

19.1 Performance on Health Sector Performance Measures

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings																												
(A) Human resource planning and management <i>(Maximum 26 points)</i>	1.	LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage <i>(Maximum 8 points)</i>	Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY (2018/19) <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 ▪ <i>If there is evidence of effort to recruit (e.g. advertisement etc.) but LG has failed to attract provide the score.</i> 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was evidence that LG has filled 76.9% of the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY (2018/19). ▪ The municipality has five health facilities; two at health centre III level and three at health centre II level. ▪ Table below shows that 50 positions for primary health workers are filled out of the 65 recommended staffing norms. This is equivalent to 76.9%. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Health facility</th> <th>Filled positions</th> <th>Recommended norms</th> <th>Percent age</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mudakori HCIII</td> <td>19</td> <td>19</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bison HCIII</td> <td>13</td> <td>19</td> <td>68.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kyamwinu la HCII</td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Serana HCII</td> <td>5</td> <td>9</td> <td>55.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kasoli HCII</td> <td>4</td> <td>9</td> <td>44.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>50</td> <td>65</td> <td>76.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Health facility	Filled positions	Recommended norms	Percent age	Mudakori HCIII	19	19	100%	Bison HCIII	13	19	68.4%	Kyamwinu la HCII	9	9	100%	Serana HCII	5	9	55.6%	Kasoli HCII	4	9	44.4%	Total	50	65	76.9%
	Health facility	Filled positions	Recommended norms	Percent age																														
Mudakori HCIII	19	19	100%																															
Bison HCIII	13	19	68.4%																															
Kyamwinu la HCII	9	9	100%																															
Serana HCII	5	9	55.6%																															
Kasoli HCII	4	9	44.4%																															
Total	50	65	76.9%																															
2.	The LG Health department has	Evidence that Health department has	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the Performance Contract, review 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A comprehensive recruitment plan for 2018/19 dated 27th September 2018 was forwarded to 																													

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings																																																				
		submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department (Maximum 6 points)	submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY (2018/19), covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 6 points	recruitment plan to determine whether the vacant positions of primary health care workers have been included in the current FY (2018/19)		<p>the human resource department. The Table below shows the details:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Job Title</th> <th>Approved Posts</th> <th>Posts Filled</th> <th>Posts Vacant</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Health assistant</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Principal health inspector</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health inspector</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health inspector</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mortuary technician</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mortuary attendant</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nursing officer</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Guard</td> <td>10</td> <td>1</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Porter</td> <td>10</td> <td>8</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clinical officer</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Driver</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health information assistant</td> <td>5</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Job Title	Approved Posts	Posts Filled	Posts Vacant	Health assistant	6	4	2	Principal health inspector	1	0	1	Health inspector				Health inspector	1	0	1	Mortuary technician	1	0	1	Mortuary attendant	3	2	1	Nursing officer	3	1	2	Guard	10	1	9	Porter	10	8	2	Clinical officer	3	1	2	Driver	1	0	1	Health information assistant	5	2	3
Job Title	Approved Posts	Posts Filled	Posts Vacant																																																							
Health assistant	6	4	2																																																							
Principal health inspector	1	0	1																																																							
Health inspector																																																										
Health inspector	1	0	1																																																							
Mortuary technician	1	0	1																																																							
Mortuary attendant	3	2	1																																																							
Nursing officer	3	1	2																																																							
Guard	10	1	9																																																							
Porter	10	8	2																																																							
Clinical officer	3	1	2																																																							
Driver	1	0	1																																																							
Health information assistant	5	2	3																																																							

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings																		
	3.	The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital in-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted. (Maximum 8 points)	Evidence that all health facility in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY (2017/18): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100%: score 8 points 70 – 99%: score 4 points Below 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the LG HR department, obtain and review a sample of in-charge personnel files to determine whether they were appraised during the previous FY (2017/18). 	8	<p>The MLG directly oversees 05 health facilities: all in-charges were appraised for 2017/18 which is 5/5 therefore 100%, as indicated in the table below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Health facility</th> <th>In-charge</th> <th>Appraisal date 2017/18</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bison HCIII</td> <td>Isaac Bwayo</td> <td>20/08/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kasoli HCII</td> <td>Rose Annusugot</td> <td>20/08/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mudakoli HCIII</td> <td>Ivan Kwenyasa</td> <td>20/08/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Serena HCII</td> <td>Idirisa Kyokonye</td> <td>31/7/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kyanwinulia HCII</td> <td>Tom Emesu</td> <td>20/08/2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Health facility	In-charge	Appraisal date 2017/18	Bison HCIII	Isaac Bwayo	20/08/2018	Kasoli HCII	Rose Annusugot	20/08/2018	Mudakoli HCIII	Ivan Kwenyasa	20/08/2018	Serena HCII	Idirisa Kyokonye	31/7/2018	Kyanwinulia HCII	Tom Emesu	20/08/2018
Health facility	In-charge	Appraisal date 2017/18																						
Bison HCIII	Isaac Bwayo	20/08/2018																						
Kasoli HCII	Rose Annusugot	20/08/2018																						
Mudakoli HCIII	Ivan Kwenyasa	20/08/2018																						
Serena HCII	Idirisa Kyokonye	31/7/2018																						
Kyanwinulia HCII	Tom Emesu	20/08/2018																						
	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). (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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) Three health facilities were sampled and these included Bison HCIII, Kyanwinulia HCII and Mudakoli HCIII. It was validated that the staff lists at the health facilities were consistent with staff lists provided by MLG health department. 																		

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(B) Monitoring and supervision (Maximum 32 points)	5.	The MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities (Maximum 6 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From MoH obtain guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities (MoH to prioritize the documents to be reviewed) From the MHO obtain evidence that s/he communicated guidelines, policies, circulars to health facilities (e.g. through meetings, submission letters, etc.). From the sample of health facilities, check whether the guidelines, policies, circulars were received. <p><i>If all guidelines of the previous year are still applicable and no new ones have been issued, then score 3</i></p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence to show that the MHO communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18). MHO has listed the following policy guidelines as distributed to health facilities; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Injection control policies and procedures by Ministry of Health 2005 National policy on public private partnerships for health Primary health care current guidelines 2015/16 by Ministry of Health Uganda
			<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 meetings with health facility in- 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 level.

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 (Maximum 6 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 points 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"> charges in the previous FY (2017/18). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check from a sample of 5 health facilities 	<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
			<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 	<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tororo Municipal council does not have a health sub district (HSD), therefore, the municipal health team supervises lower health facilities. All the health facilities in the municipality were supervised and monitored as per support supervision and monitoring reports on file for FY 2017/18. There were four support supervision reports on file: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1st was dated 4th October 2017 2nd was dated 20th November 2017 3rd was dated 20th April 2018 4th was dated 9th August 2018

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 	<p>From the MHO obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support supervision and monitoring visit reports Minutes of quarterly meetings Minutes of monthly MHT meetings 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that support supervision reports were discussed for corrective action. The health department met every quarter, however, there was no evidence that these reports were discussed.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the recommendations are followed up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled health facilities, determine whether the Health department provided recommendations from the supervision visits and followed up. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that recommendations were followed up. The support supervision reports were written in a manner which doesn't show if recommendations are followed-up. There was no status update on recommendations and action plan.
	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 	<p>From the MoH obtain and review:</p> <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At time of the assessment, HMIS reports from MoH were not availed for review, and so this performance measure could not be assessed.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(C) Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability (Maximum 14 points)	9.	The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY (2017/18) - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health sector standing committee meeting minutes – check if the Council has approved the sector implementation plan and discussions by the committee Review the MHO's reports to the committee 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that the council committee responsible for health (The "Education, health, environment and community" committee) met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. This Committee met three times in 2017/18 as shown below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1st meeting was held on 18th August 2017 2nd meeting was held on 13th December 2017 3rd meeting was held on 20th March 2018 In all these meetings there was no discussion of support supervision reports, performance assessment reports, and LG PAC reports.
	10.	The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning (Maximum 6 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council obtain and review health sector standing committee meeting minutes – check if the sector committee has presented issues that require approval. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues that require council approval were presented to council and they included: In a meeting held on 20th March 2018 it was resolved that council approves a drive to sensitize the public on the use of street litter bins
		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: 	<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 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We sampled three health facilities and reviewed their Health Unit Management Committee meeting minute files. All the three health facilities had functional health unit management committees for FY 2017/18; 	

Health facility	HUMC meeting dates	HUMC functional
-----------------	--------------------	-----------------

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings						
(D) Procurement and contract management	12	The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the Municipal Health Officer (MHO) obtain and review submissions to DPU; 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The health department prepared and submitted to PDU input to procurement plan that covered all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on 17th July 2018 and PDU acknowledged on the same day. The 						
							11.	The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check the LG Notice Boards and LG budget website to establish if the Health department publicised all health facilities receiving non-wage recurrent grants • Check a sample of health facilities 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The local government has publicized health facilities that received PHC non-wage recurrent grants on the LG notice board. ▪ In addition all health facilities sampled had displayed PHC non-wage recurrent grants received and accountabilities of how the money was spent.
Bison HCIII	7 th September 2017, 29 th December 2017, 12 th March 2018, 29 th June 2018	YES										
Kyamwinula HCII	2 nd June 2017, 22 nd December 2017, 2 nd February 2018, 31 st March 2018	YES										
Mudakhoiri HCIII	29 th September 2017, 5 th February 2018, 14 th March 2018, 2 nd July 2018	YES										

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(Maximum 8 points)		with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30, 2018 for the current FY (2018/19) - score 2 points Evidence that LG Health department procurement request form (Form PPS) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY (2018/19) - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From PDU crosscheck submission from DHO 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The health department raised a requisition on 9th July 2018 by Dr. Buyinza Godfrey. At the time of the assessment, approval to procure and confirmation of funding hadn't been done.
	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We reviewed one contract and this included ; Supply of Fuel for the Health department for Qtr. 3 by M/s Total Tororo Service Station. The amount requested was Ushs. 2, 821,953. The LPO number LPO-00338 was raised on 14th March 2018, approved by the vote controller (Dr Buyinza Godfrey, the Principal Health Officer) on same date. The LPO was approved by the Town Clerk Mr. Akuma Muzariri. A Goods received note number GRN-003318 dated 14th March 2018 was issued. Payment voucher dated 6th April 2018 was raised which amounted to Ushs. 2,821,953 and was signed by Patrick Barasa.
(E) Financial management and reporting	14	The LG Health department has submitted annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Planning Unit, obtain and review performance 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Health Sector prepared and submitted the 2017/18 quarterly reports and annual performance report that included progress in the

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings										
(Maximum 8 points)	15	reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit (Maximum 4 points)	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"> report files From the MHO check annual and quarterly reports for the previous FY (2017/18) 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> execution of the planned activities to the Planning Unit for consolidation. Discussion with the Municipal Economic Planner indicated that the performance reports were prepared using the PBS system where each Sector populated its section in the system and the planning unit made the consolidation. Online submission of the consolidated quarterly reports were then done by the Municipal Economic Planner. Our review of the submitted reports indicated that the performance reports contained sections on the health sector. However the Economic Planner did not keep record of the date on which the health sector completed populating its section in the system. Nevertheless we confirmed that the online submission of the quarter1, quarter2 and quarter 4 reports were done on the dates indicated in the table below. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Online Submission date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>20/12/2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>14/03/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.go.ug/budget/individual-ig-budgets-and-performance-reports)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>02/09/2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	Online Submission date	1	20/12/2017	2	14/03/2018	3	No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.go.ug/budget/individual-ig-budgets-and-performance-reports)	4	02/09/2018
							Quarter	Online Submission date								
1	20/12/2017															
2	14/03/2018															
3	No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.go.ug/budget/individual-ig-budgets-and-performance-reports)															
4	02/09/2018															
		LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendations	Evidence that the sector has provided information to the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Internal Auditor obtain copies of sector 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the review of the Internal audit reports, the assessment team noted that the internal auditor identified issues such as drug shortages, dilapidated structures, underfunding of the health 										

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings												
		(if any) (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year If sector has no audit query - score 4 points If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year (2017/18) - score 2 points If all queries are not responded to - score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> audit reports from the internal audit and Management responses for the previous FY (2017/18) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> facilities. Responses to all the identified queries were provided to the internal audit department. 												
(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"> 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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The HUMC composition at the 3 sampled health facilities were as shown in the table below <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Facility</th> <th>Females</th> <th>Males</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bison Health center III</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mudakori health center III</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kyamwinula Health Center II</td> <td>2</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the table above, two of the health 	Facility	Females	Males	Bison Health center III	2	5	Mudakori health center III	2	5	Kyamwinula Health Center II	2	4
Facility	Females	Males																
Bison Health center III	2	5																
Mudakori health center III	2	5																
Kyamwinula Health Center II	2	4																

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the sampled health facilities, there were no guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities. However, facilities for men and women are well separated.
	17	LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with. (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: score 2 points The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Environmental officer obtain and review filled screening forms to ascertain whether screening was done and whether risks mitigation plans were developed. From the Environmental officer and CDO obtain and review Site visit reports to establish whether they checked compliance to the risk mitigation plans 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were no health infrastructure projects among the projects screened in FY 2017/18 due to limited funding. There were no site visits or monitoring done because there was no health infrastructure project implemented in FY 2017/18.

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)	<p>to check whether the mitigation plans are compiled with: score 2 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal - score 4 points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the sampled health facilities, there was one medical waste segregation chart found on only one health facility (Bison Health center III). ▪ The other facilities visited did not have guidelines on medical waste management.
Total					56	

19.2 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 (Maximum 30 points)	1.	The Municipal LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school) (Maximum 8 points)	<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 M Performance Contract: (i) review the list of schools; and (ii) the staff lists and validate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MLG has budgeted for at least a Head Teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school. 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence that Tororo MLG has budgeted for at least a head teacher and minimum 7 teachers per school. The performance Contract Vote 764 for Tororo MLG was obtained from the Senior Planner and we reviewed the quarterly plans, staff lists and lists of schools. From the Performance Contract we established that Tororo MLG has a total of 248 teachers and 15 primary schools. 															
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY (2018/19) - 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 indicated in the staff lists are actually deployed in schools. 			4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO, staff lists were obtained to ascertain the deployment of teachers and a head teacher per school. Verification was done in five (05) sampled schools and the following was established: <table border="1" data-bbox="446 1501 722 2026"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>staff list</th> <th>Deployment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rock View p/s</td> <td>32</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oguti p/s</td> <td>25</td> <td>22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>St. Kizito's p/s</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tororo Police p/s</td> <td>14</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aturukuku p/s</td> <td>11</td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> It was validated that each of the sampled schools had one head teacher and more than 7 teachers, therefore the score is 4. 	School	staff list	Deployment	Rock View p/s	32	31	Oguti p/s	25	22	St. Kizito's p/s	10	10	Tororo Police p/s
School	staff list	Deployment																			
Rock View p/s	32	31																			
Oguti p/s	25	22																			
St. Kizito's p/s	10	10																			
Tororo Police p/s	14	14																			
Aturukuku p/s	11	11																			

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>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Check the Municipal LG approved structure ▪ Check wage bill provision ▪ Positions filled. <p><i>If there is evidence of effort to recruit (e.g. advertisement etc.) but Municipal LG has failed to attract, provide the score.</i></p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tororo MLG performance contract Vote 764 was checked and the wage bill provision was Ushs. 3,940,750,000. The approved structure is 258 teachers. The actual Positions filled were 248/258x100 hence 96.0%
	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. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As at the time of assessment, Tororo MLG had not substantively filled all the (02) positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision i.e. Municipal Inspector of Schools (MIS) and Assistant Inspector of Schools. Only the position of the MIS was filled by Mr. Ereboi Patrick.
	4.	The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY (2018/19). (Maximum 4 points)	<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"> ▪ Primary Teachers - score 2 points 	<p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review the recruitment plan to determine whether the vacant positions of teachers and inspectors have been included. 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From HRM, it was verified that the MEO had submitted the recruitment Plan of 16 teachers, one assistant Inspector of Schools and One Sports Officer to HR for FY 2018/19

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(B) Monitoring and inspection <i>(Maximum 35 points)</i>	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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Inspectors - score 2 points 	<p>From the Municipal HR department obtain and review:</p> <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 team obtained and reviewed personnel files for school inspectors and a sample of head teachers from HRM department, the Municipal Inspector of Schools was not appraised in the FY2017/18. Of the (5) sampled head teachers, the following were appraised during the year 2017: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gamoiza Abdu, appraised on 29/12/2017 Ikuya Difasi, Appraised on 5/01/2018 Iiam Nicholas, appraised on 31/12/2017 <p>Appraisals evident were at 60%. (3/5)</p>
	6.	The Municipal LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools (Maximum 3 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools - score 1 point Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools - score 2 points 70% and 89% - score 2 points Below 70% - score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From MoES obtain guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools From the MEO obtain evidence that s/he communicated guidelines, policies, 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence that the MEO, communicated guidelines, policies circulars issued by the National level in FY 2017/18 to schools. The assessment team noted that there were Letters of Invitations addressed to the head teachers dated 31/05/2018, 25th/06/2018 and 8/01/2018 From sampled schools all of them had evidence of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Circular 14/2017; Testing of Learners and Circular 3/2017 Teacher Support System

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO obtain and review minutes and/or other evidence of the meetings with Head Teachers 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"> There was no evidence of meetings with Head teachers to discuss policies, circulars and guidelines.
	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 	<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"> On inspection of Government and Private Licenced Schools, the teams reviewed school inspection reports and inventory of schools inspected in the FY 2017/2018. In Quarter One July 2017 - Sept 2017 and Quarter Two October - December, 2017 the Municipal Inspector of Schools (MIS) was on sick leave hence there was no evidence of school inspection reports. In 2018 term two, the school inspections were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rock View p/s 9/6/2018 - Oguti p/s 20 /6/2018

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
			<p>1 ✓ Below 50% - score 0</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aturukuku p/s 25 /6/2018 - St. Kizito's p/s 20/7/2018 - Tororo Police p/s 26th /6/2018 <p>In 2018 there was evidence of school inspections in Licenced schools as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Starlight 12th /7/2018 - Special Plan 29th /6/2018 - Victory Junior 19th /7/2018 - Prime View 28th /6/2018 - Winners 10th /06/2018 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It was validated that none of the sampled schools was inspected 3 times a year and reports produced, thus the score is zero.
	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). 	<p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ From MEO, assessment team reviewed minutes of departmental meetings and it was evident that the inspection reports were discussed, however the team could not validate whether the recommendations for corrective actions were followed u;
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has submitted school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ From the DES obtain and review a list of LGs that have submitted school inspection reports 	<p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ From the DES, a list of MLGs that had submitted inspection reports was obtained and reviewed. It was validated that Tororo MLG had not submitted inspection reports for FY 2017/18 to the DES. ■ At the MLG, there was no evidence of letters of

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	9.	The Municipal LG Education department has submitted accurate/ consistent reports/ date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MOES (Maximum 10 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inspection reports to the DES in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) - score 2 points Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO check whether the MEO has letter of acknowledgement from DES From the sampled schools, determine whether the education department provided recommendations from the inspection reports and followed-up. 	<p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following recommendations from inspection reports were made in a meeting held on 24/07/2017: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under Min 4/July/2017: Child Foundation resolved that schools should present children for eye inspection. The following schools to be present children, Eigon View P/S, Oguti P/S, Agururu P/S and Police P/S. Under Min 7/Aug/2017: School Essay Programme agreed that identified schools present essay pictures, poems, for competitions. However, the assessment team found no evidence of follow-up of the above inspection recommendations: The performance contract vote 764 for Tororo MLG was obtained, and we reviewed lists of schools submitted for the FY 2018/19. The EMIS report 2018 from MOES were not availed for review, so we could not verify whether the lists of schools were consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS.
			<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 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. 	<p>0</p>		

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(C) Governance, transparency and accountability (Maximum 12 points)	10.	The Municipal LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS - score 5 points 	<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 enrolment levels are consistent/similar. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment team reviewed the performance contract vote 764 Tororo MLG to check the enrolment data for the FY 2018/19. The EMIS report 2018 from MOES were not availed for review, so we could not verify whether the enrolment data for all schools was consistent with EMIS reports and PBS
			<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 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From Clerk to Council, the assessment teams reviewed education sector Committee Meeting Minutes. It was verified that the Council Committee responsible for Education met and discussed service delivery issues in 2017/18 as shown below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In a meeting held on 20/06/2018 under Min. 02/TPC/20/06/2018, the MEO presented issues for discussion which included that the Ministry be tasked to provide for funds for the purchase of alternative land at Morukaitpe View p/s and take responsibility of constructing the new school.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council obtain and review minutes to check if education issues have been presented to Council. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From Clerk to Council the team reviewed minutes and it was validated that education issues were presented to the council. In a meeting held on 20/3/2018, under Min 28/EHC/20/3/2018, the MEO presented the Education Department second quarter report dated 20/3/2018 to the Committee for discussion and

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The team reviewed the SMC files from the MEO. From the 5 sampled schools, it was validated that only Tororo Police P/S held the three mandatory (termly) meetings which was below 80%, and so the score is zero. Oguti p/s, St. Kizito's p/s, and Rock View p/s were not inspected in 2017 term 3; and Aturukuku p/s was not inspected in 2018 term 1. Details are shown in the table below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of school</th> <th>Date of meeting</th> <th>Period (Term)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Tororo Police p/s</td> <td>3/8/2017</td> <td>2017 term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3/10/2017</td> <td>2017 term 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4/4/2018</td> <td>2018 term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Aturukuku p/s</td> <td>11/5/2018</td> <td>2018 term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11/7/2018</td> <td>2018 term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31/10/2017</td> <td>2017 term 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Oguti p/s</td> <td>12/7/2017</td> <td>2017 term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2/5/2018</td> <td>2018 term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30/7/2017</td> <td>2017 term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">St. Kizito's p/s</td> <td>238/2018</td> <td>2018 term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26/4/2018</td> <td>2018 term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4/7/2017</td> <td>2017 term2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of school	Date of meeting	Period (Term)	Tororo Police p/s	3/8/2017	2017 term 2	3/10/2017	2017 term 3	4/4/2018	2018 term 1	Aturukuku p/s	11/5/2018	2018 term 2	11/7/2018	2018 term 2	31/10/2017	2017 term 3	Oguti p/s	12/7/2017	2017 term 2	2/5/2018	2018 term 1	30/7/2017	2017 term 2	St. Kizito's p/s	238/2018	2018 term 2	26/4/2018	2018 term 1	4/7/2017	2017 term2
Name of school	Date of meeting	Period (Term)																																			
Tororo Police p/s	3/8/2017	2017 term 2																																			
	3/10/2017	2017 term 3																																			
	4/4/2018	2018 term 1																																			
Aturukuku p/s	11/5/2018	2018 term 2																																			
	11/7/2018	2018 term 2																																			
	31/10/2017	2017 term 3																																			
Oguti p/s	12/7/2017	2017 term 2																																			
	2/5/2018	2018 term 1																																			
	30/7/2017	2017 term 2																																			
St. Kizito's p/s	238/2018	2018 term 2																																			
	26/4/2018	2018 term 1																																			
	4/7/2017	2017 term2																																			

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>There was evidence that the MLG has displayed all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants for public viewing on the notice board of Tororo MLG. In addition, the following schools received specific non-wage recurrent grants which had been publicised on the staff room notice boards for viewing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> St Kizito Primary School <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1,524,180</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>1,524,180</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Aturukuku Primary School <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1,575,866</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>1,575,866</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Oguti Primary School <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1,524,180</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>1,524,180</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Rock View Primary School <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Term</th> <th>Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>4,616,372</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> 	Term	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)	1	1,524,180	2	1,524,180	Term	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)	1	1,575,866	2	1,575,866	Term	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)	1	1,524,180	2	1,524,180	Term	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)	1	4,616,372
Term	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)																											
1	1,524,180																											
2	1,524,180																											
Term	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)																											
1	1,575,866																											
2	1,575,866																											
Term	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)																											
1	1,524,180																											
2	1,524,180																											
Term	Amount received in 2018 (Ushs)																											
1	4,616,372																											
						<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Rock View p/s</th> <th>2018 term 2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>23/8/2018</td> <td>2018 term 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>26/4/2018</td> <td>2018 term 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>4/7/2017</td> <td>2017 term 2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rock View p/s		2018 term 2		23/8/2018	2018 term 2		26/4/2018	2018 term 1		4/7/2017	2017 term 2										
Rock View p/s		2018 term 2																										
	23/8/2018	2018 term 2																										
	26/4/2018	2018 term 1																										
	4/7/2017	2017 term 2																										

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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education department prepared and submitted the approved Sector annual work plan and budget to the PDU on 4th July 2018 and was acknowledged by the DPU on same date. This was after the deadline of submission of 30th April 2018
	14	The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time <i>(Maximum 3 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the CFO obtain a sample of contracts, review and determine whether payment requests were certified and recommended on time 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We sampled one contract and this included ; Renovation & Completion teacher's house at Industrial view Primary School: Contract was signed on 14th December 2017 between Tororo MLG and M/s Habu Agency Ltd, and the contract amount was Ushs. 19,945,000. The contractor requested for extension of the completion period for the renovation and completion of the teachers House at Industrial view primary on 27th March 2018 and this was acknowledged by the MLG on 3rd April 2018. At the time of the assessment, the contractor had not requested for payment
(E) Financial management and Reporting	15	The LG Education department has submitted annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Planning Unit, obtain and review performance 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Education Sector prepared and submitted the 2018/19 quarterly reports and annual performance report that included progress in the execution of the

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings										
(Maximum 8 points)						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> planned activities to the Planning Unit for consolidation. Discussion with the Municipal Economic Planner indicated that the performance reports were prepared using the PBS system where each Sector populated its section in the system and the planning unit made the consolidation. Online submission of the consolidated quarterly reports were then done by the Municipal Economic Planner. Our review of the submitted reports indicated that the performance reports contained sections on the Education sector. However the Economic Planner did not keep record of the date on which the Educationsector completed populating its section in the system. Nevertheless we confirmed that the online submission of the quarter1, quarter2 and quarter 4 reports were done on the dates indicated in the table below. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Online Submission date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>20/12/2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>14/03/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.govug/budget/individual-ig-budgets-and-performance-reports)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>02/09/2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	Online Submission date	1	20/12/2017	2	14/03/2018	3	No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.govug/budget/individual-ig-budgets-and-performance-reports)	4	02/09/2018
	Quarter	Online Submission date														
1	20/12/2017															
2	14/03/2018															
3	No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.govug/budget/individual-ig-budgets-and-performance-reports)															
4	02/09/2018															
16	LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendations (if any)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Internal Auditor obtain copies of sector audit reports from the 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the our review the assessment team noted that the internal audit department identified issues such as poor record keeping in some government sponsored schools and use one bank account for different funding sources. We noted that responses 											
			<p>performance report for the previous FY - 2017/18 (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th July for consolidation: score 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> report files From the MEO check annual and quarterly reports for the previous FY (2017/18) 												

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
		(Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 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 	<p>internal audit and Management responses for the previous FY (2017/18)</p>		<p>were provided to the internal auditor on the identified queries.</p>

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(F) Social and environment safeguards (Maximum 8 points)	17	LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines (Maximum 5 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/ men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc.... score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Municipal Education Officer (MEO) obtain evidence on dissemination of sanitation guidelines and awareness raising on how to manage sanitation for girls and PVDs in primary schools 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment team was not provided with evidence of dissemination of guidelines to the schools at the Municipal Education department. However, there were copies of guidelines found at the sampled schools, which included the following handbooks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) "Life skills curriculum for primary school Teachers in Uganda" b) "Basic requirements and minimum standards indicators for education institutions" Indicator 9 of this handbook has guidelines on health and hygiene. "Survival kit for schools, Pupils' resource book"
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PVDs in primary schools - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO obtain evidence on dissemination of sanitation guidelines and awareness raising on how to manage sanitation for girls and PVDs in primary schools 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence of dissemination of one handbook titled "creating a gender responsive environment". The head teachers acknowledged receipt by stamping on a photocopy of the cover of the book retained by the education officer. However, the stamps did not have dates. There were also guidelines at the sampled schools which included the following handbooks; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) "Basic requirements and minimum standards indicators for education institutions" - Indicator 9 of this handbook has guidelines on sanitation. "Sanitation promotion: What Teachers need to know and do"
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled schools, check whether the SMC meets the guideline 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four Primary Schools were sampled and their compositions for the school management committees were as follows;

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings															
			composition - score 1 point	on gender composition		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>Females</th> <th>Males</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Police P/S</td> <td>4</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oturukuku P/S</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oguti P/S</td> <td>5</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>St. Kizito P/S</td> <td>5</td> <td>8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The School Management Committees for the sampled schools were therefore duly composed with more than 2 females each, following the guidelines in the Education (pre-primary, primary and Post-Primary) Act, 2008. 	School	Females	Males	Police P/S	4	9	Oturukuku P/S	6	7	Oguti P/S	5	8	St. Kizito P/S	5	8
School	Females	Males																			
Police P/S	4	9																			
Oturukuku P/S	6	7																			
Oguti P/S	5	8																			
St. Kizito P/S	5	8																			
	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 environmental 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filled screening forms to ascertain whether screening was done and whether risks mitigation plans were developed. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no documented evidence of dissemination of environmental management guidelines to the schools. However, there were copies of guidelines seen in the sampled schools. An example of these guidelines was a handbook titled "Information, Education and Communication (IEC) Strategy and plan for solid waste management". There were also claims that the Municipal Education Officer holds termly meetings with school head teachers in which environmental management issues are discussed and responsibility explained. However, there was no clear record of documented evidence of this engagement at the Municipal education officer's office. 															

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
				<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 	32	
Total					32	