Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)

DFID's Education Programmes in Nigeria: the Community Perspective

Inception Report

Contents

1.   Introduction

1.1.   The Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) is the independent body responsible for scrutinising UK aid. We focus on maximising the effectiveness of the UK aid budget for intended beneficiaries and on delivering value for money for UK taxpayers. We carry out independent reviews of aid programmes and of issues affecting the delivery of UK aid. We publish transparent, impartial and objective reports to provide evidence and clear recommendations to support UK Government decision-making and to strengthen the accountability of the aid programme. Our reports are written to be accessible to a general readership and we use a simple 'traffic light' system to report our judgement on each programme or topic we review.

1.2.   We have decided to review the Department for International Development's (DFID's) education programmes in Nigeria, with a particular, innovative focus on gathering community perspectives on the impact that UK aid has on pupil experiences in primary and junior secondary education. In line with our stated core value of innovation, this review will provide an opportunity to examine the education experience and outcomes enabled by aid through focussing on the experiences of intended beneficiaries.

1.3.   The review will concentrate on understanding the views and experiences of the communities being served by the education system in selected states in Nigeria. The review will record the voices and experiences of intended beneficiaries and community members. Such a qualitative approach is potentially more powerful than a large-scale quantitative survey for understanding the dynamics and factors that lie behind an individual's decisions about schooling and that affect their educational performance. One of the key benefits of qualitative analysis in this environment is the access it provides, through local researchers, to the voices of individuals in the community. This methodology will allow the evaluation to go beyond measuring impact to understanding wider issues, such as family, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status and disability and will put the conclusions in the context of the wider society within which the programmes are operating.

2.   Background

The Nigerian Education System

2.1.   Nigeria has a population of 155 million, of whom an estimated 64% live on less than £1 a day;[1] 43% of the population are aged 14 years or less.[2] These indicators show significant variation between regions within the country and indicate that the biggest challenges lie in the north. UNESCO's global monitoring report for 2012[3] shows that Nigeria has the highest absolute number of out-of school children of any country in the world (10.5 million), also experiencing the highest increase since 1999. It now accounts for almost one in five of the out-of-school children in the world.

2.2.   Nigeria's education system suffered from years of neglect under military rule and shortages of infrastructure and educational materials persist. Weak systems, however, are not unique to education and capacity is low across government at all levels. A baseline survey conducted by DFID in three northern states found that learning outcomes were amongst the worst in sub-Saharan Africa. This position was further confirmed through the USAID-funded Northern Education Initiative's Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA). The EGRA concluded that 'after three years of

---

[1] *Poverty Headcount Ratio*, World Bank data, 2010, http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.DDAY.
[2] *Out-of-School Children: New Data Reveal Persistent Challenges*, UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2011, http://www.uis.unesco.org/FactSheets/Documents/FS12_2011_OOSC_EN.pdf.
[3] *UNESCO EFA Global Monitoring Report 2012*, UNESCO, 2012, http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002180/218003e.pdf.

instruction, the vast majority of Grade 3 pupils have not mastered any foundational reading skills'.[4]

2.3. The Federal Government of Nigeria has acknowledged that education is in crisis at all levels and is facing up to the challenge of achieving the Millennium Development Goal's universal basic education goal. Some of the foundations have been put in place. The federal government and many states, which have responsibility for delivering universal basic education under the Constitution, have passed laws making six years of primary and three years of junior secondary schooling free and compulsory. Federal education budgets have increased by nearly 50% over the last five years and, in most states, education receives at least one quarter of recurrent expenditure.[5] A new four-year federal education strategy was launched in May 2012.

2.4. An increased focus on universal basic education has not led to a surge in enrolment, as experienced by other African countries in recent years. Access is rarely completely free, with schools unable to survive without continued informal charging; households incur indirect opportunity costs related to sending children to school; and cultural and religious factors limit girls' access, particularly in Northern Nigeria. Most importantly, government systems at the federal and state levels are not delivering satisfactory educational outcomes and resources are not being used effectively.[6]

2.5. Responsibility for basic education is divided between the three tiers of government: federal, state and local. The administrative arrangements are complex and vary from state to state, with an unclear division of roles and responsibilities between the main organisations, namely the:

- Federal Ministry of Education and State Ministries of Education;
- National Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC);
- State Universal Basic Education Boards (SUBEBs);
- Local Government Areas (LGA); and
- Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs).

2.6. The funding mechanisms for basic education are also complex. The state and local governments are jointly responsible for the salaries and allowances of primary school teachers. Their salaries and allowances are paid to the SUBEBs by their state's Joint Local Government Accounts Committees (JAC), having been deducted from each LGA's statutory monthly allocation from the Federation. The SUBEBs then pay teachers through the LGEAs. Basic education receives additional funding from the UBEC's Intervention Fund, which is targeted on infrastructure, textbooks and learning materials and on teacher professional development. This represents a significant challenge. With its resources and expertise, DFID believes it can make the most difference by focussing on developing and transforming the systems needed to plan and deliver universal basic education in a small number of states where needs are high.

2.7. In Nigeria, an estimated 3.6% of the population are living with HIV and AIDS. Although HIV prevalence is much lower in Nigeria than in other African countries, the size of Nigeria's population means that, by the end of 2009, there were an estimated 3.3 million people living with HIV; and approximately 220,000 people died from AIDS in 2009. With AIDS claiming so many lives, Nigeria's life expectancy has declined significantly and, in 2010, overall life expectancy had fallen to around 52 years.[7] The research will consider the impact of HIV and AIDS on surviving children.

---

[4] *Nigeria Northern Education Initiative – Results of Early Grade Reading Assessment in Hausa*, USAID, 2011, https://www.eddataglobal.org/documents/index.cfm/Nigeria%20EGRA%20Hausa%20report%20FINAL1.pdf?fuseaction=throwpub&ID=340.
[5] *ESSPIN Programme Memorandum*, Department for International Development, 2007 (unpublished).
[6] *ESSPIN Programme Memorandum*, Department for International Development, 2007 (unpublished).
[7] Information from AVERT - http://www.avert.org/aids-nigeria.htm.

2.8. DFID has supported the Nigerian education system since 2003. In addition, the World Bank has funded a major programme. The four largest programmes are summarised in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Summary of the major donor-funded education programmes in Nigeria

Programme	Dates	Donor	Intended outcomes and outputs
Capacity for Universal Basic Education (CUBE)[8]	2003-08	DFID	• Build the education governance capability of the federal government and selected states through technical assistance with policy, planning, information systems and reform of the education inspection services. • CUBE operated in Kano, Kaduna and Kwara states, with the aim of developing prioritised and costed ten-year education sector plans.
Girls' Education Programme (GEP)[9]	2005-19	DFID	• Improve girls' access, attendance, retention and relevant learning outcomes at primary and junior secondary levels in four states (phase 2).
State Education System Project (SESP)[10]	2007-11	World Bank	• Improve the quality of basic education (primary and junior secondary school) in targeted LGAs in participating states (Kaduna, Kano and Kwara), focussing on the education of girls.
Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN)[11]	2008-14	DFID	• Build government capacity and working with communities and civil society, to strengthen the federal government's capacity to play an appropriate role in the stewardship of the education sector. • Support systemic change in six selected states' delivery of basic education. • Improve the learning environment for children and promote demand for better education services.

Source: DFID programme documents

2.9. DFID's current education programme in Nigeria is targeted on interventions in some of the poorer states, with a focus on gender parity. DFID spent £24 million on education in Nigeria in 2010-11 and planned expenditure in 2013-14 is £48 million from existing programmes, falling to £44 million in 2014-15. New programmes are also in the pipeline which, if approved, will increase education expenditure to £64 million in 2014-15.[12]

---

[8] *CUBE News November 2007*, Department for International Development, http://www.dhacommunications.co.uk/resource-centre/newsletters/cube-newsletter-november-2007.pdf.
[9] Girls' Education Programme Review Report 2010.
[10] *Implementation Completion and Results Report on State Education Sector Project – Nigeria*, World Bank, 2012, http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2012/03/26/000356161_20120326001928/Rendered/PDF/ICR19590P096150C0disclosed030220120.pdf.
[11] *ESSPIN Programme Memorandum*, DFID, 2007.
[12] Information provided by DFID.

Figure 2: DFID's current education programmes in Nigeria[13]

Programme				
Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) **(phase 1 runs until June 2014)**	£60.4 million Programme budget: £84.3 million	2008-09 to 2014-15	Cambridge Education Consultants Consortium (including the British Council, BBC and Social Direct)	Lagos Enugu Kaduna Jigawa Kano Kwara
Girls' Education Project (GEP) Phases 1 and 2 (ran until 2012)	£40.7 million Programme budget: £41.1 million	2004-05 to 2011-12	UNICEF	Bauchi Katsina Niger Sokoto
Girls' Education Project (GEP) Phase 3 (runs from 2012 until 2019)	£103 million	2012-13 to 2018-19	UNICEF	Bauchi Katsina Niger Sokoto Plus six other states to be added during delivery

2.10. The majority of the DFID money in these programmes is being spent on technical assistance. There is also spending on conditional cash transfers for students, teacher training scholarships and provision of facilities.

2.11. DFID has set clear indicators in its Operational Plan that, over the next four years, its programmes should support:

- 800,000 more children into education in northern Nigeria, including 600,000 girls; and
- 5,000 women from rural areas of northern Nigeria to attend teacher training.[14]

These figures represent DFID's imputed share of outcomes achieved from wider changes in the education system.

2.12. The expected learning outcomes for the third phase of the Girls' Education Programme are more modest. By 2019, in the four northern states, the target is for 25% of girls in grade 4 of primary school to have minimum literacy competence (i.e. to be able to read a single sentence). The interim target for 2015 is 14%.[15]

2.13. DFID's approach has been to concentrate on interventions that are more structural and sustainable (such as teacher development, building schools, budgeting and strategic planning). Nigeria, however, faces weak governance, corruption and poor teaching quality and pupil enrolment. According to a recent ESSPIN-funded study, 'of primary

---

[13] Information provided to the Independent Commission for Aid Impact by the Department for International Development.
[14] *DFID Nigeria Operational Plan 2011-2015*, Department for International Development, 2011, http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/op/nigeria-2011.pdf.
[15] *Girls' Education Programme Phase 3 (2012 – 2019): Business Case*, Department for International Development, http://projects.dfid.gov.uk/iati/Document//3717636.

and junior secondary teachers working in government schools, only 75 out of 19,000 teachers surveyed achieved the minimum standards'.[16]

2.14. Both GEP and ESSPIN have been evaluated recently by DFID. As a result, the next phases of both programmes have been re-designed. We will examine the rationale for the changes which have been made and the extent to which they will impact on pupils and communities.

3. Purpose of this review

3.1. To examine how effectively DFID's education programmes in Nigeria deliver impact, focussing in particular on pupil experiences and the community perspective on primary and junior secondary level education.

4. Relationships to other initiatives and evaluations

4.1. In 2009, the International Development Committee (IDC) of the House of Commons produced a report on DFID's bilateral aid programme in Nigeria, where they examined the education sector and the initial set-up and planning of the ESSPIN programme. Additionally, they studied ESSPIN's predecessor, the Capacity for University Basic Education programme. IDC recognised the 'multi-dimensional crisis' in Nigeria's education system, with very poor access to quality education. It praised DFID's programmes and goals, particularly DFID's focus on building an education system and not running one – helping states to recognise that they are responsible for the delivery of basic, quality education.[17]

4.2. The IDC report provides a valuable baseline for our review team to examine ESSPIN further. Specifically, IDC recognised the poor management information and reporting on education indicators at the state level. ESSPIN aims to strengthen state-level education governance and capacity-building and is engaged in supporting the development of education management information systems at the federal and state levels.

4.3. IDC also praised the innovative approach that DFID has taken in promoting and integrating secular and religious education in northern Nigeria's Islamiyya schools. It praised the pilot programme that aims to incorporate more 'core curriculum by offering the incentive of assistance with provision of teachers, books and materials'. It cautioned DFID, however, that this innovative approach will 'require careful monitoring'.

4.4. As a result of the IDC report, DFID agreed to take IDC's comments into account.[18] Specifically, DFID is supporting additional work for the annual school census, which should provide better evidence and management information, thereby helping to measure the impact of the ESSPIN programme.

4.5. The National Audit Office undertook a study of bilateral support to primary education in 2010, which looked at DFID programmes in Ghana, Kenya, Ethiopia and India.[19] At the

---

[16] David Johnson and Sergij Gabrscek, *Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) - An Assessment of the Development Needs of Teachers in Nigeria - Kwara State Case Study*, Report No. KW 301, Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria, 2008, http://www.esspin.org/index.php/resources/download/52/KW%20301%20An%20Assessment%20Of%20the%20Development%20Needs%20of%20Teachers%20in%20Nigeria%20(Revised).

[17] *DFID's Programme in Nigeria: Volume 1*, House of Commons International Development Committee, HC 840-1, 2009, http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmintdev/840/840i.pdf.

[18] *DFID's Programme in Nigeria: Government Response to the Committee's Eighth Report of Session 2008-09*, House of Commons International Development Committee, HC 250, 2009, http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmintdev/250/250.pdf.

[19] *DFID: Bilateral Support to Primary Education*, National Audit Office, June 2010, http://www.nao.org.uk//idoc.ashx?docId=134fd82e-fdaf-4a38-8f58-1a0515f67d2f&version=-1.

subsequent Public Accounts Committee hearing, DFID was criticised for not placing enough emphasis on value for money in deciding where and how to spend and not going beyond enrolment to look at attainment and outcomes for children.[20]

4.6. In 2012, DFID published an internal mid-term review of its ESSPIN programme, which found that:[21]

- the programme has been effective in forming working relationships at the state level where it operates, working to bring about better governance within basic education; however, ESSPIN has not, to a great degree, pursued the same goal at the federal government level;
- ESSPIN's pilot programme was effective in working with around 2,000 schools and initial teaching and learning impacts could be seen;
- the programme will need to monitor intended beneficiary impact closer as the programme matures; and
- ESSPIN's new strategy aims to improve more than 10,000 schools over the coming years.

4.7. The World Bank-funded State Education Sector Project reported the following main lessons learned from its implementation (where the achievement of development outcomes was assessed as 'moderately satisfactory'):[22]

- government ownership and continued political commitment at sub-national levels are critical for successful project implementation;
- using existing administrative agencies (as opposed to a separate Project Implementation Unit) ensures smooth project implementation and long-term sustainability, provided the choice of agencies is accompanied by capacity-building and effective co-ordination;
- full up-front commitment of key local government education authorities is paramount for effective decentralised education management and implementation;
- establishing an effective monitoring and data collection system at the start of the project is vital to the successful monitoring and evaluation of project achievements and outcomes;
- deployment from the outset of qualified staff for key positions is paramount for ensuring strong and consistent project implementation;
- to maximise project impact, it is crucial to ensure accountability for providing timely, quality inputs regardless of the source of financing;
- a well-designed and implemented component for decentralised provision of inputs on education quality, with strong school-level leadership and accountability, can contribute significantly to improving student learning outcomes; and
- close collaboration with development partners such as DFID, UNICEF and UNESCO can lead to better results in basic education.

4.8. This ICAI review will also compare and contrast the experience of recent ICAI reviews of education in India (Bihar)[23] and East Africa.[24] Particular attention will be paid to the

---

[20] *Examination of Witnesses*: *The Department for International Development's Bilateral Support to Primary Education*, Public Accounts Committee, December 2010, www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmselect/cmpubacc/594/10111002.htm.

[21] *ESPINN First Quarterly Report,* Department for International Development, May 2012, http://www.esspin.org/index.php/search/reports?q=mid+term+review.

[22] *Implementation Completion and Results Report on State Education Sector Project – Nigeria*, World Bank, 2012, http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2012/03/26/000356161_20120326001928/Rendered/PDF/ICR19590P096150C0disclosed030220120.pdf.

[23] *Evaluation of DFID's Support for Health and Education in India,* ICAI, May 2012, http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/ICAI-Evaluation-of-DFIDs-Support-for-Health-and-Education-in-India-Final-Report.pdf.

[24] *DFID's Education Programmes in Three East African Countries*, ICAI, May 2012, http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/DFIDs-Education-Programmes-in-Three-East-African-Countries-Final-Report-3.pdf.

extent to which these and other evaluations cast light on the community perspectives on the education provision being offered.

5.   Methodology

Analytical approach

5.1.   This review will consider the effectiveness and perceived impact of the GEP and ESSPIN education programmes. The main focus will be on gathering community and pupil perspectives on the pupil experience in schools. In particular, we will focus on:

- beneficiary understanding of ESSPIN and GEP community-level programmes;
- their experience of these programmes;
- whether these programmes address beneficiary-defined needs;
- whether the beneficiaries feel they have voice in the design and implementation of the activities; and
- beneficiary perceptions of programme impact.

5.2.   The review will not cover the whole of DFID's education programmes in Nigeria. Rather, it will provide an in-depth, qualitative assessment of the education experience and outcomes in particular regions and schools.

5.3.   The review will gather the perspectives of three main groups:

- the pupils and local communities (with an emphasis on female, nomadic, working and disabled children and their families);
- the educational institutions at local, state and federal levels; and
- DFID and its contractors for ESSPIN (Cambridge Education Consultants) and GEP (UNICEF).

Pupils and school communities

5.4.   The review will target primary and junior secondary level schools and the communities they serve in selected states, where DFID programming should have affected pupils' educational experience, either through direct support for schools or through education system improvements. The review will document the community perspective on the impact of the programmes through structured observation and formal and informal discussions with pupils, teachers, parents, local education officers, civil society organisations and local community leaders. The interviews, focus groups and informal discussions will balance their contact between students and other stakeholders.

5.5.   The aim of this qualitative work is to provide a snapshot of whether money spent by DFID has made a meaningful difference to the lives of individual pupils and communities as seen from their own perspectives. We will assess DFID's contribution to educational outcomes and perceived impacts, recognising the inter-related factors that determine impact and the relatively small sample of survey participants. We will also examine the extent to which the issues and concerns expressed by the various school communities are matched by similar concerns among the managers of the DFID programmes and state education systems.

Educational institutions

5.6.   In order to understand the operating background for the programmes, we will provide an overview of the education system in Nigeria, at federal and state levels. This will consider such issues as:

- federal and state policies and strategies for primary and junior secondary schooling;
- the management and funding of primary and junior secondary schooling;
- the performance of the education system as demonstrated, for example, by data measuring enrolment rates, attendance rates of pupils and teachers, pupil completion rates and learning outcomes (analysed by gender);
- approaches to parental involvement, teacher training and school inspection;
- factors working for and against the attendance of pupils and teachers; and
- the effectiveness of management information systems to monitor learning and the critical factors that impact learning at school level.

DFID and its contractors

5.7.   The review will also consider DFID's management of the two programmes, including its involvement in design, implementation and monitoring and its ability to influence the delivery of services by responding to changed circumstances and its actions where performance is off track. We will consider the steps taken by DFID to ensure that the funds under the programme are spent on the purposes for which they were intended.

5.8.   The review will draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the two programmes and derive lessons for the future.

Evaluation framework

5.9.   The evaluation framework for this review is set out in the table below. This has as its basis the standard ICAI guiding criteria and evaluation framework, which are focussed on four areas: objectives, delivery, impact and learning. It also incorporates other pertinent questions we want to investigate in this review. The questions which are highlighted in bold are those from the Terms of Reference (ToR) on which we will focus in particular. This framework is the starting point for the review and the sources of evidence will potentially broaden as the work proceeds.

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Review questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
1. Objectives: what is the programme trying to achieve?			
Does the programme have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact? (1.1)	**Does the programme have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact? (ToR 6.2.1)** Do these objectives reflect the perceived needs of the beneficiaries, communities, civil society organisations (CSOs) and LGA officers? Has DFID's education strategy been assessed for its rationale, coherence, affordability and feasibility? Has DFID considered other options for supporting further progress in education? What is the basis of the attribution of the benefits of UK funds to intended beneficiaries?	• Evidence that clear and realistic objectives have been set that support the most recent federal education strategy (2011-15) • Evidence of consistency with DFID's overall strategy for education • Evidence of attribution of programme benefits and the basis for this	• Meetings with DFID, Cambridge Education Consultants (CEC) and UNICEF at federal and state levels • Federal education policy documents • Education plans at state and federal levels • MOUs and contracts with delivery partners • DFID education strategy • Nigeria donor co-ordination strategy • Interviews, focus groups and informal discussions

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Review questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (1.2)	**Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (ToR 6.2.2)** **Who are the intended beneficiaries? How were they identified? (ToR 6.2.3)**	• Plans demonstrate a clear and robust logic chain that leads from programme inputs (or activities) to the outcome of effective schools • Means of securing each element in the logic chain is documented • Evidence of formal commitment by a range of stakeholders to the delivery of the plan	• Meetings with DFID, CEC and UNICEF at federal and state levels • Programme logical frameworks • MOUs and contracts with delivery partners • Monitoring and evaluation reports
Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (1.3)	Is DFID confident that the current plans represent the best way forward on the basis of the available evidence? How effective is donor co-ordination in the education sector in Nigeria?	• Evidence of the extent to which state Ministry of Education's (MoEs) are responding to the support from GEP and ESSPIN • Evidence of the extent to which each programme is adapting to the rate of response from state MoEs, CSOs and communities • Evidence of alignment with other donors' priorities and federal government priorities	• Meetings with DFID, CEC and UNICEF at federal and state levels • Meetings with development partners (i.e. other donors, non-governmental organisations (NGOs)) • Education policy documents • Plans at state and federal levels • Monitoring and evaluation reports (e.g. World Bank sector report)

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Review questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context? (1.4)	Does DFID's plan effectively take into account the country and states' context, supported by effective working relationships with the federal and relevant state governments?	• Planning process enabled wide participation from key stakeholders	• Interviews in schools and communities • Meetings with federal MoE and state MoEs • Meetings with parliamentarians • Meetings with CSOs • Meetings with DFID, ESSPIN and GEP teams • Interviews, focus groups and informal discussions
2. Delivery: is the delivery chain designed and managed so as to be fit for purpose?			
Are the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (2.1)	**Are the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate and based on the best existing evidence? (ToR 6.3.1)** What was the range of funding and delivery options considered? To what extent did the choices in Nigeria depend on Nigerian experience alone or did experience from other countries or regions also inform choices?	• Evidence that DFID considered various options thoroughly in developing its approach • The extent to which the options drew on experience from Nigeria and elsewhere • The rationale for the selection of the options for implementation • Evidence of the extent to which the rationale has been confirmed in the delivery	• Meetings with DFID • Meetings with GEP and ESSPIN project managers • Meetings with state MoEs, LGAs and schools • Business case documents • Project reviews and evaluations

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Review questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (2.2)	**Was the programme set up with long-term impact on the communities in mind? Did it plan community involvement in designing the programme, in measuring impact and/or in achieving the planned outcomes? If so, in what way? (ToR 6.3.2)** Are the two programmes aimed at the long-term transformation of the education system, beyond the period of funding? How were programme participants selected and to what extent have they been retained? Was there community involvement in the design process? Has the community been involved in the monitoring and evaluation process? Are there future plans for community involvement in the management and development of the programmes?	• Evidence that DFID identified beneficiary groups and programmed their involvement • Evidence of the extent of beneficiary engagement in GEP2 review process and ESSPIN mid-term review process • MOUs with commitments beyond programme • Evidence of how the programmes define and measure long-term transformation • Evidence of equitable participant selection process and responses to retention issues • The extent to which information from communities was part of the design process • Evidence of community engagement in the monitoring and evaluation process • Evidence of feedback mechanisms for School-Based Management Committees (SBMCs) and communities • Evidence of response to HIV/AIDS and its effect on education	• Programme design documents, including logical frameworks • Meetings with DFID, GEP and ESSPIN project managers • Meetings with state MoEs • Meetings with LGAs • Meetings with SBMCs • Community meetings • Programme reviews and evaluations

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Review questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (2.3)	**Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (ToR 6.3.3)**	• Evidence of a clear governance structure at all levels with DFID able to influence design • Completed fiduciary risk-assessment reviews • Evidence of clear management processes to prevent, identify and act on allegations of corruption • Evidence of corruption being identified (and then being acted on by DFID or the relevant agency)	• SBMC reports • Programme reviews of education governance • Audit reports • Fiduciary risk assessments • Interviews in schools and communities • Interviews with DFID programme and finance staff
Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact? (2.4) Do managers ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery chain? (2.5) Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain? (2.6)	Has DFID been able to influence the level and use of other funding to increase the impact and value for money? To what extent have the resource allocation practices of the states been influenced by the DFID programme? Is the programme financially sustainable by the government on completion?	• Evidence of DFID leveraging federal or state funding and other donor funding • Evidence that DFID technical assistance is directed at improving impact and value for money • Evidence of delivery partners managing costs • Evidence of reviews and evaluations focussing on value for money • Evidence of state/LGA/school budget processes being improved through DFID support	• Meetings with delivery partners • State budget processes • LGA and school budgets • Meetings with LGAs and SBMCs • DFID programme financial records • Meetings with federal and state MoEs • Meetings with other donors • Programme reviews and evaluations

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Review questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? (2.7)	To what extent has the management of the risk process affected the delivery of the programmes? Which risks have proved to be the most difficult to respond to?	• Evidence that programme design took adequate care over risk assessment (e.g. of political context) • Evidence of risk management reports and corresponding actions (e.g. to adjust design)	• Meetings with DFID • Meetings with GEP and ESSPIN teams • Programme risk registers • Meetings with state MoEs
Is the programme delivering against its original objectives? (2.8) Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (2.9)	Is the programme delivering against its original objectives? Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances?	• Evidence that objectives are being monitored and delivered • Evidence of design or planning changes to the two programmes to reflect changing circumstances	• Reviews and evaluations of GEP2 and mid-term review of ESSPIN • Meetings with GEP and ESSPIN teams • Meetings with state MoEs
3. Impact: what is the impact on intended beneficiaries?			
Is the programme delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (3.1)	**Is the programme reaching the intended beneficiaries? Are the local communities involved in ensuring that the intended beneficiaries are reached and, if so, how? (ToR 6.4.1)** **What is the experience of individual students and recipient communities? Can community members identify any perceived impacts of the programme and, if so, what are they? (ToR 6.4.2)**	• Evidence that pupils and parents identify benefits from attending school • Processes are used to monitor the programme and measure impact • Performance indicators are used to measure impact on pupils and the education system • Results are published • Feedback mechanisms in place • Evidence of clear links between DFID programme activity and	• Interviews, focus groups, informal discussions with pupils, teachers, parents and communities, as well as structured observation of schools and SBMC meetings • Meetings with SBMCs • Meetings with NGOs • Programme budget documents • State, LGA and school budget documents • Meetings with DFID, GEP, ESSPIN, state and LGAs

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Review questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
	Has the programme generated any outputs or outcomes that were not intended or not included in the stated objectives? (ToR 6.4.3) **What systems have been put in place to monitor the programme and measure impact? Are communities involved and, if so, how? With whom is the relevant information shared? (ToR 6.4.4)** Do the design and outcomes meet the self-defined needs of the beneficiaries and communities? Do the programmes have targets for LGAs and schools or only for the programme as a whole? Are schools and SBMCs aware of the staffing and resources they should receive? Which groups are not being reached and what are the factors contributing to this situation?	improved education provision in schools, leading to learning progress by pupils • Targets are set for schools and LGAs • Evidence that specific schools and SBMCs receive support from the DFID programmes • Budget and staffing information supplied to schools • Knowledge of groups not being reached and tactics used to engage them • Evidence of any unintended consequences or benefits of the programmes • Evidence of intra-household and intra-community effects on inclusion/exclusion, differential expansion of opportunities and social cohesion • Evidence about the extent to which baseline data relevant to programme objectives were collected and/or analysed	• Annual school census and performance reports • School-centred analyses by GEP, ESSPIN or state MoEs • Reviews and evaluations

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Review questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes? (3.2)	To what extent are the two programmes linked operationally to other development partner or state programmes?	• Evidence of co-ordination across the education sector • Agreed working relationships between DFID's programmes and those of other development partners • Evidence of joint, co-ordinated review missions	• Interviews with federal and state MoEs • Interviews with other donors • Joint planning and review processes • Meetings with GEP and ESSPIN teams
Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programme? (3.3)	**What is the potential for the programme's long-term sustainability? What are the prospects for improvement, including assuring financial sustainability and local ownership? (ToR 6.4.6)** What plans do state governments have to ensure the long-term sustainability of the programmes? What processes are being put in place to secure the longer-term funding and local ownership of basic education?	• Plans exist at state level to secure the long-term sustainability of the DFID programmes • Evidence that the federal and state governments are meeting their planned financial commitments • SBMCs are confident of their continued long-term operation and performance • Community perceptions of the programmes' socio-economic value and political supportability in the long term	• Meetings with state MoEs • Interviews with schools and communities • DFID, GEP and ESSPIN documents • Meetings with DFID, GEP and ESSPIN

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Review questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme? (3.4)	**Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme? (ToR 6.4.7)**	• A documented exit strategy is in place and is practical and appropriate • The exit strategy has been agreed with the state and federal governments • The feasibility of the exit strategy has been tested	• Programme documents • Agreed MOUs with delivery partners • Meetings with state MoEs and communities
Is there transparency and accountability to the intended beneficiaries and communities as well as to donors and UK taxpayers? (3.5)	**Which indicators of impact are being measured and how? What is the basis of the attribution of the benefits of UK funds to intended beneficiaries? (ToR 6.4.5)** How important is the assessment of learning progress for individual pupils and schools? Is the successful transition to the next stage of education used as an indicator of impact? Do the annual reports for the programmes and for the education sector provide for local and international accountability? To what extent do the beneficiaries and communities feel empowered to demand transparency and hold programme officers accountable?	• Evidence of use of baseline data • Evidence of the indicators being used to measure impact • Impact measures, relating to pupils' learning progress, are included in programmes • Evidence of feedback information loops from junior secondary to primary and from senior secondary to junior secondary	• ESSPIN and GEP documents and databases • Meetings with DFID/GEP/ESSPIN • States' annual censuses • Federal annual reports • Results of learning assessments • Meetings with schools, LGAs and states • Interviews, focus groups, informal discussions with pupils, teachers, parents and communities, as well as structured observation of schools and SBMC meetings

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Review questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
4. Learning: what works and what needs improvement?			
Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (4.2)	**Is DFID innovative in its approach? If so, in what way is it different to other similar interventions? (ToR 6.5.1)** Which key components of the programmes are innovative, both in terms of Nigeria and education in the development context? Have effective education interventions from elsewhere been incorporated into programme design and implementation? How does DFID identify and adopt innovation and best practice in education?	• Evidence of approaches used by DFID that are innovative • Evidence of a system to acquire, disseminate and incorporate robust internal and external evidence into DFID programming	• Programme documents, including business cases • Interviews with DFID and GEP and ESSPIN programme teams • Meetings with DFID, state MoEs, other donors and NGOs

Relevant ICAI evaluation framework questions	Review questions	Criteria for assessment	Sources of evidence
Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (4.3)	Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken?	• Content and scope of programmes wider than the action plans	• GEP and ESSPIN programmes Operational Plans • State Education Sector Plans
Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively? (4.4)	**What lessons have been learned, including ways of improving delivery? What systems are in place to incorporate them a) in the Nigeria programme; and b) where relevant, in other DFID education programmes? (ToR 6.5.2)** To what extent are the State MoEs part of the learning process within each programme? What are the main improvements to the programmes which have been generated through the learning process? How are the lessons learned generating different approaches in DFID support for Nigeria in areas other than education? What are the main lessons from GEP and ESSPIN to date which are being actively promoted for other countries? Are lessons in design and delivery shared with DFID headquarters and other DFID country offices?	• Evidence of clear linkages between the recommendations from evaluations and future actions • Documented lessons learned and put into practice in Nigeria • Documented lessons learned and transferred elsewhere for action	• Meetings with DFID and GEP and ESSPIN programme teams • Reviews, evaluations and action plans

Detailed work programme

5.10. The work programme will have four work streams:

Work Stream 1: Preliminary assessment:

- review a range of background material about the programmes;
- interview DFID about the design and implementation of the programmes; and
- analyse available statistical data about the education system and the programmes.

Work Stream 2: Pupil and community assessment:

- understand pupil and community perspectives through qualitative field work in two states (Kaduna and Sokoto); and
- as part of this work, interviews and meetings will be held with a wide range of people including school management committees, teachers, head teachers, regional and local education officers, parents and grandparents, children, children who have left the school, and local elders and leaders.

Work Stream 3: Institutional assessment:

- assess the operation of the education system through interviews and field visits in four states and at the federal level;
- interview stakeholders in selected school communities in Niger and Kwara states;
- interview DFID's delivery partners and education sector stakeholders, including other donors and NGOs; and
- assess the sustainability of the programmes and examine information concerning corruption.

Work Stream 4: Final analysis and presentation:

- synthesise the findings, present to the Commissioners and write up.

5.11. Details of each work stream are below.

Work Stream 1: Preliminary assessment

5.12. We will review the key programme documents, including the DFID business case (or equivalent) and the logical framework. We will review evaluations that have been carried out (e.g. the ESSPIN mid-term review). We will also consider the background of the DFID Country Operational Plan and the future of the bilateral aid programme locally. We will cross-reference to other relevant ICAI reports.

5.13. We will interview DFID education staff and the ESSPIN and GEP programme teams in Nigeria (Abuja) to understand:

- the underlying rationale and objectives for the programmes;
- their funding structures and disbursements to date;
- performance to date in terms of both outputs and outcomes;
- the governance approach and DFID's role;
- DFID staff resource commitments to the programme;
- approaches to monitoring and evaluation;
- approaches to managing fiduciary risk;
- approaches to co-operation with other donors; and
- examples of learning from previous experience.

5.14. We will support this with an interview with DFID's senior education adviser in London to understand the wider context of the programmes and the comparative experience of other countries where DFID is running similar programmes.

5.15. We will review available federal and state education data that are relevant to the review, to build up a picture of the performance of the education system and the issues it is facing. This will include any independent evaluations of the education sector (e.g. the World Bank sector programme review).

Work Stream 2: Pupil and community assessment

5.16. This work stream will carry out detailed, face-to-face discussions with beneficiaries of the two DFID-funded programmes. This will provide an in-depth understanding of those factors that influence individual school attendance and learning outcomes. This qualitative research will not use random samples so it will not be feasible to generalise the research findings to the programmes as a whole. We will, however, offer deep insight into people's perspectives and experiences and the extent to which these are matched by the education system provided in each of the states.

5.17. In order to identify the exact questions to be addressed, as well as the most appropriate methodologies to employ, the team will first make a series of site visits to schools in the chosen states, to observe directly classroom practices in beneficiary schools. Next, a tailored approach to the field work will be developed, combining different research approaches in the most effective way possible. This will include the use of:

- structured and unstructured interviews, using either one-on-one or group interview approaches;
- focus groups (collective discussions) with participation from a cross-section of the community;
- direct observation of classrooms and SBMC meetings and community participation and dynamics;
- informal discussions (which can at times provide deeper insight than formal interviews and focus groups);
- consultations with key informants such as community leaders, programme staff, delivery partners and independent observers;
- analysis of background literature, media and programme records; and
- brief pen pictures of individuals (e.g. pupils and head teachers) that supplement primary data analysis with personal, anecdotal evidence.

5.18. We propose to cover a minimum of six schools and their communities in each of two states (Sokoto for GEP and Kaduna for ESSPIN). Ideally, four schools will be in the state capitals, four in smaller towns and four in semi-rural areas but travel and security constraints will affect the final selection.

5.19. We will use 'purposive sampling' and select interviewees based on their level of knowledge of a particular programme component or research topic. Sampling will be purposive in the sense that we will seek adequate representation of important sub-populations (e.g. students, parents, community leaders, religious leaders, teachers and headmasters) and situations (e.g. schools and SBMCs that have excelled under the programme, as well as those that have apparently failed; communities that are far from the school and those in which the school is located). Emphasis will be placed on disaggregating categories of beneficiaries. For example, we will develop separate interview guides for girls, boys, nomadic, working and disabled children and their parents. Islamic schools will be included in the sample.

5.20. This work will not involve tests of significance, or tests of hypotheses, or any attempt to generate population estimates of incidence or prevalence. The issue, therefore, becomes one of 'saturation'. In this case, the goal is to continue interviewing each key category of people in the study communities and LGA offices until the information and descriptions being provided no longer generate new information.

5.21. A minimum of 30 people will be involved in the research in each school and community. More people will be involved in any particular school and community if the research is providing particularly valuable insights. We plan that the researchers will have interviews or informal conversations with at least 360 people across the two states. The team will listen carefully during all interactions with pupils and community members and will be alive to opportunities to pursue in more depth views, both favourable and unfavourable, that they express. In addition, in several of the schools, the team will carry out group discussions with specific subgroups, for

example, mothers, fathers, grandparents, parents of disabled children, Fulani and religious and political leaders. The selection of schools is under discussion with the GEP and ESSPIN project teams, through DFID.

5.22. The study team will be led by a senior anthropologist-ethnographer from University of California, Berkeley, supported by a senior Nigerian sociologist from Usmanu Danfodiyo University in Sokoto State. There will be a team of Hausa-speaking female and male research associates (primarily drawn from Usmanu Danfodiyo University). Female enumerators will be used for discussions with girls and women and male enumerators for discussions with men and boys.

5.23. The field workers will be experienced local people, mainly Hausa-speaking, who will be sensitive to working with young children and the range of issues affecting their participation and performance at school. To improve the integrity of the field work and to safeguard the rights of participants, all interviewers will comply with a human subjects protocol, which ensures that each interview takes place with the informed consent of the individual, is voluntary, confidential and can be terminated for any reason and at any time by the informant. All data collected will be anonymous to protect the rights of participants.

5.24. The initial areas for questioning during interviews are the following:

- educational participation, attainment and outcomes (short term and medium term for Phase 1 GEP beneficiaries);
- expressed factors that affect enrolment, attendance and school performance, the opportunity costs of education and factors that influence out-of-school youth;
- specific aspects of GEP and ESSPIN (for example, conditional cash transfers to families, facility development such as gender-specific sanitation, female teacher training scholarships);
- the influence of social and gender issues over the course of the programme's life and their perceived interaction with specific parts of the programme;
- evidence of resource availability in the schools and any factors that might have adversely affected this; and
- systems to incorporate measurement of impact and learning into programme design and implementation.

Work Stream 3: Institutional assessment

5.25. In order to assess the institutional environment for the two programmes, we will meet a range of stakeholders in the education sector in each state. This will include the:

- State Ministry of Education and Education Commissioner;
- State Universal Basic Education Board;
- Local Government Areas; and
- Local Government Education Authorities.

5.26. We propose to carry out this work in four states, the choice of which is affected by security considerations:

- ESSPIN: Kwara and Kaduna; and
- GEP: Sokoto and Niger.

5.27. We will support this with a limited number of interviews at the federal level, where suitable individuals are available. We will interview the Ministry of Education, the Universal Basic Education Commission and the National Commission for Colleges of Education.

5.28. Further interviews will be carried out with DFID's delivery partners, namely a consortium led by CEC on ESSPIN and UNICEF on GEP. These interviews will discuss the partner's experience of implementing the programmes and the critical issues involved. We will be interested to understand what DFID can do to improve the partner's delivery performance. If feasible, site visits to a small number of schools will also be carried out in Kwara and Niger states.

5.29. Finally, we will interview other key donors in the education sector in Nigeria (e.g. the World Bank and USAID) to gain a broader perspective on the issues involved and the extent to which

their programmes are complementary. We will also interview NGOs with an informed view of the education sector (e.g. Save the Children and VSO, as well as local NGOs such as the Civil Society Action Coalition on Education for All).

Work Stream 4: Final analysis and presentation

5.30. We will present our initial findings to the Commissioners, before preparing a draft report based on the evidence gathered and the Commissioners' views and guidance. The final draft report will be submitted to DFID for fact-checking before publication.

5.31. We plan that the CEGA field-work team leader will attend the presentation of initial findings to the Commissioners. This will help to ensure that the full range of the investigation is represented.

6. Roles and responsibilities

6.1. It is proposed that this evaluation is undertaken by a core team of six, with supplementary review, peer review and in-country support. The review team will comprise consultants from KPMG in the UK as well as from the Center for Effective Global Action at the University of California, Berkeley. The field work in Nigeria will also be supported both by staff from KPMG in Nigeria and locally-recruited academics for the detailed field work in Kaduna and Sokoto, all of whom have experience of the local education sector. This recruitment will be overseen by the Population and Reproductive Health Initiative (PRHI), which is a collaboration between University of California, Berkeley and Ahmadu Bello University Teaching Hospital, Zaria, in Kaduna State.

Role	Organisation
Project Director	KPMG – UK
Team Leader	Independent
Technical Adviser	Independent
CEGA Team Leader	CEGA
Field-Work Team Leader	CEGA and PRHI
Senior Field-Work Adviser	PRHI
Technical Field-Work Adviser 1	KPMG – Nigeria
Technical Field-Work Adviser 2	KPMG – Nigeria
Technical Field-Work Adviser 3	KPMG – Nigeria

Team leader

He is a senior management consultant with wide-ranging experience of the public, private and civil society sectors. He has particular experience of helping organisations to design and implement business change and performance improvement programmes, including projects to develop new approaches to public services delivery. He began his career in policy evaluation and he has extensive experience in the area of employment and skills. He is an experienced team leader of large and complex consultancy projects. He has gained international experience through consultancy projects in Africa, the Middle East and Eastern Europe for agencies including the Overseas Development Administration (ODA), the European Commission and the World Bank. He led the KPMG teams in recent ICAI reviews of DFID's engagement with the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank.

He is a former consulting partner in KPMG (1990-97).

Technical adviser

He is a senior management consultant with an employment and consulting career characterised by making public services more customer-focussed, market-oriented and efficient. He has worked in many parts of government, ranging from local development projects, senior management in large local authorities, including the education sector, through to work with central government ministries. His international projects have ranged from large national sector transformations to institutional transformation and smaller scale developments. He has worked extensively in the Caribbean, Middle East and the Balkans in the education, justice, security and finance sectors. He spent three years in Geneva working for a United Nations organisation

focussed on trade in developing countries. He was a team member for the ICAI review of DFID's education programme in three East African countries.

CEGA team leader

He supports the Center's mission to have research inform policy through strategic, sustained engagement with global policy-makers and targeted research dissemination. He is also CEGA's programme manager for the Agricultural Technology Adoption Initiative. Prior to joining CEGA, he worked as a data analyst for UNICEF in Bhutan, Nepal and Thailand and for the research division of the Gross National Happiness Commission of the Royal Government of Bhutan.

Fieldwork team leader

He is a research medical anthropologist at the Bixby Center for Population, Health and Sustainability at the University of California, Berkeley. He has more than 20 years' experience of planning, implementing and evaluating primary health care programmes in Asia, Africa and Latin America. His graduate courses at the School of Public Health include qualitative research methods, the social dimensions of international health and the ethics of international health research. He is currently co-directing the Bixby–FIC Population and Health Program in Nigeria and co-edited 'The Practice of International Health' (Oxford University Press, 2009).

Senior fieldwork adviser

She is a seasoned sociologist with internationally recognized expertise in gender and health in Hausa society. She is an Associate Professor at the Usmanu Danfodiyo University (UDU) Department of Sociology and served as both Head of Department and Head of the Social Science Faculty. She teaches courses in gender studies, social planning and policy, qualitative research methods and Nigerian societies and cultures. As one of the few senior lecturers at UDU to promote multi-disciplinary collaboration in research, teaching and supervision, she has received honours from a number of different departments for the quality of her mentoring.

She served as Director of Research at the National Centre for Women Development and as the Community and Social Development Advisor for a PRRINN MNCH, a UK aid-funded project addressing maternal, neonatal and child health in four northern states. At PRRINN MNCH, she supervises operations research on innovative approaches to increase birth preparedness and complication readiness in the four states.

Technical fieldwork adviser 1

She is a Manager in the Management Consulting Division of KPMG Advisory Services in Nigeria. She has over eight years' working experience with non-profit, public, private and development sector clients on strategy, programme design, monitoring and evaluation and human resources. She provides technical support to the Human Capital Development Policy Commission (covering health, education and youth development areas) of the Nigerian Economic Summit Group, Nigeria's leading public–private sector think tank. She is an active member of the Unity Schools Old Student's Association National Education Summit Planning Committee. She was also the team leader on the High Level Implementation Review of the Federal Ministry of Education's Roadmap. She will be responsible for the review of the education system in Sokoto and Kaduna.

Technical fieldwork adviser 2

She is a Senior Associate in the Management Consulting Division of KPMG Advisory Services in Nigeria. She was part of the engagement team which provided support to the Federal Ministry of Education in the development of the roadmap and monitoring and evaluation framework for the education sector. She was also a team member on a separate engagement to provide Technical Support Services to the Federal Ministry of Education for the October 2010 Presidential Stakeholder Summit on Education.

Technical fieldwork adviser 3

She is a Senior Associate in the Management Consulting Division of KPMG Advisory Services in Nigeria. She is experienced with public and private sector clients covering strategy articulation, operating model design, financial management, process review and design and policy articulation & review. She was team leader for the diagnostic review of a Nigerian state's educational sector and development of a short term and medium term strategic plan for the sector. In addition, she was team leader for the development of a one year strategy for a proposed Career Centre under the Federal Ministry of Education.

7. Management and reporting

7.1. We will present our initial findings to the ICAI Commissioners on 10 July. CEGA will complete their field work on 20 July. We will then produce a draft report for discussion with the ICAI Secretariat by 22 August, allowing time for subsequent revisions and review, before preparing a final report for sign off by 9 November 2012.

8. Expected outputs and time frame

8.1. The following timetable is based on the assumption that the report will need to be finalised in Q4 2012, to meet ICAI's requirements:

Phase	Timetable
Planning	
Drafting and revising Inception Report	By 1 June 2012
Preliminary Assessment and Field work	
Interviews with DFID in London and review of evidence	By 1 June 2012
Field visits to Abuja, Niger, Kwara, Sokoto and Kaduna states	By 29 June 2012
CEGA-managed community-based field work in Sokoto and Kaduna states	By 20 July 2012
Data analysis	By 9 July 2012
Analysis and write-up	
Initial findings presentation	10 July
Skeleton draft report to ICAI	By 27 July 2012
First draft report to ICAI	By 22 August 2012
Second draft report to ICAI	By 7 September 2012
Commissioner sign-off	By 12 October 2012
Fact checking by DFID	By 26 October 2012
Final report sign-off by ICAI	By 9 November 2012

8.2. The London team members plan to be in Nigeria from Monday 11 June until Friday 22 June inclusive.

8.3. In order that these deadlines can be met, CEGA started the planning and preparation for their local field work on 17 May, from their base in Nigeria (in Zaria, Kaduna State).

9. Risks and mitigation

9.1. The following table sets out the key risks and mitigating actions for this evaluation:

Risk	Level of risk	Specific issues	Mitigation
Innovative approach to accessing intended beneficiary and community voices does not yield desired results	Medium	Innovative approach does not yield desired richness of evidence. Innovative approach does not tie in well with other facets of review.	Close supervision and review of the CEGA field work by the KPMG team, including regular review discussions with CEGA field-work team leader. CEGA and KPMG will work together to integrate the different work streams.
Inability to access key information regarding the operation of state education systems	Medium	Education management information systems (EMIS) have only recently been established in Nigeria and it is not clear if their scope will cover the key areas of interest for the review.	Undertake research on scope of and access to state education data. Deploy data from DFID projects as proxy if necessary.
Inability to access key information on individual schools in the four selected states	Medium	EMIS systems have only recently been established in Nigeria and it is not clear if their scope will cover the key areas of interest for the review.	Undertake research on scope and access to state education data. Deploy data from DFID projects as proxy if necessary.
Inability to access school communities to provide a broad sample of experiences	Medium	The selection of schools will need to be selected by the review team and approved by the relevant State Education Commissioner. It is not clear if unannounced visits will be feasible.	Initiate early discussions with state governments, with support from DFID's GEP and ESSPIN managers, to resolve any protocol issues to secure access to schools.
Safety and security of team members	High	Risk of terrorism/kidnapping. Risk to the person is significant.	Core UK team members will undertake HET training in advance. The work programme and visits will be planned carefully, in line with guidance from the FCO and Control Risks Security Services (locally based security advisers) and with security approval from KPMG in the UK or Nigeria (as applicable to the staff members).

9.2. We understand that DFID will not be responsible for any duty of care to the KPMG team whilst they are in Nigeria. Therefore, KPMG in the UK will provide this on behalf of its own employees and sub-contractors. KPMG Nigeria will be responsible for the duty of care towards its own

employees. Similarly, CEGA and its local contractor in Nigeria (PRHI[25]) will be responsible for the duty of care towards its own employees and sub-contractors.

10. How will this ICAI review make a difference?

10.1. As explained in paragraph 1.3, this review will examine the impact of DFID's education programmes in Nigeria from a new perspective. Previous ICAI reviews have examined the education system and its operation through a conventional series of performance indicators. These indicators normally provide information on the operation of the education system as a whole, with a strong emphasis on national statistics.

10.2. This review will conduct some work of this nature, in order to provide a context for the more detailed field work in selected schools and communities. It will be important that the characteristics of individual schools and communities can be situated within the education system in order to understand the context within which the community perspective exists. It will also enable an assessment to be made of the extent to which the education systems will have to change in order to meet community expectations.

10.3. The review will reach beyond this and will not only seek the views of the schools and their communities (including pupils, parents, teachers, community elders) but also will seek to understand the implications of a stronger community perspective for the management of the state education systems and for the development role of DFID. The review will enable an assessment to be made as to the extent to which the programmes are creating sustainable learning from a bottom-up perspective, rather than just using state-wide statistics to assess progress.

10.4. The review could have significant implications for DFID country programmes, once the community perspective has been injected into the planning and monitoring process. In addition, there will be implications for the state education systems if it is shown that stronger community engagement and a more responsive education system support improved learning progress for all pupils.

---

[25] The Population and Reproductive Health Initiative, based at the Ahmadu Bello University Teaching Hospital, Zaria, Kaduna State.