

## 16.1 Performance on Health Sector Performance Measures

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings																
<b>(A) Human resource planning and management</b> <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 (2018/19) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 80% filled: <b>score 8 points,</b></li> <li>• 60 – 80% - <b>score 4 points</b></li> <li>• Less than 60% filled: <b>score 0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ From the LG Performance Contract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Check the LG approved structure</li> <li>✓ Check wage bill provision</li> <li>✓ Establish the positions filled</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <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>	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There was evidence that LG has filled 72.2% of the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY (2018/19).</li> <li>▪ The Municipality has two health centres; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Nakapelimen HCII</li> <li>b. DMO's (District Medical Officer's) clinic HCII</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ A list of health workers deployed in health centres dated 5th May 2018 addressed to the town clerk Moroto Municipality is on file.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Health facility</th> <th>Positions filled</th> <th>Staff norms</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Nakapelimen HCII</td> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> <td>88.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DMO's clinic HCII</td> <td>5</td> <td>9</td> <td>55.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>13</b></td> <td><b>18</b></td> <td><b>72.2%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Health facility	Positions filled	Staff norms	%	Nakapelimen HCII	8	9	88.9%	DMO's clinic HCII	5	9	55.6%	<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>72.2%</b>
	Health facility	Positions filled	Staff norms	%																		
Nakapelimen HCII	8	9	88.9%																			
DMO's clinic HCII	5	9	55.6%																			
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>72.2%</b>																			
2.	The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM	Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ From the Performance Contract, review recruitment plan to determine whether the vacant positions of primary health care workers have been</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At the time of review, the assessment team noted there was no recruitment plan for 2018/19 however, the MLG wishes to use the 2017/18 recruitment request on file dated 15th May 2018, addressed to the Municipal Town clerk which had the following details</li> </ul>																	

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings									
(B) Monitoring and supervision <i>(Maximum 32)</i>		department <i>(Maximum 6 points)</i>	(2018/19), covering the vacant positions of health workers: <b>score 6 points</b>	included in the current FY (2018/19)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Health Assistant – 1</li> <li>b. Nursing assistants – 2</li> <li>c. Guards – 4</li> <li>d. Porters – 4</li> </ul>									
	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. <i>(Maximum 8 points)</i>	Evidence that all health facility in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY (2017/18): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100%: <b>score 8 points</b></li> <li>• 70 – 99%: <b>score 4 points</b></li> <li>• Below 70%: <b>score 0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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).</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ For the FY 2017/18, there was evidence that both (100%) health facility in-charges were appraised, as shown in the table below: <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Health facility</th> <th>In-charge</th> <th>Appraisal date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Nakapelimen HCII</b></td> <td>Salome Anoding</td> <td>7<sup>th</sup> September 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>DMO's clinic HCII</b></td> <td>Paska Gerry Ongiertho</td> <td>3<sup>rd</sup> September 2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </li> </ul>	Health facility	In-charge	Appraisal date	<b>Nakapelimen HCII</b>	Salome Anoding	7 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	<b>DMO's clinic HCII</b>	Paska Gerry Ongiertho	3 <sup>rd</sup> September 2018
	Health facility	In-charge	Appraisal date												
<b>Nakapelimen HCII</b>	Salome Anoding	7 <sup>th</sup> September 2018													
<b>DMO's clinic HCII</b>	Paska Gerry Ongiertho	3 <sup>rd</sup> September 2018													
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). <i>(Maximum 4 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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: <b>score 4 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There was 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): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Health facility staff list provided by the Municipal council health department was consistent with the staff lists available at respective health facilities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>										
	5.	The MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ From MoH obtain guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18)</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There was no evidence that MHO has effectively communicated guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level.</li> <li>▪ The MHO explained that guidelines, circulars and policies from national level are either sent</li> </ul>									

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
<b>points)</b>		by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities <b>(Maximum 6 points)</b>	national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities: <b>score 3 points</b>	to health facilities (MofH to prioritize the documents to be reviewed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ From the MHO obtain evidence that s/he communicated guidelines, policies, circulars to health facilities (e.g. through meetings, submission letters, etc).</li> <li>▪ From the sample of health facilities, check whether the guidelines, policies, circulars were received.</li> </ul> <p><i>If all guidelines of the previous year are still applicable and no new ones have been issued, then score 3</i></p>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ directly to the health centres through implementing partners or through the District Health Office</li> <li>▪ Therefore, there is no Municipal Health Office – Health facility correspondences file in the MLG health department.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence that the MHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: <b>score 3 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ From the MHO obtain and review minutes and/or other evidence of meetings with health facility in-charges in the previous FY (2017/18).</li> <li>▪ Check from a sample of 5 health facilities</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There was no evidence that the MHO held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national</li> </ul>

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	6.	The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services <b>(Maximum 6 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: <b>score 3 points</b></li> </ul>	<p>From the MHO obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG support supervision reports (quarterly)</li> <li>Minutes of MHT meetings</li> <li>Facility records</li> <li>Review and check a sample of minimum 5 facilities</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MLG does not have a health facility at this level within its jurisdiction. Based on the guidance provided by USMID, the MLG scores the full marks.</li> </ul>
			<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"> <li>If 100% supervised: <b>score 3 points</b></li> <li>80 - 99% of the health facilities: <b>score 2 points</b></li> <li>60% - 79% of the health facilities: <b>score 1 point</b></li> <li>Less than 60% of the health facilities: <b>score 0</b></li> </ul>	<p>From the MHO obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support supervision and monitoring visit reports</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MLG has no Health Sub-District; therefore, supervision of lower health facilities is supposed to be done directly by the Municipal Health Team. The assessment team noted that the municipal health department does not have the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support supervision reports</li> <li>Minutes of Municipal Health Team meetings</li> </ul> </li> <li>A review of support supervision records at health facilities did not reveal any evidence of support supervision by MHT members</li> </ul>
	7.	The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/ reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for</li> </ul>	<p>From the MHO obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support supervision and monitoring visit reports</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was no evidence that support supervision/ monitoring reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions.</li> </ul>

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
<b>(C) Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</b> <i>(Maximum 14</i>	9.	The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council	corrective actions during the previous financial year (2018/19): <b>score 4 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes of quarterly meetings</li> <li>Minutes of monthly MHT meetings</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was no evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, and LG PAC reports.</li> <li>The municipality has a “general purpose committee” in which all departmental issues are</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the recommendations are followed up and specific activities undertaken for correction: <b>score 6 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the sampled health facilities, determine whether the Health department provided recommendations from the supervision visits and followed up.</li> </ul>		
	8.	The LG Health department has submitted accurate/ consistent reports/ data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH <i>(Maximum 10 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 - <b>score 10 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the MoH obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HMIS reports for the current FY (2018/19)</li> <li>The performance contract for the current FY (2018/19)</li> <li>Check whether the lists of health facilities submitted are consistent/ similar</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment team was not in position to assess this performance measure because they did obtain the HMIS reports for the current FY (2018/19) and as a result they could not ascertain whether the lists of health facilities submitted are consistent/ similar.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision including supervision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the Clerk to Council obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health sector standing committee meeting minutes – check if the Council has approved the sector</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings									
<b>points)</b>	10.	The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/ functioning <b>(Maximum 6 points)</b>	reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY (2017/18) - <b>score 2 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>implementation plan and discussions by the committee</li> <li>Review the MHO's reports to the committee</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>discussed.</li> <li>Most meeting minutes do not clearly capture presentation and discussions of departmental reports.</li> <li>For FY 2017/18 the committee met 3 times               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1<sup>st</sup> meeting 15<sup>th</sup> December 2017</li> <li>- 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting 28<sup>th</sup> February 2018</li> <li>- 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2018</li> </ul> </li> <li>In all these meetings there was no submission from health department</li> </ul>									
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council - <b>score 2 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was no evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council.</li> </ul>									
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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"> <li>▪ If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: <b>score 6 points</b></li> <li>▪ If 80-99 %: <b>score 4</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check files of HUMCs and minutes of HUMCs (Check list for all and sample 5 to review)</li> <li>Study files from 5 randomly sampled health facilities to confirm whether they have HUMCs and review whether they have held 4</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was evidence that 1 of 2 (50%) health facilities and Hospitals had functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues) during the FY 2017/18:</li> </ul>									
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Health facility</th> <th>HUMC meeting dates</th> <th>HUMC functional</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Nakapelimen HC II</b></td> <td>4 December 2017 4 April 2018</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>DMO's clinic</b></td> <td>26 October 2017</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							Health facility	HUMC meeting dates	HUMC functional	<b>Nakapelimen HC II</b>	4 December 2017 4 April 2018	No	<b>DMO's clinic</b>	26 October 2017	Yes
Health facility	HUMC meeting dates	HUMC functional													
<b>Nakapelimen HC II</b>	4 December 2017 4 April 2018	No													
<b>DMO's clinic</b>	26 October 2017	Yes													

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
<b>(D) Procurement and contract management</b> <b>(Maximum 8 points)</b>	11.	The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants <b>(Maximum 4 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards - <b>score 4 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check the LG Notice Boards and LG budget website to establish if the Health department publicised all health facilities receiving non-wage recurrent grants</li> <li>Check a sample of health facilities</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MLG displayed health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants.</li> <li>All PHC non-wage recurrent grant funds and accountability are displayed at the two health facilities.</li> </ul>
	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 <b>(Maximum 4 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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) - <b>score 2 points</b></li> <li>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the Municipal Health Officer (MHO) obtain and review submissions to DPU;</li> <li>From PDU crosscheck submission from DHO</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The health department prepared and submitted approved Sector annual work plan and budget to the PDU on 17<sup>th</sup> August 2018. The submission was prepared and approved by Lowal Patrick-Health Inspector. It was acknowledged by the PDU senior procurement officer, Lomakol Jimmy on 20<sup>th</sup> August 2018. This was after the deadline period of April 30, 2018.</li> <li>At time of the assessment, the health department hadn't submitted procurement request form (Form PPS) to the PDU by 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter of the current FY (2018/19).</li> </ul>

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
<b>(E) Financial management and reporting</b>  <b>(Maximum 8 points)</b>	13	The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time  <b>(Maximum 4 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment- <b>score 4 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the CFO obtain a sample of contracts, review and determine whether payment requests were certified and recommended on time</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	We reviewed one contract – the construction of Our Patients Department at DMO's Clinic HC 11 by M/s Jamara Company Ltd. Contract was signed on 15 <sup>th</sup> January 2016. The contract was signed between Moroto MLG and M/s Jamara Company Ltd. The Contractor (M/s Jamara Company Ltd) requested for payment on 17 <sup>th</sup> March 2018 amounting to Ushs. 83,498,392. Payment voucher number PV-HE00016 was raised on 23 <sup>rd</sup> May 2018 and amounted to Ushs.83,498,392. <b>We were not provided with evidence to show that the health department recommended for payment of the works.</b>
	14	The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit  <b>(Maximum 4 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 - <b>score 4 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the Planning Unit, obtain and review performance report files</li> <li>From the MHO check annual and quarterly reports for the previous FY (2017/18)</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Health Sector prepared and submitted the 2018/19 quarterly reports and annual performance report that included progress in the execution of the planned activities to the Planning Unit for consolidation.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Our review of the submitted reports indicated that the performance reports contained sections on the Health sector. However the Economic</li> </ul>



Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings						
						<p>Planner did not keep record of the date on which the Health sector completed populating its section in the system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>However we confirmed that the online submission of the quarter1 and quarter2 reports were done on the dates indicated in the table below.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Online Submission date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>21/02/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>06/04/2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	Online Submission date	1	21/02/2018	2	06/04/2018
Quarter	Online Submission date											
1	21/02/2018											
2	06/04/2018											
	15	LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendations (if any) <b>(Maximum 4 points)</b>	<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"> <li>If sector has no audit query - <b>score 4 points</b></li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year - <b>score 2 points</b></li> <li>If all queries are not responded to - <b>score 0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the Internal Auditor obtain copies of sector audit reports from the internal audit and Management responses for the previous FY (2017/18)</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The internal audit identified issues such as delay in accounting for business advances amounting to USHS. 7,253,724 in quarter 1 and USHS. 5,768,725 in quarter 3. However our review of the subsequent internal audit reports revealed that the issue on delayed accountabilities were not responded to by the health department.</li> </ul>						

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
<b>(F) Social and environment safeguards</b> <b>(Maximum 12 points)</b>	16	Compliance with gender composition of Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities. <b>(Maximum 4 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the HUMC meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30% women) - <b>score 2 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two health facilities (DMOS health center II and Nakapelimen Health center II) are under the jurisdiction of the municipality. The HUMC composition at the two health facilities included 3 women out of 7 members each (43% women), which meets the gender composition requirement of at least 30% women. Lists of the members of these committees were seen.</li> </ul>
	17	LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with. <b>(Maximum 4 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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: <b>score 2 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the Environmental officer obtain and review filled screening forms to ascertain whether screening was done and whether risks mitigation plans were developed.</li> <li>From the Environmental officer and CDO obtain and review Site visit reports to establish whether they checked</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no health infrastructure projects screened in FY 2017/18, as none were planned as per the procurement plan.</li> <li>There were no site visits or monitoring activities conducted because there was no health infrastructure project implemented at the time of the assessment.</li> </ul>

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 <b>(Maximum 4 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: <b>score 2 points</b></li> <li>▪ 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 - <b>score 4 points.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There was one handbook on each of the 2 sampled health facilities (DMOS health center II and Nakapelimen Health center II), titled "Uganda National Infection Prevention and Control Guidelines". Chapter 7 of this book gives guidelines on Healthcare/medical waste management.</li> </ul>
<b>Total</b>					<b>31</b>	

## 16.2 Performance on Education Sector Performance Measures

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings															
<b>(A) Human resource planning and management</b> <b>(Maximum 30 points)</b>	1.	The Municipal LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school) <b>(Maximum 8 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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) - <b>score 4 points</b></li> </ul>	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"> <li>The Municipal LG has budgeted for at least a Head Teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school.</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment team obtained the Performance contract vote 769 for Moroto MLG, reviewed staff lists, lists of schools and quarterly budgets.</li> <li>It was verified that Moroto MLG, has a total of 05 primary schools and a total of 46 teachers.</li> <li>It was validated that Moroto MLG had budgeted for at least a head teacher and minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 The school with the lowest number of teachers has five.</li> </ul>															
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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) - <b>score 4 points</b></li> </ul>	From the MEO obtain and review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>From the sampled schools (urban and rural), verify whether the teachers as indicated in the staff lists are actually deployed in the schools.</li> </ul>			<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We checked the performance contract vote 769 for Moroto MLG and reviewed teachers' lists to determine the deployment status. From the 05 sampled schools, number of teachers indicated in the staff lists and those deployed in the schools are shown below:               <table border="1" data-bbox="354 1486 690 1984"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>Staff list</th> <th>Actual Deployed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Kakoley P/S</td> <td>11</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moroto Dem P/S</td> <td>7</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nakapelimen P/S</td> <td>7</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moroto Municipal P/S</td> <td>15</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moroto Prisons P/S</td> <td>5</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </li> <li>The assessment team noted that Moroto Prisons P/S had closed for holidays; so the team could</li> </ul>	School	Staff list	Actual Deployed	Kakoley P/S	11	10	Moroto Dem P/S	7	7	Nakapelimen P/S	7	10	Moroto Municipal P/S
School	Staff list	Actual Deployed																			
Kakoley P/S	11	10																			
Moroto Dem P/S	7	7																			
Nakapelimen P/S	7	10																			
Moroto Municipal P/S	15	15																			
Moroto Prisons P/S	5	N/A																			

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
						not access the head teacher.
	2.	Municipal LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision <b>(Maximum 6 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence that the Municipal LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision</li> <li>✓ If 100% - <b>score 6 points</b></li> <li>✓ If 80 - 99% - <b>score 3 points</b></li> <li>✓ If below 80% - <b>score 0</b></li> </ul>	<p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Check the Municipal LG approved structure</li> <li>▪ Check wage bill provision</li> <li>▪ Positions filled.</li> </ul> <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>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We checked the MLG Performance Contract vote 769 for Moroto MLG and established that the approved structure had 54 primary teachers, and the wage bill provision for Moroto MLG is Ushs. 396,832,118. The total number of teachers on payroll was 45 teachers.</li> <li>• It was validated that the MLG had filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision at (45/54); which translates to 83%.</li> </ul>
	3.	Municipal LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision. <b>(Maximum 6 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence that the Municipal LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision - <b>score 6 points</b></li> </ul>	<p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Check the Municipal LG approved structure</li> <li>▪ Positions filled.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ From the Performance Contract voter/69 for Moroto MLG, the approved structure for school inspectors is 02 i.e. (Municipal Inspector of Schools and Assistant Inspector of Schools)</li> <li>▪ The MLG has filled only one position of Assistant Inspector of school i.e. Mr. Okiru Hillary who was appointed on 1/11/2015 under Min 50/MDS/2005.</li> </ul>
	4.	The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY (2018/19).	<p>Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY (2018/19) to fill positions of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Primary Teachers - <b>score 6 points</b></li> </ul>	<p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the recruitment plan to determine whether the vacant positions of teachers and inspectors have been</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the MLG performance contract we obtained and reviewed the recruitment plan for FY 2018/19.</li> <li>• It was validated that 14 vacant positions of primary teachers were submitted for the current FY 2018/19.</li> <li>• The vacant position for Municipal Inspector of schools was not included in the submission.</li> </ul>
					<b>0</b>	

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). <b>(Maximum 6 points)</b>	<p>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)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 100% school inspectors - <b>score 3 points</b></li> <li>▪ Primary school head teachers</li> <li>✓ 90 - 100% - <b>score 3 points</b></li> <li>✓ 70% and 89% - <b>score 2 points</b></li> <li>✓ Below 70% - <b>score 0</b></li> </ul>	<p>From the Municipal HR department obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personnel files for school inspectors and a sample of head teachers to determine whether they were appraised during the previous FY (2017/18).</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We obtained and reviewed Personnel files from the Municipal HR. We established that only one school inspector Okiru Hillary AIS was appraised for the FY 2017/2018 on 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2018.</li> <li>• From the 5 sampled head teachers; only one: Mr. Engwau David –GT/2017/1260 was appraised in 2017/2018 on 29<sup>th</sup> June, 2018 i.e. 1/5x100 hence 20%</li> </ul>
			<p><b>score 2 points</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ School Inspectors - <b>score 2 points</b></li> </ul>	<p>included.</p>		
<b>(B) Monitoring and inspection</b> <b>(Maximum 35 points)</b>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 -</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ From MoES obtain guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools</li> <li>▪ From the MEO obtain evidence that s/he communicated guidelines, policies,</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the five (5) sampled schools, the assessment team noted that there was no evidence to ascertain that the Municipal LG Education department in FY 2017/18 communicated all guidelines; policies and circulars issued by national level.</li> </ul>

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings																									
		<b>(Maximum 3 points)</b>	<b>score 1 point</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the MEO obtain and review minutes and/or other evidence of the meetings with Head Teachers</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was no evidence from MEO of minutes of meetings held with head teachers to explain and sensitize on the guidelines, policies and circulars issued by the national level.</li> </ul>																									
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 - <b>score 2 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the MEO, obtain and review school inspection reports and inventory of schools inspected in the previous FY (2017/18)</li> <li>From sampled school verify the number of times they were inspected during the previous FY (2017/18)</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the MEO, we obtained and reviewed school inspection reports and inventory of schools; and it was established as follows: <b>Category : Government aided schools</b></li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>Q1</th> <th>Q2</th> <th>Q3</th> <th>Q4</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Moroto Dem P/S</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>29/3/18</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moroto Municipal P/S</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>29/3/18</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kakoley P/S</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>29/3/18</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nakapelimen</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>29/3/18</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	School	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Moroto Dem P/S			29/3/18		Moroto Municipal P/S			29/3/18		Kakoley P/S			29/3/18		Nakapelimen			29/3/18	
School	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4																											
Moroto Dem P/S			29/3/18																												
Moroto Municipal P/S			29/3/18																												
Kakoley P/S			29/3/18																												
Nakapelimen			29/3/18																												
	7.	The Municipal LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered schools <b>(Maximum 12 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ 100% - <b>score 12</b></li> <li>✓ 90 to 99% - <b>score 10</b></li> <li>✓ 80 to 89% - <b>score 8</b></li> <li>✓ 70 to 79% - <b>score</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>																												

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 <b>(Maximum 10 points)</b>	<p><b>6</b> ✓ 60 to 69% - <b>score 3</b> ✓ 50 to 59 % - <b>score 1</b> ✓ Below 50% - <b>score 0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was validated that school inspection was not effectively done, it was only done in quarter 3 hence it was below 50%.</li> <li>There was no evidence of inspection of private schools.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>P/s</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moroto</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>29/3/18</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prison P/s</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	P/s					Moroto			29/3/18		Prison P/s				
P/s																					
Moroto			29/3/18																		
Prison P/s																					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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) - <b>score 4 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the DES obtain and review a list of LGs that have submitted school inspection reports</li> <li>From the MEO check whether the MEO has letter of acknowledgement from DES</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We obtained and reviewed lists of inspection reports. There was no evidence that Moroto MLG education department submitted school inspection reports to DES.</li> <li>There were no letters of acknowledgement from DES to Municipal Education department.</li> <li>Therefore, there was no evidence that the MLG submitted inspection reports to the DES.</li> </ul>															
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the DES in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) - <b>score 2 points</b></li> </ul>																		



Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up - <b>score 4 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the sampled schools, determine whether the education department provided recommendations from the inspection reports and followed-up.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The team interacted with 04 out of 05 sampled primary schools head teachers, and noted the recommendations mentioned below. However, the team could not verify whether the recommendations from inspection reports were followed up by the MLG Education Department. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Moroto Municipal P/S. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Hygiene and sanitation of the school needs to be improved.</li> <li>ii. The school compound should be slashed to keep the grass short.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Moroto Demonstration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The school should be given more land for infrastructural development.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Kakoley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Parents need to be mobilised and sensitised on the need to take children to school.</li> <li>ii. There is need to change the school administration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nakapelimen P/S <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The administration and class room blocks need to be renovated</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Moroto Prisons P/S <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The school had closed for the holiday so the information was not accessed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li></ul>
	9.	The Municipal LG Education department has submitted accurate/ consistent reports/ date for school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence that the Municipal LG has submitted accurate/ consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ List of schools</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ From MoES obtain and review EMIS reports for the current FY (2018/19)</li> <li>▪ Obtain and review the</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The team obtained and reviewed the performance contract Vote 762 for Moroto MLG and checked the lists of schools.</li> <li>• From MoES, the EMIS report for 2018 was not availed for review.</li> </ul>

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings	
		lists and enrollment as per formats provided by MoES <b>(Maximum 10 points)</b>	which are consistent with both EMIS reports and Programme Budgeting System (PBS) - <b>score 5 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ performance contract for the current FY (2018/19)</li> <li>▪ Check whether the list of schools submitted are consistent/similar.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ From MoES obtain and review EMIS reports for the current FY (2018/19)</li> <li>▪ Obtain and review the performance contract for the current FY (2018/19)</li> <li>▪ Check whether the enrollment levels are consistent/similar.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basing on that we were not able to establish whether the lists of schools were consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Municipal LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Enrollment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS - <b>score 5 points</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The team obtained and reviewed the performance contract for Moroto MLG Vote762, and checked for the enrollment data.</li> <li>• From MoES, the EMIS report for 2018 was not availed for review.</li> <li>• Basing on that, the assessment team was not able to validate whether the enrollment data for all schools was consistent with EMIS report and PBS.</li> </ul>	

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
<b>(C) Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability (Maximum 12 points)</b>	10.	The Municipal LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council  <b>(Maximum 4 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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) - <b>score 2 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>MEO's reports to the committee</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From Clerk to Council the assessment team obtained and reviewed the minutes of the education sector standing committee. It was noted that the committee met and discussed education service delivery issues;</li> <li>On 30<sup>th</sup> May 2018 under Minute number MMC/GC/105/2018/04, presentation of committee recommendation for adoption and approval of budget was done. Under education sector, Ushs. 1,680,617,129 had been budgeted. The recurrent cost was budgeted at Ushs. 1,506,316,270 and the capital expenditure for construction of a staff house at Moroto demonstration P/S was budgeted at Ushs. 174,300,859 for approval.</li> <li>On 10<sup>th</sup> October 2017 under minute number, MMC/EXE/10/2017/03, there was a handover for completed projects. The chairperson presented that the storage building of Moroto demonstration class room block was complete pending handover. It was therefore presented for approval.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council - <b>score 2 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the Clerk to Council obtain and review minutes to check if education issues have been presented to the Council.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From Clerk to Council the team reviewed the minutes of the full council meetings, and it was validated that education issues had been presented to the council.</li> <li>On 15/7/2017, under min MMC/GPC/07/2017/06 the Committee made recommendations for approval for grant aid for Moroto Police P/S. In addition it was recommended that the school be allowed to benefit from government services like Universal Primary Education, infrastructural facilities, teachers etc.</li> </ul>

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings																														
	11.	Primary schools in a Municipal LG have functional SMCs <b>(Maximum 5 points)</b>	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"> <li>100% schools: <b>score 5</b></li> <li>80 to 99% schools: <b>score 3</b></li> <li>Below 80 % schools: <b>score 0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check files from MEO if head teachers have submitted reports to SMCs and minutes of SMCs (check the entire list and sample 5 reports)</li> <li>Study files from 5 randomly sampled primary schools to confirm whether they have SMCs and review whether they have held 3 mandatory meetings</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment team sampled five schools to ascertain functionality of SMCs and these included: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of school</th> <th>Date of Meeting</th> <th>Contents of discussion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="4">Kakoley P/S.</td> <td>23/8/2017</td> <td>Performance and budge</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20/10/2017</td> <td>Performance and discipline</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13/4/2018</td> <td>Finance and budge</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10/4/2018</td> <td>Approval of budge</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">Moroto Municipal P/S</td> <td>4/10/2017</td> <td>Performance and discipline</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5/2/2018</td> <td>Finance and budge</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10/6/2018</td> <td>Discipline and Budget</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18/8/2018</td> <td>Performance.</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">Moroto Demonstration P/S</td> <td>2/12/2017</td> <td>Performance and discipline</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5/4/2017</td> <td>Finance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8/2/2017</td> <td>Performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5/6/2018</td> <td>Work Plan</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </li> </ul>	Name of school	Date of Meeting	Contents of discussion	Kakoley P/S.	23/8/2017	Performance and budge	20/10/2017	Performance and discipline	13/4/2018	Finance and budge	10/4/2018	Approval of budge	Moroto Municipal P/S	4/10/2017	Performance and discipline	5/2/2018	Finance and budge	10/6/2018	Discipline and Budget	18/8/2018	Performance.	Moroto Demonstration P/S	2/12/2017	Performance and discipline	5/4/2017	Finance	8/2/2017	Performance	5/6/2018	Work Plan
Name of school	Date of Meeting	Contents of discussion																																		
Kakoley P/S.	23/8/2017	Performance and budge																																		
	20/10/2017	Performance and discipline																																		
	13/4/2018	Finance and budge																																		
	10/4/2018	Approval of budge																																		
Moroto Municipal P/S	4/10/2017	Performance and discipline																																		
	5/2/2018	Finance and budge																																		
	10/6/2018	Discipline and Budget																																		
	18/8/2018	Performance.																																		
Moroto Demonstration P/S	2/12/2017	Performance and discipline																																		
	5/4/2017	Finance																																		
	8/2/2017	Performance																																		
	5/6/2018	Work Plan																																		

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 <b>(Maximum 3 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the Municipal LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards - <b>score 3 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check the Municipal notice boards to establish if the Education department publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants for public viewing</li> <li>Check a sample of schools for postings of non-wage recurrent grants</li> </ul>	3	<p>It was validated that 4 out of 5 schools in Moroto Municipal Council held the three mandatory SMC meetings at 80%, thus the score of 3.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Nakapilimen P/S</td> <td>29/7/2017</td> <td>Performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>11/11/2017</td> <td>Discipline</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>7/2/2018</td> <td>Budget and performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>21/6/2018</td> <td>Performance</td> </tr> </table> <p>Moroto Prison P/S</p> <p>The school had closed for holidays so the team did not access the information at the time of the visit</p> <p>There was evidence that the MLG posted all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants on the notice board of MLG for public viewing.</p> <p>From the five sampled schools, four had postings of non-wage recurrent grants in the staff rooms and at the time of the assessment the fifth had closed. The details are shown below:</p> <p>1) Moroto Municipal P/S:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)</th> <th>Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>2,160,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td>2,130,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>2,160,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Nakapilimen P/S	29/7/2017	Performance		11/11/2017	Discipline		7/2/2018	Budget and performance		21/6/2018	Performance	Term	Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)	1		2,160,000	2		2,130,000	3	2,160,000	
Nakapilimen P/S	29/7/2017	Performance																												
	11/11/2017	Discipline																												
	7/2/2018	Budget and performance																												
	21/6/2018	Performance																												
Term	Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)																												
1		2,160,000																												
2		2,130,000																												
3	2,160,000																													

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings																																				
<b>(D) Procurement and contract management (Maximum 7 points)</b>	13	The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the Municipal Education Officer (MEO) obtain and review submission to Procurement Unit;</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<p>2) Moroto Demonstration P/S</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)</th> <th>Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>1,808,040</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td>1,808,040</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>1,808,040</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>3) Kakoley P/S</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)</th> <th>Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>961,346</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td>961,346</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>961,346</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>4) Nakapelinen P/S.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)</th> <th>Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>1,046,967</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td>1,046,967</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>1,046,844</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>5) Moroto Prisons P/S</p> <p>The school had closed; no evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the time of the assessment, there was no evidence that the Education department had 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.</li> </ul>	Term	Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)	1		1,808,040	2		1,808,040	3	1,808,040		Term	Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)	1		961,346	2		961,346	3	961,346		Term	Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)	1		1,046,967	2		1,046,967	3	1,046,844	
Term	Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)																																								
1		1,808,040																																								
2		1,808,040																																								
3	1,808,040																																									
Term	Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)																																								
1		961,346																																								
2		961,346																																								
3	961,346																																									
Term	Amount received in 2017 (Ushs)	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)																																								
1		1,046,967																																								
2		1,046,967																																								
3	1,046,844																																									

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(E) Financial management and	14	The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time <b>(Maximum 3 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: <b>score 3 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the CFO obtain a sample of contracts, review and determine whether payment requests were certified and recommended on time</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We sampled one contract and the details are shown below:</li> <li><b>Renovation of 2 classroom block in Nakapelimen primary school and teacher's house at Moroto Primary School:</b> Contract was signed on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2018 between MLG and M/s Kadam Trans Tech Services and the contract amount was Ushs. 46,213,343. The contractor requested for first Payment of Ushs. 22,175,622 on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2018. The engineer certified the works on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2018 and issued a payment certificate. The Municipal Education Officer forwarded the request for payment for consideration on the same date. Payment was effected on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2018 vide payment voucher PV/ED00052. The contractor requested for second Payment of Ushs. 22,175,622 on 25<sup>th</sup> May 2018. The engineer certified the works on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2018 and issued a payment certificate. The Municipal Education Officer forwarded the request for payment for consideration on the same date. Payment was effected on 15<sup>th</sup> June 2018 vide payment voucher PV-FN00029.</li> </ul>
	15	The LG Education department has submitted annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30, 2018 - <b>score 4 points</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From DPU crosscheck submission from MEO</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Education Sector prepared and submitted the 2018/19 quarterly reports and annual performance report that included progress in the execution of</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the Planning Unit, obtain and review performance</li> </ul>		

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings						
<b>Reporting (Maximum 8 points)</b>		reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit <b>(Maximum 4 points)</b>	annual performance report for the previous FY - 2017/18 (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15 <sup>th</sup> July for consolidation: <b>score 4 points</b>	report files <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the MEO check annual and quarterly reports for the previous FY (2017/18)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the planned activities to the Planning Unit for consolidation.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Our review of the submitted reports indicated that the performance reports contained sections on the Education sector. However the Economic Planner did not keep record of the date on which the Education sector completed populating its section in the system.</li> <li>However we confirmed that the online submission of the quarter1 and quarter2 reports were done on the dates indicated in the table below.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Online Submission date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>21/02/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>06/04/2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	Online Submission date	1	21/02/2018	2	06/04/2018
	Quarter	Online Submission date										
1	21/02/2018											
2	06/04/2018											
16	LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendations (if any) <b>(Maximum 4 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the Internal Auditor obtain copies of sector audit reports from the internal audit and Management responses for the previous FY (2017/18)</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During our review of the internal audit reports, we noted that internal auditor raised issues such as unutilized water-borne toilets constructed in primary schools, delay in accounting for business advances amounting to USHS. 591,000 in quarter1, Ushs. 2,401,000 in quarter 2, Ushs. 2,751,000 in quarter 3 and Ushs. 280,000 in quarter 4.</li> <li>However our review of the subsequent internal</li> </ul>							



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>	<p>(2017/18)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ If sector has no audit query - <b>score 4 points</b></li> <li>✓ If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year - <b>score 2 points</b></li> <li>✓ If all queries are not responded to - <b>score 0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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 handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc.</li> </ul>	<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There was no documented evidence of dissemination of guidelines on how senior women/ men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc to the schools provided by the Municipal education office at the time of assessment. However, there were copies of guidelines found in the sampled schools, which included the following handbooks; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "National School sanitation guidelines "</li> <li>- "Training manual on Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Manual"</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings															
	18	LG Education department has	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 – <b>score 2 points</b></li> <li>Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition – <b>score 1 point</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>From the sampled schools, check whether the SMC meets the guideline on gender composition</li> </ul>	<p><b>0</b></p> <p><b>1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was no documented evidence of dissemination of guidelines to the schools provided by the MEO at the time of assessment. However, there were copies of guidelines in the sampled schools, which included the following handbooks; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“National School sanitation guidelines”</li> <li>“Training manual on Water, Sanitation and Hygiene”</li> <li>These hand books have sections on sanitation for girls.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Four out of the total five primary schools were sampled, and the compositions for the School Management Committees were as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>Females</th> <th>Males</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Kakolye p/s</td> <td>4</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nakapelimen p/s</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moroto Municipal p/s</td> <td>5</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moroto demonstration p/s</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </li> <li>All the sampled schools management committees were therefore duly composed with at least 2 females, following the guidelines in the Education (pre-primary, primary and Post Primary) Act, 2008.</li> <li>There was no evidence that the Municipal Education Officer in collaboration with the</li> </ul>	School	Females	Males	Kakolye p/s	4	9	Nakapelimen p/s	6	7	Moroto Municipal p/s	5	8	Moroto demonstration p/s	6	7
School	Females	Males																			
Kakolye p/s	4	9																			
Nakapelimen p/s	6	7																			
Moroto Municipal p/s	5	8																			
Moroto demonstration p/s	6	7																			

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
		ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with  <b>(Maximum 3 points)</b>	department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.);  <b>score 3 points</b>	<p>review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Circulars to schools</li> <li>✓ Minutes of meetings with teachers</li> <li>✓ Sample of schools</li> <li>✓ Inspection reports to schools</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the Environmental officer obtain and review: Filled screening forms to ascertain whether screening was done and whether risks mitigation plans were developed.</li> <li>• From the Environmental officer and CDO obtain and review: Site visit reports to establish whether they checked compliance to the risk mitigation plans</li> </ul>	30	<p>Environment officer had issued guidelines on environmental management to the schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ From the sampled schools, there were no guidelines on environmental management.</li> </ul>
<b>Total</b>						