

3.1 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 (Maximum 26 points) | 1. | LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage (Maximum 8 points) | Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY (2018/19) <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 <p><i>If there is evidence of effort to recruit (e.g. advertisement etc.) but LG has failed to attract provide the score.</i></p> | 4 | Out of the 38 approved positions, 20 were filled thus constituting 52.6%. The staffing gap is 18 of which 8 (39%) are support staff. However, 5 out of 8 support staff were Nursing Aid, which position is being phased out and fresh recruitment is not permitted. Therefore, without the 5 nursing aid positions, only 60% of the positions were filled, thus a score of 4. |
| | 2. | The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department (Maximum 6 points) | Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY (2018/19), 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 (2018/19) | 4 | The recruitment plan dated 9 th March 2018 has 8 position which included: 2 Enrolled Nurses, 1 Laboratory Assistant, 1 Nursing Officer, 1 Askari, 1 Laboratory Technician, 1 Senior Clinical Officer and 1 Health Educator The following were recruited on 5 th September 2018: 2 Enrolled Nurses, 1 Laboratory Assistant and 1 Laboratory Technician. |
| | 3. | The LG Health department has conducted | Evidence that all health facility in-charges have been appraised during the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the LG HR department, obtain and review a sample | 4 | MG Health department conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre III in-charges during FY 2017/18; |

| Performance Area | No. | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedures | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|---|-----|--|--|---|----------|---|
| (B) Monitoring and supervision (Maximum 32 | 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 (2018/19). (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 (2018/19), 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. | 4 | Entebbe MC has two facilities. Katabi is new and staff from Kigungu were deployed to start the services at Katabi. The deployment to Katabi is informed by the critical staffing needs based on MOH staffing norms and in accordance with the wage bill provision of the Municipal Health Department. |
| | 5. | The MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the national level in | <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 | <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 | 3 | A Delivery Book exists at the MHO. The following guidelines were distributed to health facilities and signed for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficient use of resources provided by Health Development Partners from PS MOH dated 16th January 2017 |
| | | performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital in-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted. (Maximum 8 points) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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"> of in-charge personnel files to determine whether they were appraised during the previous FY (2017/18). | | <p>Kigungu HC III: In-Charge: Kugonza Robinah- Senior Clinical Officer;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Appraisal date: 18th July 2018; Plan had 7 outputs and were all assessed <p>Katabi HC III: In-Charge: Musubika Shamila: Clinical Officer;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appraisal Date: 8th August 2018. Plan output areas were 9 and were all appraised. |

| Performance Area | No. | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedures | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|------------------|-----|---|--|---|----------|---|
| points) | | the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities (Maximum 6 points) | points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prioritize the documents to be reviewed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><i>If all guidelines of the previous year are still applicable and no new ones have been issued, then score 3</i></p> | | <p>1) Rota virus vaccine guidelines disseminated on 23rd May 2018</p> <p>Most communications from the MOH are to the DHO. The MHO in most cases is not a recipient of the guidelines and circulars</p> <p>In addition the following policy documents were found at the health facilities visited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uganda Clinical Guidelines, 2016 Essential Medicines and health supplies for Uganda, 2016 Introduction to Rota virus vaccines into routine immunisation, Training Field Guide for Operational Level Health Workers, MOH, 2018 Service Standards and service delivery standards for the health sector, 2016. New guidelines on the treatment of malaria among pregnant women Integrated community case management of childhood malaria, pneumonia and diarrhoea, implementation guidelines Guidelines on implementation of differentiated service delivery for HIV & TB services in Uganda, MOH, October 2017. Job AID for health workers on vaccine preventable disease surveillance, revised edition, 2018. Improving health workers attendance to duty in Local Government Discontinuation of Vitamin A supplement among post partum women in Uganda. <p>During the meeting of 20th July 2017, guidelines on strategies to improve health workers attendance to duty in Local Governments, was disseminated and explained.</p> |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the MHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MHO obtain and review minutes and/or other evidence of | 3 | |

| Performance Area | No. | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedures | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|------------------|-----|--|--|--|----------|--|
| | | | explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> meetings with health facility in-charges in the previous FY (2017/18). Check from a sample of 5 health facilities | | For the circulars and guidelines which are sent to the MHO, these are explained during a meeting with 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MHO obtain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG support supervision reports (quarterly) Minutes of MHT meeting. Facility records | 3 | Entebbe Municipality does not have a HC IV. The MC has two HC III under its authority. |
| | | | <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: 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 | <p>From the MHO obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG support supervision reports (quarterly) Minutes of MHT meetings Facility records Review and check a sample of minimum 5 facilities | 3 | <p>The MHT undertook three support supervision during the year. The supervision was undertaken using a standard check list. The supervision reports contain the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive and negative findings for each health facility Areas followed up from last supervision. Findings mainly about the functionality of the health units, adherence to the standard and service availability. |

| Performance Area | No. | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedures | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|------------------|-----|--|---|---|----------|---|
| | 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 | <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 | 0 | There was no evidence of discussing support supervision and monitoring visit reports to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions. The meetings with In-Charges were held on 22 nd January 2018, 30 th April 2018, and 6 th July 2018, during which, presentations of the positive and negative findings were made. There was no evidence of discussing the root causes of the negatives, agreed actions, implementation time frame and the person responsible or accountable for the implementation of agreed actions. |
| | 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 (2018/19) The performance contract for the current FY (2018/19) Check whether the lists of health facilities submitted are consistent/ similar | 0 | We were not availed with HMIS reports for the current FY (2018/19). As such we could not undertake the procedure. |

| Performance Area | No. | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedures | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|---|-----|---|--|--|----------|---|
| (C) Governance, transparency, and accountability <i>(Maximum 14 points)</i> | 9. | The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council <i>(Maximum 4 points)</i> | <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 health sector standing committee meeting minutes – check if the sector committee has presented issues that require approval. | 2 | <p>The General Purpose Committee presented issues that required approval to Council in the FY 2017/18. The Council minutes reviewed indicated the following presentations from the committee;</p> <p>Council meetings held on 4th August 2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st quarter Health department report was adopted <p>Council meeting held on 14th September 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No health issued deliberated by the Council <p>Council Meeting held on 4th December 2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated work plan for 2018 /2019 that included health was received by the Council for further adoption. Mayors state of the Municipality Address covered the following health issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The construction of 2 units of for staff at Katabi HC III under local revenue |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council - score 2 points | | | |

| Performance Area | No. | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedures | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|------------------|-----|---|--|---|----------|--|
| | 10. | The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning (Maximum 6 points) | Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6 points ▪ If 80-99 %: score 4 points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Check files of HUMCs and minutes of HUMCs (Check list for all and sample 5 to review) ▪ Study files from 5 randomly sampled health facilities to confirm whether they have HUMCs and review whether they have held 4 mandatory | 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Routine health services delivery at all public health facilities ○ Garbage collection and management ○ Recruitment of Medical Officers at Entebbe Hospital <p>Council meeting held at 5th March 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Laying of the budgetary estimates of revenue and expenditure for 2018/19. The proposed budget for health was USHS. 1,733, 117,694 (reduction of USHS. 858,258,306 (33%) when compared to 2017/2018 budget). <p>Council meeting held 25th May 2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council approved the 2018/2019 health sector budget amounting to USHS. 2,737,358,000, representing an increase of USHS. of 145,982,000 (6%) when compared to 2017/2018 budget <p>Council meeting held on 26th June 2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The council did not deliberate issues on health <p>MLG Health Facilities (HF) have functional HUMCs established and they held meetings & discussed budget and resource issues as summarized below;</p> <p>Kigungu HC III Health Unit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The HF has a Management Committee ▪ The HUMC met four times on the 26th August 2017, 18th November 2017, and 24th February 2018. ▪ The meetings considered and discussed the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staffing status of the HC, having 12 workers (2 Clinical Officers, 3 Enrolled Nurses, 2 Enrolled Midwives, 1 Lab Assistant, 1 Askari, 1 Cleaner, 2 Volunteers in the laboratory and 1 Records |

| Performance Area | No. | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedures | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|--|-----|--|---|--|-------|--|
| (D) Procurement and contract management (Maximum 8 points) | 11. | The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants (Maximum 4 points) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If 70-79: %: score 2 point ▪ If less than 70%: score 0 | <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 | 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The HF did not have a functional HUMC. ▪ The facility is new and the HUMC has just been established. <p>Katabi HC III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>Health Centre – Community Dialogue.</i> |
| | 12 | The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all | <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 (2018/19) - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the Municipal Health Officer (MHO) obtain and review submissions to DPU; ▪ From PDU crosscheck submission from DHO | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Entebbe LG Health Department Procurement Plan 2018/2019 was prepared by John Kalyesubula, Medical Health Officer, approved by Head of Department and submitted to Head of the Procurement and Disposal Unit (PDU) on 2nd March 2018 which was before due date of 30th April 2018. ▪ The investment items: Hire of equipment for dumpsite , hire of low bed and purchase of microscope were captured in the Procurement Plan |

| Performance Area | No. | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedures | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|------------------|-----|--|---|---|----------|--|
| | | items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget (Maximum 4 points) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PPS) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY (2018/19) - score 2 points | | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LG PP Form 5 (Procurement Requisition) for the hire of bulldozer and low bed was prepared and submitted to the PDU before end of 1st quarter of FY 2018/2019; on 20th September 2018 <p>and Work plan at an estimated Ushs. 8,000,000, 4,000,000 and 3,000,000.</p> |
| | 13 | The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time (Maximum 4 points) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment- score 4 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 | 4 | <p>Entebbe MLG health department certified (within 28 days) and initiated payment (within 30 days) for works on time. We sampled two contracts as follows:</p> <p>Contract between Renovation 2010 Company Limited dated 7th February 2018 for the Renovation of Banga Nakiwogo Public Toilet;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The request for payment by Renovation 2010 Company Limited was certified and recommended on time. • The contractor completed the first phase of works on 28th February 2018 and submitted their claim for payment on the same date. Works were certified by Senior Municipal Engineer on 20th March 2018. A sum of USHS. 17,172,665 was recommended for payment on 26th March 2018 by Municipal Health Officer. • The final payment certificate was issued on 30th April 2018 and a sum of USHS. 7,682,575 was recommended for payment on 8th May 2018. <p>Contract between Pharm Investments Limited and Entebbe Municipal Council for the Renovation of public toilets at Mayors' garden and Children's park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The request for payment was certified and recommended on time. |

| Performance Area | No. | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedures | Score | Detailed assessment findings | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|----------|--|---------|-------|----------|---|------------------|----------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|----------------------|---|
| (E) Financial management and reporting <i>(Maximum 8 points)</i> | 14 | The LG Health 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 (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"> The contractor completed the first phase of works on 17th February 2018 and submitted their claim for payment on the same date. Works were certified by Senior Municipal Engineer on 20th February 2018. A sum of USHS. 55,726,255 was recommended for payment on 1st March 2018 by Municipal Health Officer. For the FY 2017/18, the Planning unit was using PBS. Discussions with the Economic Planner revealed that the departmental head for health would have access to PBS and input their departmental figures after which the Planner would receive an email notification from the PBS system, although there was no evidence of submission. However, we noted that all the quarterly performance reports included input from the health department and Entebbe MLG annual performance report for the FY 2017/18 was submitted to MoFPED on 8th August 2018 before the deadline of 30th August 2018. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 15 | LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendations (if any) <i>(Maximum 4 points)</i> | <p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <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) | 4 | <p>The Senior Internal Auditor did not raise any issues to the health department in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd quarterly internal audit reports for the FY 2017/18. However, the 4th quarter internal audit report had not been prepared at the time of assessment hence the score four.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Issue</th> <th>Response</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>No issues raised</td> <td rowspan="2">No response required</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>No issues raised</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>No issues raised</td> <td rowspan="2">No response required</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>The 4th quarter report was not ready at the</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Quarter | Issue | Response | 1 | No issues raised | No response required | 2 | No issues raised | 3 | No issues raised | No response required | 4 |
| Quarter | Issue | Response | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | No issues raised | No response required | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | No issues raised | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | No issues raised | No response required | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | The 4th quarter report was not ready at the | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Performance Area | No. | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedures | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|--|-----|---|---|---|----------|---|
| (F) Social and environment safeguards (Maximum 12 points) | 16 | Compliance with gender composition of Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities. (Maximum 4 points) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the previous financial year (2017/18) - score 2 points If all queries are not responded to - score 0 Evidence that HUMC meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30% women) - score 2 points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the number and gender of committee members is as per required composition | 2 | <p>Committees for selected health facilities met the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30% women).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kigungu HC III – Committee is in place composed of 6 members with 3 women and 3 men meeting required minimum 30% women Composition. Katabi HC III – Committee is in place composed of 5 members with 3 women and 3 men meeting required minimum 30% women Composition. |
| | 17 | LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with. | <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 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 | <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 From the Environmental officer obtain and review filled screening forms to ascertain whether screening was done and whether risks | 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was construction of a 4-stance lined VIP latrine at Katabi H/C III under development fund for health facilities in 2017/18. The project was screened by the Municipal Environment Officer and screening form was seen on file signed by the Municipal Environment Office, dated 2nd November 2017. |

| 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"> 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"> mitigation plans were developed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Environmental officer and CDO obtain and review Site visit reports to establish whether they checked compliance to the risk mitigation plans From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management | 0 | At Katabi and Kigungu health facilities, there were medical waste management guidelines in form of posters and charts displayed at various locations around the facilities. A circular dated 23 rd September 2016 addressed to all the Health Unit In Charges, communicating guidelines on medical waste management was seen on file signed by the Medical officer of health. No other current guidelines issued were provided. |
| Total | | | | | 64 | |

3.2 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 (2018/19) - score 4 points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Municipal LG Performance Contract: (i) review the list of schools; and (ii) the staff lists and validate that: <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. | 0 | <p>The performance contract for 2017/18 was reviewed. A total of 15 Schools and 242 teachers had been budgeted for.</p> <p>From the review of the staff lists submitted with the performance contract, it was noted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A total of 7 teachers (inclusive of the head teacher) had been budgeted for Nakiwogo P/S which has P.7 class. A head teacher and more than 7 teacher had been budgeted for the rest of the 14 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 (2018/19) - score 4 points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO obtain and review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers' lists to determine whether Municipal LG 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 (2018/19). From the sampled schools (urban and rural), verify whether the teachers as | | | 4 | <p>Teacher's lists were obtained and reviewed. It was noted that each of the 15 schools had a head teacher and more than 7 teachers.</p> <p>A sample of 5 public schools was randomly selected, and number of teachers deployed were verified during the visit to the schools. The number of teachers deployed at the school was noted as shown in the table below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>Staff list</th> <th>Teachers deployed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Kiwatu P/S</td> <td>28</td> <td>22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Entebbe Changsha P/S</td> <td>10</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nakiwogo P/S</td> <td>8</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>St. Joseph Katabi P/S</td> <td>19</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>St. Theresa P/S</td> <td>17</td> <td>21</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | School | Staff list | Teachers deployed | Kiwatu P/S | 28 | 22 | Entebbe Changsha P/S | 10 | 12 | Nakiwogo P/S | 8 | 16 | St. Joseph Katabi P/S |
| School | Staff list | Teachers deployed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiwatu P/S | 28 | 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Entebbe Changsha P/S | 10 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakiwogo P/S | 8 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Joseph Katabi P/S | 19 | 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Theresa P/S | 17 | 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% - score 6 points If 80 - 99% - score 3 points If below 80% - score 0 | <p>indicated in the staff lists are actually deployed in the schools.</p> <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> | 6 | <p>There was evidence that the MLG filled the structure for primary teachers 100% with a wage bill provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of teachers as per the approved structure for the municipal primary teacher is 242. From the performance contract for FY 2017/18, we noted a total of 242 teachers and a wage bill of 1,683,844,654 was provided. |
| | 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 | <p>MLG substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The staff structure provides for two inspectors of schools. The MLG has 2 substantively appointed inspectors of schools namely: Mr. Ndagga Daniel – senior inspector of schools, and Ms Nabirye Monica Sarah the assistant inspector of schools. <p>Note; Mr Ndagga Daniel is currently the acting MEO.</p> |
| | 4. | The LG Education department has submitted a | Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has submitted | <p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the | 2 | <p>There was no vacancy for Primary teachers hence they were not included in the recruitment plan.</p> |

| Performance Area | No | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedure | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|----------------------------------|----|---|---|--|----------|--|
| (B) Monitoring and inspection | 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 ✓ 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"> ▪ The personnel files for Mr. Ndaga Daniel, the Senior inspector of schools (as well as Acting MEO) and Ms, Nabirye Monica Sarah, the assistant inspector of schools were obtained and reviewed. It was noted that none of the inspectors of schools had been appraised in FY 2017/2018. ▪ The personnel files of the head teachers of the 5 sampled schools were reviewed. It was noted that none was appraised in 2017. |
| | 6. | The Municipal LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the | <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 | 1 | Minutes of meetings with head teachers were not availed for review. However, letters from the MEO to the head teachers were reviewed as evidence that the Municipal LG Education department communicated some guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY |

| Performance Area | No | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedure | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|----------------------------|----|--|---|---|----------|---|
| (Maximum 35 points) | | guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools (Maximum 3 points) | national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools - score 1 point | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the MEO obtain evidence that s/he communicated guidelines, policies, circulars to schools. ▪ From the sampled schools, check whether the guidelines, policies, circulars were received. | 0 | <p>(2017/18) to schools. The following communications were obtained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A letter dated 28th September 2017 was written by the MEO to the head teachers about dissemination of policy documents and guidelines. The teachers were reminded about the importance of securing and adhering to the guidelines received from Min. ▪ Letter dated 15th June 2017 was written by the MEO addressed to HTs about the National registration circular that was dated 25th April 2017 ▪ Letter dated 19th March 2018 to all Head Teachers on E-Registration of candidates. ▪ Letter dated 19th July 2017 on ensuring teacher presence in schools through enforcing sanction and rewards. <p>Policies communicated through letters included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines on E-Registration of candidates. • Circular on ensuring teacher presence in schools through enforcing sanction and rewards • Circular on closure of illegal schools <p>Minutes of meetings with head teachers were not availed for review, and so there was no evidence that the Municipal LG Education department held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level</p> |
| | | | <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 | | |

| Performance Area | No | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedure | Score | Detailed assessment findings | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|---|--|----------------|---|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|----------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|------------|-----------------|----|----|-----|-----|-----------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|----|----|----|----|-----------|----------------|----|----|----|----|-----------|
| | 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) ▪ From sampled school verify the number of times they were inspected during the previous FY (2017/18) | 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspection reports for the FY 2017/18 were obtained and reviewed and we observed that the reports included details of schools inspected, but did not include dates of inspection of the schools. • A sample of 10 schools (5 private and 5 government aided schools) was randomly selected to verify the number of times of inspection for each of the sampled schools. • It was noted that 40% of the sampled schools (4 schools out of 10) were inspected each term in the FY 2017/18, as shown in the table below. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Term (T)</th> <th>2017 T2</th> <th>2017 T3</th> <th>2018 T1</th> <th>2018 T2</th> <th>Overall status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="6">Government Aided Schools</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kiwatu P/S</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>St. Joseph Katabi P/S</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nakiwogo P/S</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Entebbe Changsha P/S</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>St. Theresa P/S</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="6">Private schools sample</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Entebbe Education Centre</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Entebbe Junior</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | | | | | Term (T) | 2017 T2 | 2017 T3 | 2018 T1 | 2018 T2 | Overall status | Government Aided Schools | | | | | | Kiwatu P/S | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | St. Joseph Katabi P/S | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Nakiwogo P/S | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Entebbe Changsha P/S | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | St. Theresa P/S | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Private schools sample | | | | | | Entebbe Education Centre | No | No | No | No | No | Entebbe Junior | No | No | No | No | No |
| Term (T) | 2017 T2 | 2017 T3 | 2018 T1 | 2018 T2 | Overall status | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Government Aided Schools | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiwatu P/S | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Joseph Katabi P/S | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakiwogo P/S | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Entebbe Changsha P/S | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Theresa P/S | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private schools sample | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Entebbe Education Centre | No | No | No | No | No | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Entebbe Junior | No | No | No | No | No | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Performance Area | No | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedure | Score | Detailed assessment findings | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----|---|---|---|-----------|--|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------|----|----|----|-----|-----------|---------------|----|----|----|----|-----------|-------------------------|----|----|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | | | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>School</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Entebbe Modern P/S</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good hope P/S</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Victoria Montessori P/S</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table> <p>St. Theresa was not inspected in 2017 term 3.</p> <p>There was no evidence of effective inspection of private schools</p> | School | | | | | | Entebbe Modern P/S | No | No | No | Yes | No | Good hope P/S | No | No | No | No | No | Victoria Montessori P/S | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| School | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Entebbe Modern P/S | No | No | No | Yes | No | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Good hope P/S | No | No | No | No | No | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Victoria Montessori P/S | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 8. | Municipal LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations (Maximum 10 points) | <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"> Minutes of departmental meetings held on 4th September 2017, 13th March 2018, and 3rd June 2017 were availed for review and we established that there was no evidence that the Education department discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY (2017/18). Note: Inspection was done jointly by the senior inspector of schools (who is currently the acting MEO), the assistant inspector of schools, and the Centre Coordinator Tutor from the Kibuli core PTC. After inspection, the team meets to discuss the inspection findings and collectively make recommendation to the TC and Education committee for corrective action. However, there was no evidence for this claim. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the DES obtain and review a list of LGs that have submitted school inspection reports | 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the DES, we obtained and reviewed a list of LGs that had submitted school inspection reports. It was noted that the Entebbe MLG had not submitted inspection reports for any of the four quarters to the DES. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Performance Area | No | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedure | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|------------------|----|--|--|---|----------|---|
| | | | DES in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) - score 2 points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO check whether the MEO has letter of acknowledgement from DES | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledgement forms from DES were not availed for review and so there was no evidence that the MLG Education department submitted school inspection reports to the DES in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). |
| | | | <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"> There was no evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up. |
| | 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 accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Enrolment data for all | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From MoES obtain and review EMIS reports for the current FY (2018/19) Obtain and review the performance contract for the current FY (2018/19) Check whether the list of schools submitted are consistent/similar. From MoES obtain and review EMIS reports for the current FY (2018/19) Obtain and review the performance | 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MoES, the EMIS reports were not availed for review. We obtained and reviewed the performance contract for 2018/19. The list of schools has 12 Government Aided primary schools. Note: From the MEO, we obtained a list of schools (a different format from the performance contract), which had 15government aided schools. <p>Based on the above, we were unable to ascertain the level of consistency of information submitted in PBS and the EMIS reports. Therefore the score is zero.</p> |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Enrolment data for all | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From MoES obtain and review EMIS reports for the current FY (2018/19) Obtain and review the performance | 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MoES, the EMIS reports were not availed for review. We obtained and reviewed the performance contract for 2018/19. The enrolment in the 12 Government Aided primary schools was 6,877. |

| 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) | schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS - score 5 points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> contract for the current FY (2018/19) Check whether the enrolment levels are consistent/similar. | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Finance, planning administration education and community based services committee were reviewed. It was noted that education reports were presented in only two meetings and the key highlights are shown in the table below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date</th> <th>Key highlights</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>29th August 2017</td> <td>Presentation of education department report including: PLE Mock exams, comparative tour to Fort Portal, Regional MDD festivals, organising workshop for P7 teachers and head teachers to improve performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27th June 2018</td> <td>Discussion of education annual work plan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19th March 2018</td> <td>Consideration and approval of SMCs</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Date | Key highlights | 29 th August 2017 | Presentation of education department report including: PLE Mock exams, comparative tour to Fort Portal, Regional MDD festivals, organising workshop for P7 teachers and head teachers to improve performance | 27 th June 2018 | Discussion of education annual work plan | 19 th March 2018 | Consideration and approval of SMCs |
| | | | Date | Key highlights | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 th August 2017 | Presentation of education department report including: PLE Mock exams, comparative tour to Fort Portal, Regional MDD festivals, organising workshop for P7 teachers and head teachers to improve performance | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 th June 2018 | Discussion of education annual work plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 th March 2018 | Consideration and approval of 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council obtain and review education sector standing committee meeting minutes – check if the Council has approved the sector implementation plan and discussions by the standing committee MEO's reports to the committee | <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. | 2 | <p>Minutes of council meetings were reviewed and there was evidence of presentation of education issues that required approval to Council.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date</th> <th>Key Highlights</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>25th May 2018</td> <td>MIN.C.019/05/2018: Approved the budgetary estimates of revenue and expenditure for the FY 2018/19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5th</td> <td>MIN.C.011/03.2018: Approval of</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Date | Key Highlights | 25 th May 2018 | MIN.C.019/05/2018: Approved the budgetary estimates of revenue and expenditure for the FY 2018/19 | 5 th | MIN.C.011/03.2018: Approval of | | | | |
| Date | Key Highlights | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 th May 2018 | MIN.C.019/05/2018: Approved the budgetary estimates of revenue and expenditure for the FY 2018/19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 th | MIN.C.011/03.2018: Approval of | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Performance Area | No | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedure | Score | Detailed assessment findings | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|--|---|---|----------|--|--------|------|---------------|----------------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|
| | 11. | Primary schools in a Municipal LG have functional SMCs (Maximum 5 points) | Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Check files from MEO if head teachers have submitted reports to SMCs and minutes of SMCs (check the entire list and sample 5 reports) ▪ Study files from 5 randomly sampled primary schools to confirm whether they have SMCs and review whether they have held 3 mandatory meetings | 0 | <p>There were no key education sector highlights made in the council meetings held on 4th December 2017 and 14th September 2017.</p> <p>Minutes of SMC meetings held in FY 2017/18 were reviewed for each of the 5 sampled schools. It was noted that only 3 out of 5 sampled schools held the 3 mandatory SMC meetings (at least one meeting per term) as shown in the table below.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>Date</th> <th>Period (Term)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Entebbe Changsha P/S</td> <td>16/06/2017</td> <td>2017 Tem2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>07/12/2017</td> <td>2017 Tem3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27/04/2018</td> <td>2018 Tem1</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Nakiwogo P/S</td> <td>25/05/2017</td> <td>2017 Tem2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14/09/2017</td> <td>2017 Tem3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31/01/2018</td> <td>2018 Tem1</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">St. Joseph Katabi P/S</td> <td>23/07/2017</td> <td>2017 Tem2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>03/11/2017</td> <td>2017 Tem3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>28/03/2018</td> <td>2018 Tem1</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">St. Theresa P/S</td> <td>24/06/2017</td> <td>2017 Tem2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20/03/2018</td> <td>2018 Tem1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15/07/2017</td> <td>2017 Tem2</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Kiwatu P/S</td> <td>16/04/2018</td> <td>2018 Tem1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | School | Date | Period (Term) | Entebbe Changsha P/S | 16/06/2017 | 2017 Tem2 | 07/12/2017 | 2017 Tem3 | 27/04/2018 | 2018 Tem1 | Nakiwogo P/S | 25/05/2017 | 2017 Tem2 | 14/09/2017 | 2017 Tem3 | 31/01/2018 | 2018 Tem1 | St. Joseph Katabi P/S | 23/07/2017 | 2017 Tem2 | 03/11/2017 | 2017 Tem3 | 28/03/2018 | 2018 Tem1 | St. Theresa P/S | 24/06/2017 | 2017 Tem2 | 20/03/2018 | 2018 Tem1 | 15/07/2017 | 2017 Tem2 | Kiwatu P/S | 16/04/2018 | 2018 Tem1 |
| School | Date | Period (Term) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Entebbe Changsha P/S | 16/06/2017 | 2017 Tem2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 07/12/2017 | 2017 Tem3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 27/04/2018 | 2018 Tem1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakiwogo P/S | 25/05/2017 | 2017 Tem2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 14/09/2017 | 2017 Tem3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 31/01/2018 | 2018 Tem1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Joseph Katabi P/S | 23/07/2017 | 2017 Tem2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 03/11/2017 | 2017 Tem3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 28/03/2018 | 2018 Tem1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Theresa P/S | 24/06/2017 | 2017 Tem2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 20/03/2018 | 2018 Tem1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 15/07/2017 | 2017 Tem2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiwatu P/S | 16/04/2018 | 2018 Tem1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | <p>March 2018 supplementary budget for the FY 2017/18</p> <p>MIN.C.012/03/2018: Laying budgetary estimates of revenue and expenditure for the FY 2018/19</p> <p>4th August 2017 Transfer of head teachers who have overstayed in one schools</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Performance Area | No | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedure | Score | Detailed assessment findings | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|---|-------|---|--------|---|--------------|----|----------------------|---|-----------------|----|------------|----|-----------------|----|
| | 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 | 0 | <p>St. Theresa P/S and Kiwatu P/S did not hold an SMC meeting in 2017 Term 3.</p> <p>It was also noted that the composition of SMC was not appropriate. Only Entebbe Changsha P/S and Kiwatu P/S had the 12 members, the required number of SMC members. Changsha have 9 foundation body members instead of 6.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>No. of SMC members (excluding Head teacher)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Nakiwogo P/S</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Entebbe Changsha P/S</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>St. Josephs P/S</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kiwatu P/S</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>St. Theresa P/S</td> <td>12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MLG Noticeboards were checked and it was noted that there was no evidence that the Municipal LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants on the municipal noticeboard at the time of assessment. The funds received in FY 2017/18 had been displayed in the head teacher's office or the staff room in all the 5 sampled schools. | School | No. of SMC members (excluding Head teacher) | Nakiwogo P/S | 10 | Entebbe Changsha P/S | 8 | St. Josephs P/S | 11 | Kiwatu P/S | 12 | St. Theresa P/S | 12 |
| School | No. of SMC members (excluding Head teacher) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nakiwogo P/S | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Entebbe Changsha P/S | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Josephs P/S | 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kiwatu P/S | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Theresa P/S | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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"> Entebbe LG Education Department Procurement Plan 2018/2019 was prepared by Municipal Education Officer, approved by Head of Department and submitted to Head of the Procurement and Disposal Unit (PDU) on 1st March 2018 which was before/ due date of 30th April 2018 The Annual Work plan and Procurement Plan had investment items; Purchase of department vehicle and water harvesters included there in. |
| | 14 | The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for suppliers 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>Entebbe MLG Education department certified (within 28 days) and initiated payment (within 30 days) for works on time. We sampled two contracts as follows;</p> <p>Contract between A & S Electronics Limited and Entebbe Municipal Council dated 22nd November 2017 for Supply and Installation of lightning arrestors;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The request for payment by A&S Electronics Limited for the supply and installation of lightning arrestors was certified and recommended on time. The contractor completed the first phase of works on 10th January 2018 and works were certified by Municipal Engineer on 29th January 2018. The contractor submitted their claim for payment for sum USHS. 11,287,673 on 20th November 2017 which was recommended for payment by Municipal Engineer on 10th January 2018. The contractor completed the final phase of works on |

| Performance Area | No | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedure | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|---|----|---|---|--|----------|---|
| (E) Financial management and Reporting | 15 | The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Planning Unit, obtain and review performance report files | 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the FY 2017/18, the Planning unit used PBS. Discussions with the Economic Planner revealed that the departmental head for education would have access to PBS and input their departmental figures after which the Planner would receive an Final phase of works were completed on 30th April 2018, certification of works were done on the same date. The contractor submitted their claim for payment for USHS. 3,771,672 on 30th April 2018 which was recommended for payment on 8th May 2018 by the Municipal Education Officer. The contractor completed the first phase of works on 27th February 2018 and works were certified by Senior Municipal Engineer on 22nd March 2018. The contractor submitted their claim for payment for sum USHS. 38,768,977 on 27th February 2018 which was recommended for payment by Municipal Education Officer on 26th March 2018 The request for payment by Restoration 2010 Company Limited for the renovation of 10 stance lined VIP latrine was certified and recommended on time. Contract between Restoration 2010 Company Limited and Entebbe Municipal Council dated 22nd November 2017 for Construction of a 10 stance lined VIP latrine at Bugonga P/S; 20th January 2018 and works were certified by Municipal Engineer the same date. The contractor submitted their claim for payment for sum USHS. 58,574,430 on 20th January 2018 which was recommended for payment by Municipal Engineer on 18th June 2018. |

| Performance Area | No | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedure | Score | Detailed assessment findings | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|----------|---|---------|-------|----------|---|------------------|----------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|---|---|
| (Maximum 8 points) | 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) | 4 | <p>The Senior Internal Auditor did not raise any issues to the education department in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd quarterly internal audit reports for the FY 2017/18. However, the 4th quarter internal audit report had not been prepared at the time of assessment hence the score four.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Issue</th> <th>Response</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>No issues raised</td> <td rowspan="4">No response required</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>No issues raised</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>No issues raised</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>The 4th quarter report was not ready at the time of assessment 6th to 7th September 2018.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Quarter | Issue | Response | 1 | No issues raised | No response required | 2 | No issues raised | 3 | No issues raised | 4 | The 4th quarter report was not ready at the time of assessment 6 th to 7 th September 2018. |
| | | | | | | | Quarter | Issue | Response | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | No issues raised | No response required | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | No issues raised | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | No issues raised | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | The 4th quarter report was not ready at the time of assessment 6 th to 7 th September 2018. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit (Maximum 4 points) | FY – 2017/18 (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15 th July for consolidation: score 4 points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the MEO check annual and quarterly reports for the previous FY (2017/18) | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ email notification from the PBS system, although there was no evidence of submission. ▪ However, we noted that all the quarterly performance reports included input from the education department and Entebbe MLG annual performance report for the FY 2017/18 was submitted to MoFPED on 8th August 2018 before the deadline of 30th August 2018. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Performance Area | No | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedure | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|---|----|---|--|--|----------|--|
| (F) Social and environment safeguards <i>(Maximum 8 points)</i> | 17 | LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines <i>(Maximum 5 points)</i> | <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 girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc....: 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 | 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence of dissemination of sanitation guidelines and awareness raising on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools. |
| | | | <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 | <p>The SMCs for the sampled schools were duly composed with at least 2 females, following the guidelines in the Education (pre-primary, primary and Post Primary) Act, 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> St Joseph's Katabi Primary School – Committee is composed with 2 women and 10 men meeting required minimum at least 2 females on the SMC St. Theresa's Primary School - Committee is composed with 4 women and 8 men meeting required minimum at least 2 females on the SMC |

| Performance Area | No | Performance Measures | Scoring guide | Assessment Procedure | Score | Detailed assessment findings |
|------------------|----|---|--|--|-----------|--|
| | 18 | LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with (Maximum 3 points) | <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 management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3 points | <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 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 | 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Kiwefu Primary School</u> - Committee is composed with 2 women and 10 men meeting required minimum at least 2 females on the SMC committee. ▪ There was no evidence that LG Education department issued guidelines on environmental management. ▪ There were no circulars on file at the MEO's office communicating environmental management activities to schools. |
| Total | | | | | 41 | |