inspected in the previous FY (2017/18) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From sampled school verify the number of times they were inspected during the previous FY (2017/18) 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school inspection reports for the registered public primary schools and licenced private schools were reviewed. The sample included: - 5 licenced private schools and 5 government aided Primary Schools to verify whether they were inspected at least once per term and reports produced in FY2017/18. It is validated that 3 government aided schools (Arua Public P/S, Niva P/S, Mvara Junior P/S), and 2 private licenced schools (Bright View P/S, Springs P/S) had been inspected at least once per term and reports produced, as showing in the table below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>Date of inspection</th> <th>Period (Terms)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">Category 1: Government Aided Primary Schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Arua Public P/S</td> <td>7th September 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6th February 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	School	Date of inspection	Period (Terms)	Category 1: Government Aided Primary Schools			Arua Public P/S	7 th September 2017	2017 Term 3	6 th February 2018	2018 Term 1
School	Date of inspection	Period (Terms)															
Category 1: Government Aided Primary Schools																	
Arua Public P/S	7 th September 2017	2017 Term 3															
	6 th February 2018	2018 Term 1															

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings																																																																					
						<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>4th June 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Niva P/S</td> <td>17th August 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd November 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5th February 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Mvara Junior P/S</td> <td>2nd August 2017</td> <td>2018 Term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd November 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5th February 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"></td> <td>18th April 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3rd October 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Arua P/S</td> <td>7th February 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Anyafio P/S</td> <td>4th December 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9th April 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="7">Category 2: Private Licensed Schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Bright View P/S</td> <td>20th November 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24th April 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27th June 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Springs P/S</td> <td>8th August 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6th October 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13th March 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"></td> <td>27th June, 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8th August 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Canaan P/S</td> <td>13th March 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14th August 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Christ the King P/S</td> <td>27th June 2018</td> <td>2018 Term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10th November 2017</td> <td>2017 Term 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cornerstone P/S</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		4 th June 2018	2018 Term 2	Niva P/S	17 th August 2017	2017 Term 2	2 nd November 2017	2017 Term 3	5 th February 2018	2018 Term 1	Mvara Junior P/S	2 nd August 2017	2018 Term 2	2 nd November 2017	2017 Term 3	5 th February 2018	2018 Term 1		18 th April 2018	2018 Term 1	3 rd October 2017	2017 Term 3	Arua P/S	7 th February 2018	2018 Term 1	Anyafio P/S	4 th December 2017	2017 Term 3	9 th April 2018	2018 Term 1	Category 2: Private Licensed Schools							Bright View P/S	20 th November 2017	2017 Term 3	24 th April 2018	2018 Term 1	27 th June 2018	2018 Term 2	Springs P/S	8 th August 2017	2017 Term 2	6 th October 2017	2017 Term 3	13 th March 2018	2018 Term 1		27 th June, 2018	2018 Term 2	8 th August 2017	2017 Term 2	Canaan P/S	13 th March 2018	2018 Term 1	14 th August 2017	2017 Term 2	Christ the King P/S	27 th June 2018	2018 Term 2	10 th November 2017	2017 Term 3	Cornerstone P/S		
	4 th June 2018	2018 Term 2																																																																									
Niva P/S	17 th August 2017	2017 Term 2																																																																									
	2 nd November 2017	2017 Term 3																																																																									
	5 th February 2018	2018 Term 1																																																																									
Mvara Junior P/S	2 nd August 2017	2018 Term 2																																																																									
	2 nd November 2017	2017 Term 3																																																																									
	5 th February 2018	2018 Term 1																																																																									
	18 th April 2018	2018 Term 1																																																																									
	3 rd October 2017	2017 Term 3																																																																									
Arua P/S	7 th February 2018	2018 Term 1																																																																									
Anyafio P/S	4 th December 2017	2017 Term 3																																																																									
	9 th April 2018	2018 Term 1																																																																									
Category 2: Private Licensed Schools																																																																											
Bright View P/S	20 th November 2017	2017 Term 3																																																																									
	24 th April 2018	2018 Term 1																																																																									
	27 th June 2018	2018 Term 2																																																																									
Springs P/S	8 th August 2017	2017 Term 2																																																																									
	6 th October 2017	2017 Term 3																																																																									
	13 th March 2018	2018 Term 1																																																																									
	27 th June, 2018	2018 Term 2																																																																									
	8 th August 2017	2017 Term 2																																																																									
Canaan P/S	13 th March 2018	2018 Term 1																																																																									
	14 th August 2017	2017 Term 2																																																																									
Christ the King P/S	27 th June 2018	2018 Term 2																																																																									
	10 th November 2017	2017 Term 3																																																																									
Cornerstone P/S																																																																											

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	8.	Municipal LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY (2017/18) - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO obtain and review minutes of departmental meetings to determine whether school inspection reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY (2017/18). 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only one set of departmental meeting minutes was availed for review. The minutes from the MLG Education department held on 6th August, 2017 under Min 6/EDUC/08/2017, the following were resolved; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Any school that neglects participation in co-curricular activities the head teacher is reprimanded. b) Head teachers to increase support supervision in schools to ensure effective teaching and learning. <p>However, since minutes of only one departmental meeting were availed for review, the score is zero.</p>
		(Maximum 10 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the DES in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the DES obtain and review a list of LGs that have submitted school inspection reports From the MEO check whether the MEO has letter of acknowledgement from DES 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO the letters of acknowledgement for school inspection reports from DES for term 1, 2018 dated 2nd May 2018 were evident, reports for other quarters were not evident. From the DES, we obtained and reviewed a list of LGs that have submitted school inspection reports. It was noted that the MLG had not submitted inspection reports of all the four quarters to the DES.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled schools, determine whether the education department provided recommendations from the inspection reports and followed-up. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled schools the team reviewed feedback recommendations from inspection reports as shown below but we were not able to verify whether the recommendations from the inspection reports were followed up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Mvara Jn PS; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Poor state of the classrooms; 4 classrooms block

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	9.	The Municipal LG Education department has submitted accurate/ consistent reports/ date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES (Maximum 10 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the Municipal LG has submitted accurate/ consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and Programme Budgeting System (PBS) - score 5 points • Evidence that the Municipal LG has submitted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From MoES obtain and review EMIS reports for the current FY (2018/2019) ▪ Obtain and review the performance contract for the current FY (2018/2019) ▪ Check whether the list of schools submitted are consistent/similar. ▪ From MoES obtain and review EMIS reports for the current 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The team reviewed the performance contract from the MLG Senior Planner. Enrolment lists / data for all schools was reviewed.
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to be renovated and fewer teachers in the school hence more teachers need to be posted b) Arua Public PS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Capacity gaps in teaching methodology; CPD for teachers to be centralized and teachers need to be mentored. c) Anyafio PS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ School environment is causing erosion; school compound should be restored and the apron built. There is need to create an access road to the entrance of the school. d) Niva PS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Absenteeism among teachers; letters intended to reprimand teachers to be written. e) Arua Prisons P/S <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Infighting of staff / administrators; old staff to transferred and replaced with new staff

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(C) Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability (Maximum 12 points)	10.	The Municipal LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ accurate/consistent data: Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS - score 5 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY (2018/2019) Obtain and review the performance contract for the current FY (2018/2019) Check whether the enrolment levels are consistent/similar. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council the minutes of the Education sector standing committee were obtained and reviewed. In a meeting held on 20th June 2017 under Min./AMC/TWC/06/2017/18, budgets and work plans were presented to MLG Council for approval by Committee. It was validated that the council received the sector implementation work plan for approval and discussions by standing committee.
	11.	Primary schools in a Municipal LG have functional SMCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc...during the previous FY (2017/18) - score 2 points Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council obtain and review minutes to check if education issues have been presented to the Council. Check files from MEO if head teachers have submitted reports to SMCs and minutes of 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From Clerk to Council there was evidence that the Education sector committee has presented issues that require approval by Council. In a meeting held on 15th July 2017 under Min./AMC/TWS/07/2017-. It was resolved that school projects, staff houses at Arua P/S be commissioned. The assessment team sampled five schools to ascertain functionality of SMCs and these included; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Arua Public Primary school. On 4th April, 2018 the

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings																		
		(Maximum 5 points)	discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to MEO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% schools: score 5 80 to 99% schools: score 3 Below 80 % schools: score 0 	SMCs (check the entire list and sample 5 reports) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study files from 5 randomly sampled primary schools to confirm whether they have SMCs and review whether they have held 3 mandatory meetings 		SMC discussed Budgeting & Finance; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Niva Primary School. On 26th March, 2018 the SMC discussed budgeting & work plans. Anyafio Primary School. On 2nd March 2018 the SMC discussed budgeting & work plans. Arua Prisons Primary School. On 22nd June 2018; discussed discipline, Health and co-curricular Mvara Junior Primary School On 21st February, 2018, the SMC discussed discipline & performance and on 20th July 2018, it discussed teaching & learning, records management, parents meeting etc. <p>It was validated that none of the sampled schools held 3 mandatory meetings hence it was below 80%</p>																		
	12.	The Municipal LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants (Maximum 3 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards - score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check the Municipal notice boards to establish if the Education department publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants for public viewing Check a sample of schools for postings of non-wage recurrent grants 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence that MLG has displayed all schools receiving non -wage grants on the notice board of MLG for public viewing. From the five sampled schools, all had postings of non-wage recurrent grants in the staff rooms as indicated below: - <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>Term 1 2018 Ushs</th> <th>Term 2 2018 Ushs</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Anyafio P/S</td> <td>2,371,710</td> <td>2,371,710</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Arua Public</td> <td>3,331,121</td> <td>3,331,121</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Arua Prisons</td> <td>2,949,650</td> <td>2,949,650</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mvara P/s</td> <td>2,238,522</td> <td>2,238,522</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Niva</td> <td>3,138,757</td> <td>3,138,757</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	School	Term 1 2018 Ushs	Term 2 2018 Ushs	Anyafio P/S	2,371,710	2,371,710	Arua Public	3,331,121	3,331,121	Arua Prisons	2,949,650	2,949,650	Mvara P/s	2,238,522	2,238,522	Niva	3,138,757	3,138,757
School	Term 1 2018 Ushs	Term 2 2018 Ushs																						
Anyafio P/S	2,371,710	2,371,710																						
Arua Public	3,331,121	3,331,121																						
Arua Prisons	2,949,650	2,949,650																						
Mvara P/s	2,238,522	2,238,522																						
Niva	3,138,757	3,138,757																						

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(D) Procurement and contract management <i>(Maximum 7 points)</i>	13	The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget <i>(Maximum 4 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30, 2018 - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Municipal Education Officer (MEO) obtain and review submission to Procurement Unit; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From DPU crosscheck submission from MEO 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education department submitted the approved Sector annual work plan and budget that covered all investment items to the PDU on 15th March 2018 and was acknowledged by the DPU on same date.
	14	The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time <i>(Maximum 3 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the CFO obtain a sample of contracts, review and determine whether payment requests were certified and recommended on time 	3	<p>We sampled two contracts and these included :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supply of Laptop to the education department- Contract was signed on 2nd May 2018 at Ushs. 3,000,000. A goods received note (GRN) was issued on 15th May 2018 by the Assistant Inventory Officer (James Yaka). The Principal Education officer (Ozimati Jehoiakim) recommended for payment of Ushs. 3,000,000 on 21st May 2018. The supplier was paid on 14th June 2018 as per payment voucher number PV ED00239 Purchase of Motorcycle-Contract signed on 4th April 2018 between Arua MLG and Godmax services Ltd for supply of Five Units of Motor Cycle at Ushs. 44,175,000. The Supplier issued the delivery note on 30/4/2018 for one motor cycle and it was received by Omale Jimmy. A GRN was raised on 30th April 2018. The supplier requested for payment on 30th April

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings						
(E) Financial management and Reporting <i>(Maximum 8 points)</i>	15	The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit <i>(Maximum 4 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY - 2017/18 (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th July for consolidation: score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Planning Unit, obtain and review performance report files From the MEO check annual and quarterly reports for the previous FY (2017/18) 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education department submitted the 2017/18 quarterly reports and annual performance report that included progress in the execution of the planned activities to the Planning Unit for consolidation. Discussion with the Municipal Economic Planner indicated that the performance reports were prepared using the PBS system where each Sector populated its section in the system and the planning unit made the consolidation. Online submission of the consolidated quarterly reports were then done by the Municipal Economic Planner. Our review of the submitted reports indicated that the performance reports contained sections on the education sector. However the Economic Planner had no record of the date on which the education department completed populating its section in the system. Nevertheless we confirmed that the online submission of the quarter¹ and quarter² reports were done on the dates indicated in the table below. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Online Submission date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>02/04/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>16/04/2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	Online Submission date	1	02/04/2018	2	16/04/2018
Quarter	Online Submission date											
1	02/04/2018											
2	16/04/2018											
						<p>2018 and it was approved by Head of Finance and Head of internal audit on 30 April 2018. Payment was effected on 12 June 2018 vide a payment voucher number PV-ED00237</p>						

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	16	LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendations (if any) (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year (2017/18) ✓ If sector has no audit query - score 4 points ✓ If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year (2017/18) - score 2 points ✓ If all queries are not responded to - score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the Internal Auditor obtain copies of sector audit reports from the internal audit and Management responses for the previous FY (2017/18) 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ During our review of the internal audit reports, we noted that the internal auditor raised queries relating to delays in accounting for business advances received by the Education department. Our review of the subsequent internal audit reports and discussion with the internal auditor indicated that the education department later provided information to the internal auditor relating to the delayed accountabilities.
(F) Social and environment safeguards (Maximum 8 points)	17	LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines (Maximum 5 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/ men teachers should provide guidance to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the Municipal Education Officer (MEO) obtain evidence on dissemination of gender guidelines on how senior women/ men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several meetings were conducted and attended by the school head teachers and the senior women/men teachers in which the guidelines were disseminated. Minutes of these meetings and attendance lists were seen on file at the Municipal education officer's office. An example of a meeting where such guidelines was disseminated was held on 6th July 2017. In addition, there were copies of the guidelines at the sampled

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc. score 2 points 	<p>handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc.</p>		<p>schools, which included hand books such as, Basic requirements and minimum standards indicators for education institutions. Indicator 9 of this handbook has guidelines on health and hygiene.</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO obtain evidence on dissemination of sanitation guidelines and awareness raising on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines are disseminated and discussed during workshops held between the Municipal education department and the School Head teachers held every term. An example of a meeting where such guidelines was disseminated was held on 6th July 2017. Some of the guidelines distributed included hand books like "Basic requirements and minimum standards indicators for education institutions" Indicator 9 of this handbook has guidelines on health, and sanitation. In addition, there was a book titled "safe school environment, a handbook for primary school teachers" it had some guidance on protection of children's rights.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition - score 1 point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled schools, check whether the SMC meets the guideline on gender composition 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The School Management Committees for the sampled schools (Anyafio P/S, Arua Public School, Arua Prisons School, Mvara Primary School and Niva Primary School) were duly composed with at least 2 females, following the guidelines in the Education (pre-primary, primary and Post Primary) Act, 2008
	18	LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From MEO obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Circulars to schools ✓ Minutes of meetings with teachers ✓ Sample of schools inspection reports to 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no documented evidence of dissemination of environmental management guidelines. However, from the sampled schools, it was established that the schools were actively involved in environmental management activities which included competitions in which the best performing schools are awarded, for example: Arua Hill Primary School was awarded as the third best school in the school environment

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
		(Maximum 3 points)	management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.); score 3 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> schools From the Environmental officer obtain and review: Filled screening forms to ascertain whether screening was done and whether risks mitigation plans were developed. From the Environmental officer and CDO obtain and review: Site visit reports to establish whether they checked compliance to the risk mitigation plans 		management competition held in July, 2017.
Total					47	